UCLA
UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title
Cruel Embrace: War and Slavery in the Texas Borderlands, 1700-1840

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2q08b3nd

Author
Flomen, Max

Publication Date
2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Cruel Embrace: War and Slavery in the Texas Borderlands, 1700-1840

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in History

by

Max Flomen

2018

© Copyright by

Max Flomen

2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Cruel Embrace: War and Slavery in the Texas Borderlands, 1700-1840

by

Max Flomen

Doctor of Philosophy in History

University of California, Los Angeles, 2018

Professor Stephen A. Aron, Chair

This dissertation examines the role of slaving during the encounter between indigenous societies and Euro-American empires in the Texas borderlands from 1700 to 1840. Historians have generally overlooked the structures that bound continental and Atlantic slave systems together. In this multipolar borderland pastoral and plantation modes of production conflicted and comingled, drawing all participants into a "cruel embrace" rife with possibilities for exploitation, destruction, and reinvention. The dissertation charts the formation of French and Spanish colonies in Louisiana and Texas during the eighteenth century, where forced, long-distance transfers placed indigenous and African populations into plantation and mission regimes. Within the indigenous world of the Southern Plains, epidemics, firearms, and horses catalyzed the emergence of powerful equestrian societies. Slaving figured prominently in the confrontation of these band societies and European empires, and captives themselves assumed significant roles during a period of protracted inter-cultural warfare. Following Mexican independence in 1821,

the arrival of Native American and Anglo-American colonists introduced new contenders for control of land and labour in this fractious borderland. During the ensuing conflicts of the 1830s and 1840s, new multi-ethnic cohorts emerged to contest the expansion of plantation slavery.

The dissertation of Max Flomen is approved.

Jessica R. Cattelino

Benjamin L. Madley

Stephen A. Aron, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2018

Table of Contents

Introduction: Engines of Capture, Ethnographies of Violence……1

Chapter 1: Origins of a Slaving Zone, 1700-1770…….17

Chapter 2: Slaving Communities and the Pastoral-Plantation Borderland, 1770s-1780s…….61

Chapter 3: War and Slavery in the Borderland, 1785-1795…….107

Chapter 4: Newcomers, Revolution, and Divergent Slaveries, 1800-1825…….142

Chapter 5: The Long War for the Texas Borderlands, 1825-1840……..188

Conclusion: Slaving, Borderlands, Fragments…….236

Bibliography……241

Acknowledgements

This dissertation was completed with financial support from the UCLA History Department, UCLA Graduate Division, the University of Texas Center for American History, the Center for French Colonial Studies, the Newberry Library, and the Gilder-Lerhman Institute of American History. Steve Aron and Ben Madley played integral roles in helping me bring this project to fruition. I wish to thank my teachers, colleagues, friends, and family at UCLA and beyond for their advice, help, and support. All errors are mine.

Curriculum Vitae

EDUCATION

M.A., Department of History, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, 2011

B.A., Department of History, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, 2009

AWARDS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Dissertation Year Fellowship, UCLA Graduate Division, 2017-2018

Newberry Library-Jack Miller Center Short-Term Fellowship, 2016-2017

Carl J. Ekberg Research Grant, Center for French Colonial Studies, 2016

Samuel and Marion Merrill Graduate Student Travel Grant, Organization of American Historians, 2016 Conference, Providence, RI

Gilder-Lerhman Institute of American History Fellowship, 2015-2016

University of Texas, Center for American History, William and Madeline Smith Travel Award, 2015-2016 and 2017-2018

UCLA Gary B. Nash Graduate Fellowship in Early American History, 2014-2015

LANGUAGES

Fluent in English, French, and Spanish

Introduction: Engines of Capture, Ethnographies of Violence

At dawn on March 6, 1836 Mexican troops commanded by President Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna stormed San Antonio's Mission de Valero, known as *El Alamo*. Regarding the Anglo-American rebels inside as pirates, before the assault Santa Anna's flagbearer hoisted the red banner that signalled "no quarter." As the sun rose over the smoking ruins of the mission, Joe, an enslaved African-American brought to Texas by one of the rebels, was the only male defender left alive. Santa Anna released Joe to carry news of the battle to the remaining insurgents and then pressed the offensive. But as the Mexican Army advanced on the abandoned plantations of east Texas, another force approached from the west.[1]

Entering war-ravaged San Antonio just months after the fall of the Alamo, the Comanche leader Casimiro and his men expressed no interest in the ongoing Anglo-Mexican conflict. Casimiro had a message. But first he and his companions wanted something to eat. Entering a storehouse, Casimiro asked the *Tejano* (Hispanic Texan) soldier Antonio Menchaca if he could have parcels of salty bread, dried beans, and three strings of peppers. After Menchaca obliged, Casimiro turned to depart "but before he left he looked at me in a very strange pitying manner and said to me Manchaca I feel a great deal of compassion for you." Menchaca asked to know the reasons for Casimiro's disquiet. Casimiro told him that Comanches "intended to come into San Antonio burn the town and kill all the people." Listening as Menchaca stumbled from terror to indignation, Casimiro informed his old acquaintance that "I have 20 horses 2 mexican prisoners to wait on me and 4 wives. If you will come and live with me and my band I will devide equally with you each of these articles." Menchaca demurred but gave six bottles of mescal and some sugar cakes (*piloncillos*) to the visitors, who promptly left. Mencahca himself

[1] For Joe's account of the fall of the Alamo, see the entry of March 20, 1836, in Paul D. Lack, ed., *The Diary of William Fairfax Gray: From Virginia to Texas, 1835-1837* (Dallas, 1997), 128-129.

soon departed the beleaguered capital for Nacogdoches, where he hoped to retrieve his family. During their journey home, he learned that in mid-August Casimiro led 1,500 Comanches against San Antonio and a nearby mission, killing six people and taking numerous horses.[2]

Indigenous-colonial diplomacy intertwined gendered exchanges of goods, animals, and captives during interactions punctuated by violence as well as reciprocity. "Cruel Embrace: War and Slavery in the Texas Borderlands, 1700-1840," examines the comingling of slaving practices at the intersection of indigenous borderlands and the Atlantic World. It is a history of how slaving defined and shaped borderland peoples. Pushing beyond standard categories (specific colonies or tribes) and chronologies (colonial and national periods), this dissertation investigates the interplay between pastoral and plantation-oriented slaving to demonstrate how alliances, warfare, and the exchange of captives proved mutually-constitutive of unfree labour regimes in a borderland setting. Although the confluence of slaving cultures manifested shared meanings, this collectively-constructed world masked predatory motives that unleashed pain, disillusion, and destruction for tens of thousands of people.

Charting these changing patterns, the dissertation foregrounds the experiences of the indigenous bands, Euro-American slavers, and captives of all nations who moved across the borderland slaving zone – both to exploit others and to mitigate their own precarious circumstances. Analyzing the strategies of equestrian raiders, missionized Natives, maroon bands, and slave traders, the dissertation argues that slaving drew the peoples of three continents across vast cultural and geographical distances into a "cruel embrace" – relationships fraught with violence from within and shifts in alliance politics from without. In a multipolar setting where no group was dominant, the unintended consequences of slaving conjured coalescent

[2] Antonio Menchaca, "The Unpublished Second Part of the Menchaca Manuscript," in *Recollections of a Tejano Life: Antonio Menchaca in Texas History*, Timothy Movina and Jesús F. de la Teja, eds., (Austin, 2013), 155.

peoples, galvanized new forms of resistance, and infused regional politics with the constant threat of insurrection or enslavement.[3]

Applying the borderlands paradigm to build a more complete (but certainly contested) narrative of colonial slavery, this dissertation focuses on the activities of protean formations during a period of biological catastrophes and revolutionary changes. Analyzing slaving as central to inter-communal relations, rather than the product of an institutionalized imperial project, frames a new understanding of how competing modes of production mingled the practices and personnel of different slave regimes. Doing so shifts our understanding of multi-ethnic coalitions, such as raiding bands and fugitive communities, out of a national or racial framework and onto the more fluid social terrain where the dispossessed discovered new methods of recombination. This approach to the study of slavery moves beyond scholarly focuses on commercial slaving, Atlantic networks, and legal abolition. Comingling subsistence

[3] There are many works on early American history that engage with the borderland and Atlantic models to revise older imperial histories. For those most pertinent to this dissertation, see Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in between in North American History," *American Historical Review* (*AHR*) 104:3 (June 1999): 814-841; David J. Weber, "Bourbons and Bárbaros: Center and Periphery in the Reshaping of Spanish Indian Policy," in Christine Daniels and Michael V. Kennedy, eds., *Negotiated Empires: Centers and Peripheries in the Americas, 1500-1820* (New York, 2002), 79-103; Alan Taylor, *American Colonies* (New York, 2004); James Pritchard, *In Search of Empire: The French in the Americas, 1670-1730* (London, 2004); Paul Cohen, "Was there an Amerindian Atlantic? Reflections on the Limits of a Historiographical Concept," *History of European Ideas* 34:4 (August 2008): 388-410; Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (New Haven, 2008); Shannon Lee Dawdy, *Building the Devil's Empire: French Colonial New Orleans* (Chicago, 2008); Brian DeLay, *War of a Thousand Deserts: Indian Raids and the U.S.-Mexican War* (New Haven, 2009); Eric Hinderaker and Rebecca Horn, "Territorial Crossings: Histories and Historiographies of the Early Americas," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 67:3 (July 2010): 395-432; Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett, "On Borderlands," *The Journal of American History* 98:2 (September 2011): 338-361; Daniel K. Richter, *Before the Revolution: America's Ancients Pasts* (Cambridge, 2011); Paul W. Mapp, *The Elusive West and the Contest for Empire, 1713-1763* (Chapel Hill, 2011); John K. Thornton, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820* (Cambridge, 2012); Pekka Hämäläinen, "The Shapes of Power: Indians, Europeans, and North American Worlds from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century," in Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman, eds., *Contested Spaces of North America* (Philadelphia, 2014), 31-68; Matthew Babcock, *Apache Adaptation to Hispanic Rule* (Cambridge, 2016). Among the most important monographs of the "New Indian History" for this dissertation are Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge, 1991); Daniel H. Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley before 1783* (Chapel Hill, 1992); James F. Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, 2001); Ned Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West* (Cambridge, 2003); Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia, 2006); Juliana Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands* (Chapel Hill, 2007); Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*; Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France* (Chapel Hill, 2012).

strategies, information, and personnel, the travails of indigenous, European, and African bands offer a continental, community-centered approach to the alternative patterns of slaving and abolition long-neglected by the meta-narrative of North American history.

Over the last thirty years, students of "early America," emphasizing its indigenous, borderland, and Atlantic dynamics, point to the negotiated nature of colonial societies within the complex spaces of inter-cultural encounter. The communities that emerged at the intersection of pastoral and plantation slaving zones confound scholarly and popular conceptions of so-called "slave societies," and the activities that cause "slavery" to expand or decline. Borderland slaving was more than a legal, racial, and national institution constructed by states or empires. It was a historically contingent strategy that empowered marginalized communities, including those who were the targets of other slavers. Scholars often frame an implicit binary between Atlantic slavery (or the United States' "peculiar institution") and the varied customs of captivity practiced by the peoples of Africa and the Americas. The latter are almost always characterized as unfolding along kinship structures, in opposition to the racialized and capitalist dynamics of early modern European slaving.[4]

Challenging these assumptions, scholars of the "New Indian History's" second wave have focused on the role of Native Americans in shaping colonial-era slave trades. Examining a multitude of continental settings, their findings have altered histories of race, captivity, and labour while demonstrating the pervasive influence of Atlantic ideologies and markets on indigenous slaving practices. This new understanding of inter-cultural slaving goes hand-in-hand with interpretations emphasizing the "negotiated" character of European empires, where local environments, inter-colonial trade, and Native polities shaped colonial societies far more than

[4] The distinction between "slave societies" and "societies with slaves," is developed in Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, 1998).

metropolitan directives. The works of James Brooks, Ned Blackhawk, and Juliana Barr have established the centrality of gendered, kin-based systems of exchange and captive-taking within the social relations of the southwest borderlands.[5] Yet even in the heart of the continent the traffic in Native captives was also influenced by the development of the Atlantic slave trade and the surging number of African and Afro-American peoples who laboured on colonial plantations in the midst of indigenous homelands. Most historians of North American slavery have largely ignored the interplay between indigenous and Atlantic slaveries, particularly during the formative decades when French and Spanish imperialists sough to establish plantation zones west of the Mississippi River. In the pastoral-plantation borderland that overlay Texas, there was no "other" slavery. Rather, continental and Atlantic slave systems developed in tandem, exposing all participants to a spectrum of violent and uncertain outcomes.[6]

[5] For recent works on Native American slavery, see Allan Gallay, ed., *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln, 2009); Max Carocci and Stephanie Pratt, eds., *Native American, Adoption, Captivity, and Slavery in Changing Contexts* (New York, 2012); Bonnie Martin and James F. Brooks, eds., *Linking the Histories of Slavery: North America and Its Borderlands* (Santa Fe, 2015), xv-xxxiv; Andres Résendez, *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America* (Boston, 2016); Arne Bialuschewski and Linford D. Fisher, "New Directions in the History of Native American Slavery Studies," *Ethnohistory* 64:1 (January 2017):1-17. For earlier scholarship on the Indian slave trade, see A. W. Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York, 1913) and L. R. Bailey, *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest: A Study of Slave-Taking and the Traffic of Indian Captives* (Los Angeles, 1966). For Indian slavery in the southwest, see Brooks, *Captives and Cousins*; Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land*; Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*. For the southeast, see Alan Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717* (New Haven, 2002); Paul Kelton, *Epidemics and Enslavement: Biological Catastrophe in the Native Southeast, 1492-1715* (Lincoln, 2007); Christina Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country: The Changing Face of Captivity in Early America* (Cambridge, 2010). For the upper Mississippi Valley and Great Lakes, see Carl J. Ekberg, *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country* (Urbana, 2007); Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*. For New England, see Margaret Ellen Newell, *Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery* (Ithaca, 2015); Linford D. Fisher, 'Why shall wee have peace to bee made slaves': Indian Surrenderers during and after King Philip's War," *Ethnohistory* 64:1 (January 2017): 91-114. For California and the Colorado Valley, see Benjamin L. Madley, 'Unholy Traffic in Human Blood and Souls': Systems of California Indian Servitude under U.S. Rule," *Pacific Historical Review* 83:4 (November 2014): 626-667; Natale Zappia, *Traders and Raiders: The Indigenous World of the Colorado Basin, 1540-1859* (Chapel Hill, 2016). For works that explore the dynamics of continental and Atlantic slaveries, see Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves*; Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country*; Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*; Erin Woodruff Stone, "America's First Slave Revolt: Indians and African Slaves in Espanola, 1500-1534," *Ethnohistory* 60:2 (Spring 2013): 195-217; Marjoleine Kars, "Dodging Rebellion: Politics and Gender in the Berbice Slave Uprising of 1763," *AHR* 121:1 (February 2016): 39-69.

[6] For works on "American slavery" in Texas and the Lower Mississippi Valley that do not substantively engage with the continent's broader slaving patterns, particularly those implicating indigenous peoples, see Randolph B.

Building on and departing from these findings, this dissertation reframes the historical contingencies of slavery's development in the North American West, which long vexed imperial constructs and involved long-term exchange patterns across distinct slaving zones. A clearer understanding of bondage in North America necessitates moving away from binary categories – slave or free, black or Native – and towards definitions of slaving and enslavement that embrace a spectrum of possibilities. Since most human societies develop methods of coercion and exploitation, none of these possibilities should be regarded as "ideal types" neatly comparable with other localities at different times. Rather than impose models or abstract distinctions among and within these regimes, slaving must be understood as multidimensional. The social, economic, and political value provided by captives were interwoven in both state and non-state societies, progressively layered onto each other through warfare and commerce. By reframing our understandings of slavery – what "it" looks like, how it "rises" and "falls," – this dissertation breaks with older, nationalist narratives to uncover alternative methods of slaving and abolition. This approach necessarily moves beyond, but hardly erases, colonies, empires, and nation-states as units of analysis.

At the intersection of the pastoral and plantation political economies emanating from Texas and Louisiana, multiple communities – bands, villages, empires, and the enslaved themselves – contested the structures of bondage. Focused on an indigenous-colonial encounter marked by extreme violence, varied practices of capture, incorporation, deployment, and associated rituals – what I term "engines of capture" – emerged in response to the historic

---

Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas* (Baton Rouge, 1989); Sean M. Kelley, *Los Brazos de Dios: A Plantation Society in the Texas Borderlands, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge, 2010); John Craig Hammond, "Slavery, Settlement, and Empire: The Expansion and Growth of Slavery in the Interior of the North American Continent, 1770-1820," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 32:2 (Summer 2012): 175-206; Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge, 2013); Edward E. Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York, 2014); Andrew J. Torget, *Seeds of Empire: Cotton, Slavery, and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850* (Chapel Hill, 2015).

marginality of certain actors, and not static institutions transferred across time and space. Given their respective organizational capabilities and mutual entanglements, indigenous and colonial societies faced a paradox: they had to engage one another as potential partners even as they sustained their political economies with violence, including extensive slave trafficking. Although raiders and planters developed different methods of acquiring, mobilizing, and controlling captives, alliances predicated on the transfer of people and animals enmeshed them within an economy of violence rife with new possibilities for resistance and exploitation.[7]

Rooted in ethnohistorical and comparative methods, the dissertation focuses on groups and individuals who moved through the slaving zone, whether motivated to acquire and control labour (human beings, animals) or coerced by bondage and dislocation. Developing a raiding economy over time, equestrian indigenous nations are at the forefront of borderland slaving regimes. Although raiding made them consumers and purveyors of captives, even the most powerful indigenous nations, such as Apaches and Comanches, were also victims of enslavement. Taking seriously the egalitarian structures of Apache, Comanche, and Wichita bands and related concepts of kinship, pastoralism, and territoriality reveals the impact of their social organization on slaving practices. These indigenous engines of capture placed prisoners on a gendered continuum of incorporation, from drudge labourers and auxiliary wives to full members of the group. Inextricable from kinship structures, these practices did not reproduce slaves as a distinct class, as slave lineages usually dissolved over a generation. Within indigenous bands slavers belonged to the warrior-trader stratum, generally cohorts of younger men directed by senior war leaders selected from the ranks. Building on intra-band dynamics,

[7] My understanding of slaving and its historic role in human societies is drawn from Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, 1982); Claude Meillassoux, *The Anthropology of Slavery: The Womb of Iron and Gold*, trans. Alide Dasnois (Chicago, 1991); Fernando Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies: Slavery, Predation, and the Amerindian Political Economy of Life* (Austin, 2009); Joseph C. Miller, *The Problem of Slavery as History: A Global Approach* (New Haven, 2012); Catherine M. Cameron, *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World* (Lincoln, 2016).

these men organized and profited from raids by connecting their interests with allied Native, *mestizo*/*métis*, and Euro-American clients. Working as raiders, purveyors, and consumers of captive labour, Euro-American men often referred to obliquely as "Indian traders" provided access to additional markets as they joined indigenous kinship and commercial networks. Thus the agents of this pastoral economy of violence simultaneously supplied, insulated, and constrained the plantation economy assembled by sedentary, extraction-oriented colonists. The creation and control of massed labour gangs, composed of individuals alienated as racialized chattel, created the permanently antagonistic master-slave relations characteristic of Euro-American slavery. Entangling these political economies, fugitive slaves and aspiring masters converged on the borderlands to escape or expand a plantation regime modeled on those of the greater Caribbean world. Following these actors, the narrative hinges on moments of alliance, war, insurrection, and maronnage that challenged the planter hegemons who "dominated" history because textbooks say they did.[8]

No uniform ecological or geographic features defined the slaving zone that emerged between northeastern New Spain and southern French Louisiana, and this dissertation pushes against colonial constructions of this complex human and natural space. Instead, the region's

[8] My focus on these groups, generally marginalized in the literature, is inspired by Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York, 1965); Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History* (Berkeley, 1982), 154-157; Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Brian Massumi, trans., *Nomadology: The War Machine* (Cambridge, 1986); Howard Lamar, "From Bondage to Contract: Ethnic Labor in the American West, 1600-1890" in Stephen Hahn and Jonathan Prude, eds., *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America* (Chapel Hill, 1985), 293-326; Colin G. Calloway, "Neither White nor Red: White Renegades on the American Indian Frontier," *Western Historical Quarterly* 17:1 (January 1986): 43-66; Deborah A. Poole, "Landscapes of Power in a Cattle-Rustling Culture of Southern Andean Peru," *Dialectical Anthropology* 12:4 (1987): 367-398; William L. Merrill, "Cultural Creativity and Raiding Bands in Eighteenth-Century Northern New Spain," in William B. Taylor and Franklin Pease G. Y., eds., *Violence, Resistance, and Survival in the Americas: Native Americans and the Legacy of Conquest* (Washington, D. C., 1994), 124-152; Daniel H. Calhoun, "Strategy as Lived: Mixed Communities in the Age of New Nations," *American Indian Quarterly* 22:1/2 (Winter-Spring 1998): 181-202; James F. Brooks, "Served Well by Plunder: *La Gran Ladroneria* and Producers of History Astride the Rio Grande," *American Quarterly* 52:1 (March 2000): 23-58; Anne F. Hyde, *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the American West, 1800-1860* (Lincoln, 2011); Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston, 2013).

function as a unit of analysis emerges from the exchange networks that plaited Native, Euro-American, and African peoples into a roughly coherent intercultural zone. This vast contact zone of dense thickets, creek bottoms, and coastal bayous stretched southward from the Ozark Plateau to the delta country of the Gulf Coast, drained (south to north) by the Rio Grande, Nueces, Guadalupe, Colorado, Brazos, Trinity, Sabine, and Red rivers. These waterways and the woodlands that surrounded them sustained humans and animals with water, forage, and shelter. Pine forests dominated east Texas and northwestern Louisiana, transitioning to a mixture of oak, mesquite, cedars, and cypresses that clustered around rivers and dominated the hill country of central Texas. Salt marshes and lengthy sandbars that sustained swarms of mosquitoes and abundant marine life characterized the coastal plains that greeted Gulf tides and storms.[9]

Methodologically, this dissertation combines a historical materialist approach with an ethnohistorical reading of European accounts of indigenous warfare and captive-taking, practices in which Europeans were intimately implicated. Summarizing post-structural trends in the social sciences, anthropologist Deborah Poole argued that violence, rather than a totally anti-social force, is "productive of subjectivities, truths, histories, and identities – productive, in short, of the social order itself."[10] This dissertation explores these violent, productive processes on the ground. Without dismissing the many distinguishing differences between and among the African, European, and Native peoples at the center of this work, material motives trumped cultural markers as the historical encounter unfolded. Hence indigenous violence is not interpreted as intrinsically ritualistic and the motivations for European warfare as single-mindedly capitalistic. As anthropologist R. Brian Ferguson pointed out, there are invariably connections between "war

[9] For descriptions of the borderland, see Fray Juan Augustin Morfi, *History of Texas, 1673-1779*, Carlos E. Castaneda, ed. and trans., 2 vols. (Albuquerque, 1935), I: 49-67; Antoine Simon Le Page Du Pratz, *The History of Louisiana, or of the Western Parts of Virginia and Carolina […]*, (London, 1774), 148-152.

[10] Deborah Poole, ed., *Unruly Order: Violence, Power, and Cultural Identity in the High Provinces of Southern Peru* (Boulder, 1994), 1.

and magico-religious beliefs and practices […] ritual commonly precedes, accompanies, and follows an engagement."[11] In short, warfare and slaving produced *shared* communities. Strategies and lineages developed together. Yet they also tore people *apart* in more obvious and subtle ways. This materialist approach is premised on the assumption that common challenges faced by peoples living in the same time and space will produce broadly similar solutions, in this case the problem of power relations in a borderland setting.

Within the cultural-material nexus that informed engines of capture, other categories, long-staples of an over-theorized academic literature, become flattened as well. Among the most salient of these categories are diasporas and shatter zones (created by the initial shockwaves of slaving and epidemics); plantations and missions (extractive sites organized around the concentration of unfree labourers); creolization and ethnogenesis (the "imagined communities" created by economies of violence). These pairings are generally dichotomized into racialized "black" and "Indian" categories, at the expense of seeing how they are coterminous products of the colonial project. Indeed, these processes all unfolded sequentially in different times and places. Contact and conquest produced enormous casualties, dispossession, and dislocation. Colonists then attempted to forcibly concentrate racialized subjects in productive zones. Within and at the edges of these localities of exploitation, new groups emerged that pursued their own objectives.[12]

---

[11] R. Brian Ferguson, "Explaining War," in Jonathan Haas, ed., *The Anthropology of War* (Cambridge, 1990), 46. For anthropological perspectives on war, see also R. Brian Ferguson, ed., *Warfare, Culture, and Environment* (New York, 1984), 1-81; Thomas J. Barfield, "The Devil's Horsemen: Steppe Nomadic Warfare in Historical Perspective," in S. P. Reyna and R. E. Downs, eds., *Studying War: Anthropological Perspectives* (Amsterdam, 1994), 157-182; D. S. Farrer, *War Magic: Religion, Sorcery, and Performance* (New York, 2016), 1-24. To this point, in 1787 Spanish troops hauled a statue the Virgin of Guadalupe into eastern Apache territory, where their idol would countenance a season of pillage and killing. See Al B. Nelson, "Campaigning in the Big Bend of the Rio Grande in 1787," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (*SWHQ*) 39:3 (January 1936): 205.

[12] This methodology and critique of other approaches draws on the insights of Bruce Trigger, "Early Native North American Responses to the European Encounter: Rationalistic vs. Romantic Interpretations," *JAH* 77:4 (March 1991): 1195-1215; R. Brian Ferguson and Neil L. Whitehead, eds., *War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and*

Given their perspective and tenor, European observations of indigenous peoples are often themselves a historical problem: ideologically-tinged statements justifying assaults on what contemporary readers understand as sovereignty and human rights. Ethnographic military and missionary reports, official diaries, trials and interrogations, treaties, travelogues, and maps compose the bulk of French and Spanish-language archival sources that describe indigenous societies. These documents say much more about European societies than they do about indigenous ones. Likewise, colonial policies generally provide evidence of aspirations, rather than outcomes. For example, laws forbidding soldiers from gambling or trading with Natives is likely a sign that these activities were pervasive, rather than an indicator that they were suppressed. Despite the often-hyperbolic cultural chauvinism ingrained in the colonial archive, over a protracted encounter involving sustained interaction, certain French and Spanish people developed better understandings of indigenous motives through exposure to their cosmologies, politics, and values. The arrival of Anglo-Americans in the 1820s add family letters, plantation records, booster literature, captivity narratives, and newspapers to an array of government and military documents produced by Mexicans and Anglo-Texans. Several reports written by Mexican officials during the 1820s are among the best ethnographic material, composed by

---

Indigenous Warfare (Princeton, 1992), 1-30; Calhoun, "Strategy as Lived," esp. 188-190; Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Indian Southwest: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention* (Norman, 1999); Hal Langfur, "Moved by Terror: Violence as Inter-Cultural Exchange in Late Colonial Brazil," *Ethnohistory* 52:2 (Spring 2005): 255-289; Brian Sandberg, "Beyond Encounters: Religion, Ethnicity, and Violence in the Early Modern Atlantic World, 1492-1700," *Journal of World History* 17:1 (March 2006): 1-25; Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8:4 (December 2006): 387-409; Robbie Ethridge and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall, eds., *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: The Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South* (Lincoln, 2009); Jason M. Yaremko, "Colonial Wars and Indigenous Geopolitics: Aboriginal Agency, the Cuba-Florida-Mexico Nexus, and the Other Diaspora," *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 35 (2011): 165-196; Wayne E. Lee, ed., *Empires and Indigenes: Intercultural Alliance, Imperial Expansion, and Warfare in the Early Modern World* (New York, 2011), 1-18; James Sidbury and Jorge Canizares-Esguerra, "Mapping Ethnogenesis in the Early Modern Atlantic," *William and Mary Quarterly* (*WMQ*), 3rd series, 68:2 (April 2011): 181-208; and respondents, 209-222; Juliana Barr, "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of the Early Southwest," *WMQ* 68:1 (January 2011): 5-46; Mark Santiago, *The Jar of Severed Hands: Spanish Deportation of Apache Prisoners of War, 1770-1810* (Norman, 2011); and various chapters in Martin and Brooks, *Linking the Histories of Slavery*.

people who spent prolonged residences among indigenous partners. On the whole, the Anglophone sources, especially sensationalized captivity narratives or ethnographies based on second-hand accounts, are less reliable than Hispanic ones.

Beginning with the early eighteenth-century colonization of Texas and Louisiana – both marginal, defensive colonies with relatively small and impoverished Euro-American populations – this dissertation charts the convergence and divergence of pastoral and plantation regimes. During the eighteenth century demands for unfree labour and the exigencies of alliance altered slaving patterns among indigenous and colonial societies. Warfare played a decisive role in generating both the supply *and* demand for captives, as slaving subsumed cycles of violence in a multipolar setting. Seeking new lands for the monocropping of tobacco, indigo, and cotton along the Gulf Coast, Euro-American mercantile agents organized nascent plantation economies built by increasingly large servile populations. By the early nineteenth century powerful indigenous confederacies emerged from the chaos stirred by war, disease, and slaving. Dominated by Comanche bands, these formations became active participants in dismantling northern New Spain and forged violent relations with Mexico. The arrival of removed Natives and Anglo-American planters during the 1820s challenged Comanche hegemony, and over the succeeding decades new alignments of raiders, traders, bandits, and slaves confronted an aggressive plantation regime.

The first chapter introduces the colonial and indigenous groups that competed for captive labour in the Texas-Louisiana borderland during the first half of the eighteenth century. Within the maelstrom of epidemics, dispossession, and slaving initiated by European invasions, some indigenous societies, such as Apaches and Comanches, transformed themselves into powerful nomadic pastoralists who made war an engine of slavery. Deportations and saltwater slaveries drastically expanded the impact of slaving, as both French plantations and Spanish missions

depended on forced, long-distance population transfers to maintain their supply of unfree workers. Fleeing subjugation as agricultural labourers, black maroons and indigenous apostates reconstituted themselves as multi-ethnic communities in autonomous families, camps, and villages. Challenged by a series of uprisings within the plantation-mission zones and the rise of new indigenous coalitions during the 1730s, colonists increasingly relied on indigenous allies to bolster their precarious position, which further entangled all sides in expansive slaving networks.

Chapter 2 focuses on two groups at either end of the mid-eighteenth-century pastoral-plantation borderland: francophone Natchitoches slavers and eastern Apache bands. In the aftermath of the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) Natchitoches planters intensified their slaving practices, exposing themselves to the problems of controlling a large Afro-American slave population amid potentially hostile indigenous nations. Insulated from Apache raids by their cordon of Caddo allies, during the 1770s Natchitoches slavers expanded their commercial networks into Texas and across the Atlantic in order to procure Apache and African captives. Beyond the plantation zone, Apache bands centered their new political economy on pastoralism and raiding, increasing the fluidity of peace and war with Spanish colonial communities. Other indigenous groups imitated key elements of Apache raiding to challenge colonial hegemony. Thrust between predatory communities, the socializing effects of captivity allowed erstwhile victims to assume significant roles as interpreters, diplomats, and war leaders – individuals who conjured new methods of inter-cultural exchange from their searing experiences.

Chapter 3 explores the chaotic results of late eighteenth-century borderland warfare unleashed by the 1785 Comanche-Spanish-Wichita alliance against Apaches. Apache bands persevered by launching their own raiding campaigns and making new compromises with the mission regime. Although the belligerents reached a détente during the early 1790s, the blowback from a century of borderland slaving soon erupted within the plantation zone.

Informed by the revolutionary currents of the French and Haitian revolutions (1789-1804), the descendants of Apache and other indigenous women shuttled from the economy of violence to the plantation complex launched determined legal bids to win their freedom. As their efforts met staunch resistance from their masters, slaves' frustrations coalesced in a 1795 plot to overthrow the planters' regime, exposing the violent dynamics that underwrote captive exchanges across the pastoral-plantation borderland.

Chapter 4 examines the gradual divergence of the pastoral-raiding and plantation economies amid changing modes of production during the early nineteenth century. From the 1800s onwards, nomadic pastoralists continued to expand their political economy through raiding and trading, eventually discarding their treaties with the frontier provinces of New Spain. For Apache and Comanche bands, the resurgence of raiding during the 1810s and 1820s did not end cross-cultural alliances. It pushed them in unexpected directions as indigenous peoples reassessed their opportunities. As pastoralists exchanged animals for manufactured items, plantation slavery further penetrated the borderland and its extractive dynamics soon marked a clear challenge to indigenous territoriality. Amidst the chaos and social revolution of the Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821), the disaggregation of prior military-commercial pacts opened up new spaces for outlaws, renegade slavers, emigrant Natives, and fugitive slaves.

Marginalizing these competitors, the plantation economy's expansion between 1820 and 1840 eroded the older bonds and unleashed new cycles of violence and disorder. Chapter 5 analyzes the indigenous bands, enslaved peoples, and others who challenged planter hegemony, demonstrating that the specters of "Indian" and "servile" war were not merely ideological foils ripping at the teleological narrative of American slavery's "manifest" expansion. The arrival of Anglo-American planters initiated the shift from colonial engines of capture intimately connected with indigenous societies to an antagonistic slaving regime predicated on capital and

the racialized exploitation of black labour. After Anglo-Texans rejected Mexican sovereignty in 1835-1836, during the late 1830s, the convergence of land speculation, racism, and commercial slaving motivated extermination campaigns designed to transform indigenous homelands into an empire for slavery.

Ultimately, this dissertation tells the story of how indigenous bands, Euro-American traders, and maroons participated in the creation of a pastoral-plantation borderland. Overlapping relations of symbiosis and opposition characterized a slaving zone rooted in different engines of capture. Thus this borderland was always susceptible both to the shifts of alliance politics and the challenges of social control. Despite the consummation of alliances among raiders and planters, there remained fundamental incongruencies between pastoral and plantation slaveries, especially the means and ends for which the enslaved were exploited. These differences eventually sundered the historic linkages between these slaving regimes, and created new opportunities for conflict and cooperation. Inter-indigenous and Native-Black relations are essential to understanding this history. "Indian wars" and slave uprisings were not simply the nadirs of the colonial imaginary, but tangible efforts to survive the onslaught of dispossession, enslavement, and mass murder. These efforts are seldom accorded much space in the moralistic, Eurocentric narratives of nineteenth-century slavery and emancipation. Nevertheless, they were clear, often successful, challenges to colonialism that can broaden our understanding of how multi-ethnic cohorts made their own histories of abolition.

The foundational violence of colonialism – and resistance to it – are the processes at the heart of this history. It is a story of loss, greed, and survival. No sustained attempt is made to qualify the pain and suffering inflicted on the many victims portrayed in the following pages. Instead, the reader is left to contemplate the experiences of abduction, rape, torture, and death that consumed so many. These were not abstractions, then or now. Today, millions of North

American citizens live with the multiple legacies of slavery, including many indigenous nations in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This shared history of war and slavery reminds us that all we possess was built on the plunder of others.[13]

[13] For meditations on the violence of history and historical memory, see W. E. B. Dubois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago, 1903); Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Richard Philcox trans. (New York, 1963); Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston, 1995); Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Norman, 2000); Blackhawk, *Violence over the Land*, esp. 1-15; James H. Sweet, "The Quiet Violence of Ethnogenesis," *WMQ* 68:2 (April 2011): 209-214; Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Durham, 2015); Sarah Deer, *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America* (Minneapolis, 2015).

Chapter 1: Origins of a Slaving Zone, 1700-1770

At the intersection of probing empires and the equestrian world taking shape on the southern Plains, the villagers and nomads of the borderlands transformed their mutual entanglements with human bondage. Locked in a vicious struggle against enslavement at the hands of mounted raiders or subjugation within Franciscan missions, by the mid-eighteenth century Apachean peoples were at the center of a protracted conflict, itself inextricable from the borderland slave trade.[1] Despite their complicity in sponsoring inter-indigenous violence, French Louisiana officials hoped many Apache bands could be detached from the Spanish and help place the French at the head of a new Native alliance. Embittered by Spanish reluctance to apprehend the deserters fleeing his garrisons, in 1753 Governor Louis Billouart de Kerlérec schemed to lead an indigenous-French strike force into New Spain and either open up free trade with the viceroyalty or bring "war and desolation into Mexico itself." Indignantly criticizing Spanish Indian policy as despotic, Kerlérec argued that missionized Natives, despised by Spaniards as "slaves," made San Antonio a particularly inviting target. An uprising among the indigenous peoples held in the missions of central Texas could tip the scales if only the neophytes "unleashed the hatred they nourished against those colonists." With commercial opportunities never far from his planning, the governor also designed to forge a permanent alliance with eastern Apaches by constructing an outpost near their territory and releasing an Apache slave held by the Louisianans. Kerlérec hoped this captive could be persuaded to serve

[1] Among the many equestrian peoples who remained beyond Spanish control, a series of historical developments gradually established the Apaches as the primary targets of the borderland slave trade, a process that drove radical social transformations. Spaniards played a central role in initiating the cycle of violence. For Apache-Spanish hostilities in Texas during the eighteenth century, see Fray Benito Fernandez de Santa Anna to Juan Antonio de Vizarron, November 24, 1739, in Fr. Benedict Leutenegger, ed. and trans., *Letters and Memorials of the Father Presidente Fray Benito Fernandez de Santa Ana, 1736-1754: Documents from the Missions of Texas from the Archives of the College of Queretaro* (San Antonio, 1981), 32; Russell M. Magnaghi, ed. and trans., "Texas as Seen by Governor Winthuysen, 1741-1744," *SWHQ* 88:2 (October 1984): 176-177; Juan Domingo Arricivita, *Apostolic Chronicle: The Franciscan Mission Frontier in the Eighteenth Century in Arizona, Texas, and the Californias*, George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, ed. and trans. (2 vols. Berkeley, 1996), II: 23-45.

as an inter-cultural broker, stressing the choice of someone "who is familiar to us, knowing their language and ours." French-equipped Apache raiders would then crack restrictive Spanish trade policies and create an open trade in livestock, providing animals desperately needed for the labour, energy, and food they contributed to the plantation economy while excess mules and horses could be shipped to Saint Domingue (Haiti) for great profits.[2]

Although the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in 1756 forestalled French designs on the trans-Mississippi West, Governor Kerlérec's proposal illustrates of the ways that indigenous and colonial peoples clashed over the pursuit of wealth and security in a contested borderland. European imperialists intended to use the human and natural resources of the western hemisphere to generate massive wealth for themselves and their descendants. In doing so, dislocation, slaving, and violence became readily accepted means for mobilizing labour. As historical anthropologist Shannon Lee Dawdy reminds us, "a peaceful, 'orderly' slave society is an oxymoron."[3] Imbued with the tensions that came with mingling commercial and military slaving, the colonial societies of the North American borderlands occupied different geo-political terrain than the plantation complexes that enveloped the Euro-Caribbean settlements and some of their successor colonies.[4] In devising his scheme to invade Texas, the governor could look to

[2] For French officials long-standing frustration with desertions at Natchitoches, see Vaudreuil to Rouill*é: "I shall be obliged to put a price upon the heads of these deserters among the Indians in order to deprive this garrison of their liking for going to the Spaniards," July 20, 1751, in Dunbar Rowland, A. G. Sanders, and Patricia Galloway, eds. and trans., Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion, 1749-1763 (MPAFD), (5 vols. Baton Rouge, 1984), V: 95.* Kerlérec's plan to invade Texas is outlined in "Projet de paix et d'alliance avec les *Cannecis* (ou *Apaches*) afin de contraindre les *Espagnol* de la province du *Texas* à conclure une capitulation avec la Louisiane," October 1, 1753, in *Journal de la Société des Americanistes de Paris*, 3 (1901): 67-76.

[3] Dawdy, *Building the Devil's Empire*, 227.

[4] For conceptualizations of the plantation complex, see Jay R. Mandle, "The Plantation Economy: An Essay in Definition," *Science and Society* 36:1 (Spring 1972): 55-58; Philip D. Curtin, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History* (London, 1998), esp. xi-xiii; 46-48; 98-110; Eric R. Wolf, "Specific Aspects of Plantations Systems in the New World: Community Subcultures and Social Classes," in Wolf, ed., *Pathways of Power: Building an Anthropology of the Modern World* (Berkeley, 2001), 215-229; Trevor Burnard and John Garrigus, *The Plantation Machine: Atlantic Capitalism in French St-Domingue and British Jamaica* (Philadelphia, 2016).

local history. During the preceding fifty years of intercultural encounter and contest African, European and Native peoples experienced the devastation caused by overlapping slaving patterns. Raiding and commercial slave trading proved an explosive combination. The proximity of large servile populations – such as those of the Franciscan missions or Louisiana plantations – to powerful indigenous societies heightened the risks of unrestrained slaving.

The borderland's multipolar context shaped local slaving and raiding patterns – that is, socio-economic projects designed to acquire human and animal labour through interlocking sets of military and ritual practices. These engines of capture developed at the edges, transforming previously marginal Native and European groups into regional powers. Slaving unfolded as part of a continuous series of emergent inter-cultural relationships, punctuated by violence, rather than the outcomes of "discourses" or "institutions." As human beings who could learn and adapt, prisoners often played a pivotal role in inter-cultural diplomacy and exchange, practices that often centered on their release from captivity. Even in a less labour-intensive pastoral economy, Spanish and French colonists struggled to meet the labour demands required by their ranching and plantation operations. Their belligerence towards neighbouring indigenous peoples subsumed the shortage of labour to make war their engine of slavery. Indigenous peoples responded with their own efforts to secure land, labour, and other resources, which included seizing and incorporating captives taken from other indigenous and European groups.

This violence did not signify the collapse of inter-cultural interaction. Rather, the slave trade embedded various groups within a discrete social system – the economy of violence. Predicated on the acquisition of animals, goods, and captives, economies of violence overlay many of the vast contact zones that developed across the Americas. Dominated by the trade networks of mobile indigenous nations, this political economy connected the products of raiding and pastoralism with colonial communities focused on the distribution of trade goods and

agricultural production. Multi-ethnic cohorts of traders and war leaders were the architects of this system, and their expansive slaving enterprises in turn produced servile populations of greater ethno-racial complexity. The resulting slaving zone was a militarized social landscape beset with cross-cultural alliances.

This opening chapter introduces the major actors and the historical contexts that informed their approaches to war, slaving, and the incorporation of captive labour. For all the groups engaged in slaving, the violent deracination of others, from the raids of procurement to captive exchanges to their forced incorporation, became crucial to the development of servile populations. Targeted groups were themselves in states of fragmentation and coalescence in response to these assaults – the violent unfolding of ethnogenesis. Colonial slavers, operating from isolated outposts at San Antonio and Natchitoches, encountered indigenous societies of varied political structures, most of whom were adapting to the aftershocks of displacement, disease, and the spread of horses and other invasive organisms. Captured in raids, significant numbers of indigenous people entered colonial societies as slaves. European imperialists forced other groups into servile or tributary relations. Other nations, such as Apaches and Comanches, developed their own predatory slaving practices to expand their power in the borderland political economy. During the 1730s, resistance within the mission and plantation regimes of Texas and Louisiana culminated in large-scale insurrections that prompted reconfigurations of the imperial project. At the same time, efforts to subjugate nomadic bands proved increasingly futile as these groups re-oriented their mode of production around pastoralism, hunting, and raiding. By the 1760s, new alliances began to meld economies of violence and the agricultural regimes of the Mississippi Valley, creating new patterns of social control and disorder.

The Transformation of Indigenous Societies

Across the Americas, the socio-political configuration of small-scale indigenous bands, what historian John K. Thornton termed "free associations," vexed European attempts to exploit and enslave.[5] Adapting colonial technologies, principally horses and firearms, they experienced significant social change as economies of violence transformed their worlds, empowering certain groups and destroying others. The consensus-based and associational nature of band societies became major preoccupations for European invaders, who made sustained but generally unsuccessful efforts to alter indigenous political structures. In turn, the organization of indigenous bands altered the colonial project, particularly the construction of unfree labour regimes.

Eighteenth-century Spanish imperialists deployed colonization methods developed on both sides of the Atlantic during their earlier wars with Arabs, Aztecs, and Incas. Along the northern borderlands of New Spain, Spanish officers favoured indigenous leaders more amenable to concentrating their followers in agricultural zones, plying these individuals with trade concessions and adorning them with the sartorial trappings of vassalage: hats, canes, and medals of office. At other times, Spaniards attempted to foster internal and external divisions in the hopes that bands would destroy each other or so weaken themselves their homelands could be conquered directly. These efforts exacted few, if any, structural changes on indigenous bands, in

[5] John K. Thornton, *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820* (London, 2012), 100-104. Free associations, or egalitarian democracies, were the basic unit of socio-political organization for many indigenous peoples throughout the Americas. Composed of extended families, membership was voluntary, and "chiefs" lacked the power to compel obedience through force. Their authority flowed from the ability to mediate, persuade, and redistribute communal resources. Note that free association does not imply a nomadic or semi-nomadic lifeway, though this was often the case. For the conceptualization of free associations, see Pierre Clastres, *Society Against the State: Essays in Political Anthropology*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York, 1989), esp. 7-47. Clastres argued that "the society itself, and not the chief, is the real locus of power," *Society Against the State*, 154. See also Thomas D. Hall, *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350-1880* (Lawrence, 1989), 50-51; 60-63; Donald V. Kurtz, *Political Anthropology: Paradigms and Power* (Boulder, 2001), 21-65; Severin Fowles, "A People's History of the American Southwest," in Susan M. Alt, ed., *Ancient Complexities: New Perspectives in Precolumbian North America* (Salt Lake City, 2010), 183-204. The terms Spaniards and Frenchmen commonly used to describe sovereign indigenous peoples, "*barbaro*" and "*sauvage*," are political terms denoting a non-state society rather than simply pejorative labels. Indeed, indigenous modes of organization and production became foils for Europeans' developing conceptions of the state.

no small part because free associations sapped Spanish resources and strategic coherency. One exasperated general argued that severe setbacks would ensue if "the Apacheria was commanded by a single leader," since bands would no longer operate as "scattered gangs of bandits" but a war machine capable of overawing the Iberian soldiers who defeated "the Incas and Montezuma."[6]

The egalitarian politics and kin-based mode of production among indigenous free associations decisively shaped their encounter with colonizing, state-based regimes. This was particularly true in the diplomatic sphere. Determined to repeat the "conquests" of the Aztec and Inca empires, Europeans discovered they could not co-opt indigenous labour regimes in the absence of pre-existing state structures. Instead, as European colonists used violence to steal land and labour, indigenous bands formed alliances with specific colonial communities while remaining at war with others. Since no truce was general and peace could only be maintained at the local level, face-to-face intercultural negotiations were essential to any partnership. Even the most influential war leaders lacked the authority to compel their followers' obedience beyond the length of a campaign, and the relative weakness of coercive mechanisms made it impossible for free associations to surrender or accept subjugation *en masse*. If internal disputes occurred bands could always split, if overmatched militarily they could always retreat. In short, the associational nature of indigenous bands transformed colonial warfare.

Political egalitarianism also inflected indigenous pastoralism. A political economy focused on the domestication and reproduction of animal herds, pastoralism became the chosen lifeway of Apaches, Comanches, and others who embraced the "equestrian revolution" – the rapid spread of horses across North America that began during the seventeenth century. Animals were individually owned but collectively managed, and their husbandry transformed indigenous

[6] Pedro de Nava to Viceroy Revillagigedo, April 13, 1791, Archivo General de Mexico (AGM), Provincias Internas (PI), Volume 224, Part II, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History (CAH), University of Texas, Austin.

work patterns by increasing the need for pasturage, mobility, and skilled labour. The transition to pastoralism was determined by a kin-based mode of production, which Marxist anthropologist Eric R. Wolf defined as a means of using labour to transform nature "through appeals to filiation and marriage, and to consanguinity and affinity."[7] As horses, cattle, and mules overran the southwest, labour demands to manage these animals increased accordingly. Already a feature of pre-contact indigenous warfare, captive-taking became a salient feature of indigenous pastoralism as free associations incorporated members from among Native and non-Native outsiders. Beginning with various Athabascan peoples, indigenous bands retained their protean nature as they adapted a kin-based production to a form of nomadic pastoralism that combined husbandry with raiding. Acquisitive, egalitarian, and kin-based social structures meant all adult members participated in the acquisition, incorporation, and exchange of the captives and animals procured through the pastoral raiding economy.[8]

Intensifying the transformation of indigenous political economies, the borderland became an increasingly diverse space as equestrian newcomers entered the territories of village-dwelling farmers and coastal hunter-gatherers.[9] Four groups of Caddoan peoples, the Hasinai, Kadohadacho, Natchitoches, and Wichita confederacies, lived on the plains-woodland ecotone of east Texas, where they supplemented their fields of maize, beans, and pumpkins with hunting expeditions onto the increasingly crowded grasslands. Preserving the more stratified political and

[7] Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History*, 91. See also Patricia C. Albers, "Symbiosis, Merger, and War: Contrasting Forms of Intertribal Relationship Among Historic Plains Indians," in John H. Moore, *The Political Economy of North American Indians* (Norman, 1993), 94-132.

[8] For Apache and Comanche pastoralism, see Frédéric Gaillardet, *Sketches of Early Louisiana and Texas*, James L. Shepherd III, trans. (Austin, 1966), 54-55; Gerald Betty, "Skillful in the Management of the Horse': The Comanches as Southern Plains Pastoralists," *Heritage of the Great Plains* 30:1 (Spring-Summer 1997): 5-13; Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Indian Southwest, 1580-1830: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention* (Norman, 1999), 122-123; Gerald Betty, *Comanche Society: Before the Reservation* (College Station, 2002), 74-95; Pekka Hämäläinen, "The Politics of Grass: European Expansion, Ecological Change and Indigenous Power in the Southwest Borderlands," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 67:2 (April 2010): 173-208; Nancy McGowan Minor, *The Light Gray People: An Ethno-History of the Lipan Apaches of Texas and Northern Mexico* (Lanham, 2009), 66-69.

[9] For the evolving indigenous geography of the Texas borderlands, see Barr, "Geographies of Power," 5-46.

ceremonial organization of earlier Caddo polities, the villagers of the Hasinai, Kadohadacho, and Natchitoches nations were relatively hierarchical communities that divided hereditary leadership between the *caddis* (political leaders) and the *xinesi*s (religious leaders). The Caddo confederacies, and the villages that composed them, were mini-states rather than egalitarian bands. Senior men and women controlled agricultural production within permanent villages of grass lodges surrounding a central temple mound, and their control of extensive trade networks with visiting French and indigenous merchants further enhanced their status. With epidemics ravaging their dense settlements, the Caddo population plummeted from 200,000 to 15,000 people by the end of the seventeenth century. It stabilized around 1,500 by the end of the eighteenth century. Migrating further up the Red and Arkansas river valleys, the Wichitas acculturated to longer residences on the plains as they developed an increasingly equestrian, pastoral-based political economy. But the Wichita nations (Iscani, Kichai, Taovaya, Tawakoni, and Wichita proper) never abandoned their sedentary lifeways, maintaining their villages on the Red River and the upper Brazos. Numbering 1,500 to 2,500 people each during the second half of the eighteenth century, the Taovaya and Tawakoni were the most influential Wichita groups, but kin and linguistic ties allowed for fluid movement and inter-marriage between villages.[10]

West and south of the Caddoan homelands, Tonkawan, Karankawan, and other small bands exploited the abundant plant and animal life of central and coastal Texas. Adopting a nomadic pastoral existence as they acquired horses, roughly 1,500 Tonkawas lived along the central Colorado and Brazos river valleys. Moving between the sandy islands of the Gulf Coast

[10] F. Todd Smith, *The Caddo Indians: Tribes at the Convergence of Empires, 1542-1854* (College Station, 1995), 5-62; David La Vere, *The Caddo Chiefdoms: Caddo Economics and Politics, 700-1835* (Lincoln, 1998), 10-74; for population statistics see F. Todd Smith, *From Dominance to Disappearance: The Indians of Texas and the Near Southwest, 1786-1859* (Lincoln, 2005), 5-7;28-30; for the development of Hasinai political structures, see Martha McCollough, "Political Decentralization as a Strategy to Maintain Sovereignty: An Example from the Hasinai During the 1700s," *Plains Anthropologist* 46:177 (August 2001): 305-322. For village locations, see Fray Calahorra y Sanz, "Diary of the Journey," in Leroy Johnson Jr., and Edward B. Jelks, "The Tawakoni-Yscani Village, 1760: A Study in Archeological Site Identification," *Texas Journal of Science* 10:4 (December 1958): 405-422.

and the Guadalupe River delta, 2,500 Karankawan people, divided into bands of Cocos, Coapites, Copanes, Cujanes, and Karankawas remained decentralized during the early contact period. Shielded from encroachment by the alluvial flood plain, they traveled seasonally between their hunting and fishing camps and developed few alliances with their neighbours. Pressured by the advance of the Spanish mission-*presidio* (fort or garrison) frontier from the south and Apachean peoples from the north, smaller groups ethnologists labeled "Coahuiltecans" accepted the presence of Franciscan priests and incorporated the missions into their subsistence cycle.[11]

The staggered expansion of two politically decentralized, equestrian peoples from the north drastically altered borderland history. Stretching over a century (1720s-1840s), the history of conflict, competition, and occasional cooperation between Apache and Comanche bands became a defining element of regional politics. Indeed, the southeastward expansion of Apache and Comanche bands were events long remembered by other indigenous peoples in Texas. In 1828 a Spanish-speaking Bidai leader explained that his nation are "the oldest natives of Texas, [and] consider themselves the owners of all this land. It is a tradition among them that the Comanches, Lipans, and Tawakonis, and the many other tribes, all came from the north."[12] While playing a significant role in exacerbating Apache-Comanche warfare, Spanish chroniclers often described it as a primordial conflict between "natural" enemies. In his 1784 history of the Texas Apaches, the provincial governor claimed that if slain Apache and Comanche warriors "rose up on Judgement Day, their bones would fight." Interpretations emphasizing a model of inherent inter-tribal animus ignore the complexity of inter-indigenous relationships. Even within

---

[11] Robert A. Ricklis, *The Karankawa Indians of Texas: An Ecological Study of Cultural Tradition and Change* (Austin, 1996), 11-24; 143-168; Smith, *Dominance to Disappearance*, 28; T.N. Campbell, "Coahuiltecans and their Neighbours," in Hester, *Ethnology of the Texas Indians*, 109-126; W.W. Newcomb, "Karankawa," in ibid., 139-149; Lawrence E. Aten, *Indians of the Upper Texas Coast* (New York, 1983); Martin Salinas, *Indians of the Rio Grande Delta: Their Role in the History of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico* (Austin, 1990), 14-20.
[12] Jose Maria Sanchez, "A Trip to Texas in 1828," Carlos E. Castaneda, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 29:4 (April 1926): 276.

the overall pattern of Apache-Comanche conflict, moments of symbiosis, exchange, and alliance created a spectrum of outcomes between peace and war.[13]

Apache bands were the first nomadic pastoralists to bring a political economy of raiding and trading to the Texas borderlands. Separating from the mountain-dwelling Jicarillas, the Plains-oriented Apache groups that became the Lipans arrived in Texas during the second half of the seventeenth century, drawn by the river valleys that sustained seasonal bison populations. Dispersing or incorporating the local Coahuiltecans, Jumanos, and others, proto-Lipan bands moved southward and claimed ownership of the hill country of central Texas, which granted them access to hunting grounds and established indigenous trade networks. Spanish depletion of the local Coahuiltecans during the 1710s and 1720s also played a role in Apache expansion, with San Antonio colonists' recalling how after the "abandonment of [the] lands in this vicinity by the afore-mentioned nations, who settled down to live in communities in or near the missions […] the warlike Lipan Apache nation began to infiltrate this country."[14] With the acquisition of horses, eastern Apaches (Lipans, Mescaleros, Natages) displaced the Rio Grande-based Jumanos as the region's economic middlemen, shuttling trade goods, livestock, and carbohydrates along an east-west axis. Apache expansion also brought them into conflict with Caddoan peoples, the latter of whom deepened their French connections in order to maintain their advantage in firearms. By the mid-eighteenth century, eastern Apaches numbered approximately 5,000 people,

---

[13] Domingo Cabello, Ynforme, September 30, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1. For other Spanish ethnographies that emphasize the primordial animosity between Apaches and Comanches, see José Cortés, *Views from the Apache Frontier: Report on the Northern Provinces of New Spain, 1799*, Elizabeth A. H. John and John Wheat, ed. and trans. (Norman, 1989), 76; Manuel Merino y Moreno, "Views from a Desk in Chihuahua: Manuel Merino's Report on Apaches and Neighbouring Nations, ca. 1804," Elizabeth A. H. John and John Wheat, eds. and trans., *SWHQ* 95:2 (October 1991): 157. For a more nuanced view of Apache-Comanche conflict, see David M. Vigness, ed. and trans, "Nuevo Santander in 1795: A Provincial Inspection by Félix Calleja," *SWHQ* 75:4 (April 1972): 501. For contemporary portrayals of Comanche expansion as a zero-sum game of conquest (and Apache retrenchment) see Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 48-58; 89-90.

[14] San Antonio Cabildo, Memorial, [no date], 1787, Bexar Archive (BA), Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin.

with perhaps 2,500 Lipans living between the Nueces and Guadalupe rivers. Despite transforming the southern Plains into a core region of *Apacheria* ("Apache Country"), others soon challenged Athabascan hegemony.[15] In several short verses, the most complete transcription of Lipan oral history records the origins of a century-long conflict: "The Lipan then/some of them/ to Comanche/ their country/ some of them/they went about/The Lipan then/they did not like it."[16]

Likewise drawn by the possibilities of an equestrian lifestyle, a group of Shoshonean people split from their Rocky Mountain kinsmen and moved onto the Plains beginning around 1650. They entered the European historical record in 1706 as Comanches, when they and their Ute allies began raiding the "Cuartalejo" Apaches and the Indo-Hispanic communities of northern New Mexico.[17] By the 1720s, militarized Comanche bands alternated between raiding and trading with New Mexicans, one officer describing how they "always wander in battle formation, for they make war on all the Nations" and sent commercial delegations to exchange "tanned skins, buffalo hides, and those young Indians which they capture."[18] During the same period, other Comanche bands pushed southeastward from the Arkansas and Canadian river valleys towards Texas, igniting their war with Plains Apaches. In his overview of Texas history, Governor Domingo Cabello recorded an epic, nine-day running battle between Comanches and

---

[15] Minor, *The Light Gray People*, 11-24; Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 112-116; Thomas A. Britten, *The Lipan Apaches: People of Wind and Lightning* (Albuquerque, 2009), 33-94. For Apache populations, see Smith, *From Dominance to Disappearance*, 7; 28.

[16] Harry Hoijer, *The History and the Customs of the Lipans, as told by Augustina Zuazua*, Harry Hoijer Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

[17] For the earliest Spanish accounts of Comanche expansion at the expense of Plains Apaches and New Mexico, see "The Diary of Juan de Ulibarri, 1706" and "Diary of the Campaign of Governor Antonio de Valverde Against the Ute and Comanche Indians, 1719," in Alfred Barnaby Thomas, ed. and trans., *After Coronado: Spanish Exploration Northeast of New Mexico, 1696-1727* (Norman, 1935), 59-59-77; 110-137.

[18] Pedro de Rivera, *Diario y derrotero de lo caminado; visto, y obcervado en el discurso de la visita general de precidios, situados en las provincias ynternas de Nueva España*, […] Guillermo Porras Munoz, ed., (Mexico City, 1945).

eastern Apache bands, with the latter defeated and forced south of the Red River. By the mid-eighteenth century, eastern Comanches numbered as many as 5,000 people in ten to twelve large bands. Fleeing before the Comanche onslaught, eastern Apaches reconstituted their bands along the Rio Grande and the surrounding mountains, making only periodic buffalo-hunting expeditions into the Colorado River valley.[19]

Kin-based formations, Apache and Comanche bands underwent significant social change as they reshaped the borderlands. From the building-blocks of several extended families, mobile Lipan encampments (Spanish: *rancherias*) organized themselves to maximize the efficiency of production and security within a specific territory.[20] Although allied bands interacted for socio-economic, military, and religious purposes, "tribal" bonds were extremely limited. At the band level, communal modes of production militated against pronounced hierarchical relations among individuals or lineages. The authority of any given leader was not the focus of social organization.

Individual Apache leaders (Lipan: *nashneta* or *nanita*; Spanish: *capitan*) established their influence through a combination of their kin-based influence, distribution of resources across networks, war record, and ritual power. These qualities were often mutually-reinforcing. In 1761 a Franciscan priest described how the Lipans "have many chiefs…He who gets a reputation of being bold is joined by several others who elect him chief without any ceremony other than joining him…All of them are free; they go from one rancheria to another whenever their chief

---

[19] Cabello, Ynforme, September 30, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1. For early Comanche history and populations, see Thomas W. Kavanagh, *The Comanches: A History, 1706-1875* (Lincoln, 1996), 63-132; Smith, *From Dominance to Disappearance*, 31; Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 18-67.

[20] Antonio Cordero y Bustamante, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," Daniel S. Matson and Albert H. Schroeder, eds. and trans., *New Mexico Historical Review* 32:4 (October 1957): 339; Merino, "Report on Apaches and Neighbouring Nations," 152.

does not have the strength to oppose [their leaving]."[21] Four decades later, an experienced Spanish observer again emphasized the size of a chief's extended family and military ability in establishing a consensus-based association, with the caveat that "every family head in his own camp considers himself a sovereign in his own district."[22] Along with a war record, "magic" or "medicine" powers of augury reinforced a band leader's reputation. The late eighteenth-century Apache chieftain Picax-andé Yns-tinsle (Lipan: "Strong Arm of the People"), who led a confederacy of Lipan, Lipiyan, Mescalero, and other Plains Apache bands, made his reputation defending the upper Pecos hunting grounds from Comanches. In 1788 he also calculated the exact timing of a solar eclipse, during which he and a large number of followers performed a peyote ceremony. Although barred from attending the ritual, a Spanish officer who knew him remarked that Picax-andé's power is "manifested more each day by the great number of important Apache chiefs who submit to him, a natural prince, through whose mouth they believe the gods speak." With his impressive shamanistic and military abilities Picax-andé's career is certainly exceptional in terms of the breadth of his influence, but generally indicative of the extent to which empires failed to control equestrian bands, where indigenous norms continued to determine leadership roles and residential patterns.[23]

By mobilizing kinship to organize diplomatic and trading ventures, pursuits intimately connected in indigenous cultures, leaders oversaw the distribution of animals, tools, and status goods that further enhanced their reputation. Evincing the layers of organization, a high-ranking Spanish officer described the sequencing and purpose of Apache social bonds: "the Lipan nation is composed of different factions connected progressively by close links of kinship, alliances and

[21] Diego Ximenez, "Descriptions of the Customs of the Apache Indians," Archivo San Francisco El Grande, Spanish Material from Various Sources, Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin.

[22] Cordero, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," 339.

[23] For Picax-andé's exploits, see Casimiro Valdéz to Juan de Ugalde, September 29, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111; Ugalde, "Diary," February 27-29, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111 (quotation).

patriotism, assuring that all those interests are preserved through robbery and the hunting of buffalo."[24] The practice of large-scale bison hunting constituted a key reason for inter-band coordination among Plains-dwelling eastern Apaches, since "it requires time and defensive measures, because they will carry it out in lands adjacent to enemy nations."[25]

Adapting to, and transforming, the world of the Southern Plains, Comanches organized their society in ways that mirrored Apaches and other indigenous peoples with whom they fought, traded, and lived. Extended families (Comanche: *numunakahni*, "the people who live together in a household") formed the basis of larger bands whose shared interests structured the major eighteenth-century tribal divisions: Yamparicas ("Yap Eaters), Jupes ("People of the Timber") and Kotsotekas ("Buffalo Eaters"). Similar to Apaches, Comanche bands were egalitarian societies led by leaders (Comanche: *paraibo*) who acquired and maintained their status through their military record, *puha* ("medicine power") and ability to distribute resources gained through trade, war, or hunting. Among males, war honours and puha were intimately linked. Esteemed for their leadership, longevity, and influence, post-menopausal women could also become *puhakatu* ("possessors of power") through participation in vision quests and small-scale medicine societies. War honours allowed warriors to participate in the face-to-face, consensus-based politics of the band – the Comanche word *tekwuniwapI* ("warrior" or "hero") derives from *tekwa* ("to speak"). As with other free associations, paraibos served on the basis of their public standing and their ability to represent group objectives within the band, among other Comanches, and to outsiders.[26] Although often dispersed in order to manage pasturage for their expansive horse herds, larger gatherings of Comanche bands assembled to discuss major political

[24] Pedro de Nava to Revilla Gigedo, March 16, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part II.

[25] Merino, "Report on Apaches and Neighbouring Nations," 153.
[26] Kavanagh, *Comanches*, 28-38. For female puhakatu see Joaquin Rivaya-Martinez, "The Captivity of Macario Leal: A Tejano among the Comanches, 1847-1854," *SWHQ* 117:4 (April 2014): 380.

initiatives, as occurred during the 1785-1786 negotiations with Spanish representatives of New Mexico and Texas.

The extent of a Comanche leader's authority remained fluid, and generally quite limited beyond his residential band. During their diplomatic encounters Spanish observers consistently identified "principal chiefs" (*gefe principal* or *capitan*) with influence over "minor captains" (*capitancillo*) but this authority did not extend beyond the purposes of a military campaign, trade fair, or religious ceremony.[27] The egalitarian, voluntary structures of Comanche war culture persisted throughout the colonial encounter. During the apex of Comanche power (1810s-1830s) a Tejano who lived among them for almost a decade remarked that "in times of war all Comanches are soldiers" who collectively agreed to "follow the warrior who organized the venture. At the end of the war they are free to go where they please, although many leave before the campaign's end."[28] Although paraibos accrued influence through traditional channels (such as puha), their increasing access to and control of colonial trade networks further enhanced their prestige. Nevertheless, there is no indication that the status of indigenous captains corresponded to European influence, despite French and especially Spanish efforts to sponsor individuals more amenable to imperial objectives.

Ultimately, the consensus-based politics and pastoral nomadism of Apaches, Comanches, and other free associations strongly determined the slaving practices that emerged over the ensuing decades of conflict. By organizing alliances, war leaders gained control of the resources

---

[27] Pedro Vial and Francisco Xavier Chaves, "Inside the Comancheria, 1785: The Diary of Pedro Vial and Francisco Xavier Chaves," Elizabeth A. H. John and Adan Benavides, Jr., ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 98:1 (July 1994): 38-40; Alfred Barnaby Thomas, ed. and trans., "An Eighteenth-Century Comanche Document," *American Anthropologist*, New Series, 31:2 (April-June 1929): 289-298.

[28] Jose Francisco Ruiz, *Report on the Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, ed. John C. Ewers, trans. Georgette Dorn (Yale University Press, 1972), 9; 11 (quotations). For similar observations on Comanche society, see Juan Antonio Padilla, "Report on the Barbarous Indians of the Province of Texas, 1820" Mattie Austin Hatcher, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 23:1 (July 1919): 54; David G. Burnet, "David G. Burnet's Letters Describing the Comanche Indians," Ernest Wallace, ed. *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 30 (1954): 120-124.

(people, animals, weapons, and other goods) that enhanced the productive and reproductive powers of the entire band. At the macro level, expanding kinship networks facilitated inter-band cooperation within and across groups. We cannot assume, *a priori*, the absence of intra-tribal warfare. Inter-Apache or inter-Comanche cooperation, usually facilitated through marriages, were the basis for all other coalitions. Once established, the fluidity of these confederacies allowed for the incorporation of outsiders, including both groups and individuals. At the micro level, free associations increased their labouring ranks, and future nodes of kinship, through the incorporation of individuals. Seizing enemy women and children formed one track of this process, but in many other cases individuals volunteered themselves for membership. Rigid categories break down in the context of Apache and Comanche slaving, as captives served multiple purposes and could pass through various stages of incorporation. Ultimately, placing human captives alongside stolen animals highlights the material purposes of slaving – the acquisition of labour for internal consumption or exchange with allies.

Human captives stand apart from other commodified elements (animals, weapons, food, etc.) of the indigenous raiding economy. As individuals with personalities, skills, and their own desires, captives represented a unique being within the captor society. From informing their captors' world view to the means by which they were stolen and assimilated, captives themselves became agents of social change. This outsider-as-insider role helps explain, rather than obfuscate, their agency within the isolation of enslavement. Along with long-distance removal from geographic and cultural homelands, temporality defined the captive experience in indigenous societies. As they adopted (or were denied) kin-status, captives' levels of incorporation ranged from enslavement to assimilation to full integration. As their captors created and benefitted from creating a social space for them within the band, a wide range of outcomes resulted. Captives could be used as ritualized gifts to cement alliances, transformed

into new members of the capturing society, deployed as menial labourers, traded for goods, or killed. Whether they incorporated or ritually destroyed their prisoners, captors' perceived enemy peoples through metaphors of predation, ascribing them animal-like qualities that would be transcended through the process of incorporation or immolation. One European observer noted the Comanche use of the predation metaphor, explaining that "in their summons to wars of revenge against the enemy, they say 'Let us go and eat this nation.'"[29]

Given the subsistence and labour patterns of pastoral bands, gender and age largely determined captive fates. Children, adolescents, and young women were the primary targets of raiders, as their productive and reproductive powers could most effectively be harnessed by their captors. Adult women brought skills as craftsmen, as well as their potential as wives and mothers – roles particularly important to indigenous societies depleted by war and epidemics. Regardless of gender, infants and children were appealing for the relative ease of total assimilation into the captor's language and culture. Economic conditions, as well as "magic" portents, also determined where, or if, the captive would find a permanent place within the captor society.[30] Ultimately, since bands possessed land communally, the "primitive accumulation of people" allowed them to increase the scope of production within the pastoral-raiding economy. Crucially, captive-taking did not free their masters from their own roles as producers, and because slave status was not hereditary captive-slaves did not become a permanent social class. They were, however, a constant presence within band societies. Analyzed throughout the succeeding chapters, the operation of indigenous engines of capture, and the increasing commodification of captives, developed in tandem with their colonial competitors.

---

[29] Jean Louis Berlandier, *The Indians of Texas in 1830*, John C. Ewers and Patricia Reading Leclercq, ed. and trans. (Washington, D.C., 1969), 77.

[30] For captive-taking and associated rituals among Lipans and Comanches, see for example Vial and Chaves, "Inside the Comancheria," 51; Padilla, "Report on the Barbarous Indians of the Province of Texas," 54-55; Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 7; 15; Berlandier, *Indians of Texas in 1830*, 75-77; Rivaya-Martinez, "The Captivity of Macario Leal," 396-397; Burnet, "Letters Describing the Comanche Indians," 129-131.

Colonial Slaving Strategies

The ascendance of Apache and Comanche bands within the borderland political economy precipitated their confrontation with European invaders who sought to destroy and enslave them. Seeking new sources of animals and trade, during the late 1730s some Kotsoteka Comanche bands divided from their kinsmen and moved eastward to the upper reaches of the Guadalupe and Colorado rivers of central Texas. Allied and sometimes inter-married with the Plains-dwelling Wichitas, these Comanches used their privileged position to obtain French goods and put severe pressure on the "nucleus of the Apache."[31]

Encircled by these powerful free associations, French plantations and Spanish missions generated the highest demands for unfree labour. Inserted into these violent zones of production, Native bondspeople navigated deployment in ranching, subsistence farming, textile manufacturing, and monocropping, among many other tasks. Faced with labour shortages and willing to employ coercion to meet demands in a borderland setting, these colonial regimes faced distinct challenges in acquiring, controlling, and deploying unfree workers. For French and Spanish colonial slavers, distance itself became an essential means of conditioning as captives were drawn across vast geographical and cultural spaces on their searing journeys into bondage. During the first half of the eighteenth century, colonial slaving communities made sustained efforts to subjugate indigenous polities, both free associations and small-scale states. Outnumbered and operating in an unfamiliar environment, slavers provoked wars with and among their Native neighbours that could destroy entire colonies.

---

[31] Russell M. Magnaghi, ed. and trans., "Texas as Seen by Governor Winthuysen," *SWHQ* 88:2 (October 1984): 176 (quote); Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 55-58; Thomas A. Britten, *The Lipan Apache: People of Wind and Lightning* (Albuquerque, 2009), 33-94; Nancy McGowan Minor, *Turning Adversity to Advantage: A History of the Lipan Apaches of Texas and Northern Mexico* (Lanham, 2009), 15-30.

An extraneous source of captives represented an alternative answer to these demands for slave labour without the risk of destabilizing alliance politics. Thus even as these slaving communities expanded their consumption of indigenous captives they developed new methods for controlling the supply and diffusion of African slaves. Over time, increasingly inter-ethnic servile and maroon populations developed within colonial societies rife with social disorder. Sustained resistance to plantation and mission regimes in this borderland region peaked during the 1730s and provoked re-evaluations of slaving practices. Forced onto Native diplomatic ground, colonists concluded alliances with free associations that they hoped might bolster their regimes against insurrection as well as supply additional prisoners for enslavement. Thus, between 1700 and 1750 colonial slavers increasingly focused on the long-distance acquisition of captives and relied on alliances to support and supply their regimes. The believed these methods posed fewer risks to their colonies and would make it more difficult for slaves to successfully escape. As always, they deployed extreme violence to manage the inter-ethnic cauldron created by their predatory activities.

Colonial societies drew on slaving practices developed on both sides of the Atlantic as their interactions with indigenous peoples deepened across time and space. As Spanish colonists took prodigious numbers of indigenous captives from the initial conquests onward, metropolitan officials struggled to establish the legal parameters of enslavement. In 1542, under pressure from the Franciscan activist Bartolome de Las Casas, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V and his ministers promulgated the New Laws of the Indies, which forbade the enslavement of indigenous peoples. Striking at the foundation of colonial wealth, the New Laws met with strong resistance from military and religious authorities across the Spanish Americas, and the laws never curtailed

the *de facto* enslavement of indigenous peoples.[32] Spanish imperialists sought to incorporate Native peoples directly into the empire as subjects of the Crown, and their dual strategy, alternating between *reduccion* ("reduction") in the missions and "just wars" of conquest against non-Christians, provided Iberian colonists' with ample opportunities to deploy customs of captive taking rooted in centuries of conflict with the Muslim polities of North Africa. To regain their own subjects, imperial officials embraced a policy of prisoner exchange with indigenous nations, adapted from the *rescate* ("ransom") system that regulated the barter of prisoners during the *Reconquista*. Emulating the pillages of the early *conquistadores,* during the Chichimeca Wars (1550-1590) Spanish war leaders further intertwined the imperial project and slaving campaigns, for the acquisition of Native labour was the most direct path to wealth and glory for the soldiery.[33] Acquiring Natives for domestic, ranching, or agricultural work, Spanish colonists elided prohibitions against their enslavement by indoctrinating captives into Hispanic culture. Colonists used god-parentage and other Catholic rituals to establish the fictive kin relations that mediated *de facto* bondage. Prevalent throughout the villages and missions of the Spanish borderlands, this caste of unfree workers were known as *criados* – "those who are raised up."[34]

The initial Spanish expeditions into Texas, launched between 1689 and 1716, skirted the eastern Sierras and the coastal plains beyond, leaving a large swath of indigenous territory relatively unmolested. Spanish encroachment devastated Coahuiltecan free associations suddenly

[32] James Lang, *Conquest and Commerce: Spain and England in the Americas* (New York, 1975), 13-22; Rolena Adorno, *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative* (New Haven, 2008), 61-82.
[33] For the development of New Spain's Indian policy, see Philip W. Powell, *Soldiers, Indians, Silver: The Northward Advance of New Spain, 1550-1600* (Berkeley, 1952), 105-111; Jack D. Forbes, *Apache, Navajo, and Spaniard* (Norman, 1960), 3-28; 107-130; Max L. Moorhead, *The Presidio: Bastion of the Spanish Borderlands* (Norman, 1975), 267-272; Hall, *Social Change in the Southwest*, 50-74; Richard W. Slatta, "Spanish Colonial Military Strategy and Ideology," in Donna J. Guy and Thomas E. Sheridan, eds., *Contested Ground: Comparative Frontiers on the Northern and Southern Edges of the Spanish Empire* (Tuscon, 1998), 83-96; David J. Weber, *Barbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment* (New Haven, 2006); Résendez, *Other Slavery*, 100-148.

[34] For *criados* and other unfree labourers at San Antonio, see Jesus F. de la Teja, *San Antonio de Bexar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier* (Albuquerque, 1996), 122-123.

subjected to missions, slaving, and diseases. Colonists and missionaries competed intensely for control of these populations, whom they sought to bind into varying states of dependency. Imperial officials also fused the need for labour with geopolitical considerations, as they hoped the removal of the indigenous groups would open the coast for commercial development. Backed by the military presidios, the Franciscan missions were the primary exploiters of indigenous labour. Like other borderland provinces, the pattern of exploitation in Texas was one of competition between military and ecclesiastical authorities over the acquisition and control of indigenous labour.[35]

Organizing their North American colonizing strategy around alliances with indigenous peoples, rather than reduction, French imperialists became more amenable to formally holding Natives slaves in order to meet their commercial and military objectives. In 1709, the influx of indigenous captives into New France led the colony's intendant to compose the "Ordinance Rendered on the Subject of the Negroes and the Indians Called Panis." Although it did not *de jure* legalize Indian slavery, the ordinance guaranteed colonists' ownership of their "Panis" slaves, whose "country is far distant from this one," and whose agricultural labour was so crucial to the colony that their position should conform to the slave status of the "Negroes in the Islands."[36] Although colonists' generally lacked formal legal title to their indigenous slaves, communal consensus allowed masters to hold Natives as immovable property – human chattel subject to sale, inheritance, and other forms of alienation.

The expanding French presence in the continental interior further entwined alliance politics and slaving. Departing New Orleans in late 1718, B*é*nard de La Harpe and his party,

---

[35] For the Spanish province of Nuevo Santander and the development of its unfree labour regime, see Omar S. Valerio-Jimenez, *River of Hope: Forging Identity and Nation in the Rio Grande Borderlands* (Durham, 2013), 17-27.

[36] Jacques Raudot, "Ord[onan]ce rendue au sujet des neigres et des Sauvages nommez Panis," April 13, 1709, in Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*, 395.

which included French traders, indentured workers, and two enslaved African men, traveled upstream along the Red River to establish trading relations between the *Compagnie des Indes* and the indigenous nations of the Great Plains. Arriving at the concentric townships of the Kadohadacho, La Harpe and a caddi reached a tentative trade agreement during which the latter informed the Frenchman "that the greater part of their compatriots had been killed or made slaves by their adversaries [the Osage]." After a year spent crossing the woodland-prairie ecotone La Harpe and his men turned north along the foothills of the Ouachita Mountains, where they reached a large Wichita village near the banks of the South Canadian or Arkansas River. Pleased with the auspicious commercial opportunities presented by the strangers' arrival, for a whole day and night the Wichita danced and sang the calumet. The following day, again singing the calumet, Wichita elders painted La Harpe's face blue and presented him with gifts of buffalo robes, rock salt, and tobacco. Finally, a Wichita war leader stepped forward and sealed the alliance with the living flesh of his nation's enemy, adding "to these presents a young slave of eight years of age from the Cancy [Lipan Apache] nation." According to La Harpe, the young boy had been marked as a menial by the mutilation of his fingers, and other villagers allegedly expressed their sorrow at being unable to furnish additional captives. Perhaps the Wichitas expected a return in kind. Providing a rare glimpse into first contact between indigenous and African peoples, La Harpe recorded how the Wichitas "could not fail to admire my two negroes," while both the women and men "wished that they might remain among them." Although unwilling to part with the enslaved men who hauled equipment, chopped wood, and managed animals, La Harpe expressed an interest in returning the Apache captive to his people in order to "make a peace with their nation."[37]

[37] "Relation du Voyage de Bénard de la Harpe: D*écouverte Faite par lui de Plusieurs Nations Situées à L'Ouest"* in Pierre Margry, ed., *Découvertes et Établissements des Français dans L'Ouest et dans le Sud de L'Amérique Septentrionale (1614-1754)* (6 vols. Paris, 1886), VI: 291-296.

La Harpe's corporate superiors soon considered the desirability of an alliance with Apaches in order to extend their commercial prospects across Native borders. But French colonists' demand for Apache slaves, stimulated by intensifying warfare among Athabascans and their Caddo, Comanche, and Wichita rivals, precluded any lasting peace. In February 1723 Louisiana Governor Jean Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville attempted to recall a diplomatic expedition to the "Padouca" (Plains Apache) in favour of a more lucrative policy. Cynically, Bienville argued that any peace with the Padoucas "would not last." Instead, he suggested that French traders "push our tribes toward war with them and trade in slaves for the account of the Company."[38] The impact of French-sponsored slaving endured throughout the history of Louisiana and New France, exemplified by wars against the Fox (1712-1730), Chickasaw (1720s; 1736-1739) and several massive French-Cree-Assiniboine raids which targeted the Lakota during the 1740s.[39]

As officials wrestled with the legal and strategic consequences of enslaving indigenous peoples, more distant slaving zones procured alternative sources of captive labour. In 1719, the French slaver *Duc du Maine* deposited approximately 200 enslaved Africans, probably from the Senegambian hinterland of West Africa, at Biloxi's open-air slave corral, the first slave ship to arrive directly in Louisiana.[40] Committing its Caribbean and Gulf Coast colonies to indigo, sugar, and tobacco monocultures, French imperialists developed a more explicit program for governing the surging number of Africans inserted into the plantation regime. Authored in 1685 for the Caribbean colonies and introduced to Louisiana in 1724, in its fifty-four articles the *Code*

[38] Frank Norall, ed., *Bourgmont: Explorer of the Missouri, 1698-1725* (Lincoln, 1988), 34; 45. The Compagnie des Indes was the private corporation that organized French colonization of North America between 1670 and 1730.

[39] For the Fox and Sioux slave wars, see Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*, 198-236.

[40] For the *Duc du Maine*, see the Atlantic Slave Trade Database, Voyage 33116, at http://www.slavevoyages.org/voyage/33116.

Noir ("Black Code") regulated everything from slaves' religion, marriage, burial, sale, and punishment, to their relationships with masters. In short, the *Code* laid out the social contract for a society where all humane values had been jettisoned in favour of profit and power. Nevertheless, the articles stipulating mandatory baptism and other religious obligations aimed at the incorporation of Africans into colonial society as something more than aliens *in extremis*. As the eighteenth century wore on, the absence of a slave code directed at indigenous captives, alongside black-Native intermarriage, meant that Native slaves were ever more bound by the laws that regulated African bondage.[41]

Through the mingling of formal slave codes and customary, often localized, practices, colonial societies devised multiple strategies for transforming the captives they seized into an enslaved labour force for the emerging plantation order. Nevertheless, these policies failed to contain the explosive comingling of slaving systems, especially when indigenous and African peoples resisted through war and rebellion.

Borderland Slaving in Texas and Louisiana, 1720-1750

Examined together, the early histories of French Louisiana and Spanish Texas reveal the perils of unrestrained slaving. Established in 1714 by westering Canadian traders and their Caddo hosts, what began as a rude stockade below the "Great Raft" of the Red River, the fort of St. Jean Baptiste de Natchitoches rapidly developed into an important nexus of borderland and Atlantic slaveries. From Natchitoches' beginnings, slaving became an essential means of driving production and expanding personnel. Earlier in their careers, the town's founders, Louis Juchereau de St Denis, and his lieutenant, Francois Derbanne, joined other traders and allied

[41] "The Code Noir of 1724," in Vernon Valentine Palmer, ed. and trans., *Through the Codes Darkly: Slave Law and Civil Law in Louisiana* (Clark, 2012), 163-191. For the code's legal and historical context, see James Pritchard, *In Search of Empire: The French in the Americas, 1670-1730* (London, 2004), 88-92; Palmer, *Through the Codes Darkly*, 3-41; Guillaume Aubert, "'To Establish One Law and Definite Rules': Race, Religion, and the Transatlantic Origins of the Louisiana Code Noir," in Cécile Vidal, ed., *Louisiana: Crossroads of the Atlantic World* (Philadelphia, 2014), 21-43.

warriors in destroying a Chitimacha village along the Gulf Coast. They then sold the eighty survivors to French colonists in Biloxi and Mobile. Having established their outpost to tap Native and Spanish trade routes, St Denis and Derbanne eventually brought eight Chitimacha slaves to Natchitoches, including the latter's wife, a former captive renamed Jeanne de la Grand Terre. Although trade-based alliances with the Caddos continued to supply the Natchitoches French with Osage, Apache, and other Native captives, labour demands quickly outpaced the supply of prisoners that could be procured through raiding. By 1722, three years after the first French slave ships reached Louisiana, twenty enslaved Africans had been transported up the Red River and deployed in Natchitoches' burgeoning ranching and tobacco industries. By the time of St Denis' death in 1744, his family-based cartel had consolidated its position within the regional trade in pelts, livestock, firearms, and slaves.[42]

Spanish imperialists founded the province of Texas as a defensive colony designed to check Gallic ambitions, a project which drew them into costly conflicts with their European rival. Fearing the expansion of French influence from Louisiana towards the mining regions of central Mexico, in 1718 soldiers and colonists founded the garrison town of San Antonio de Bexar. Typical of the Hispanic villages that dotted northern New Spain, over the ensuing decades San Antonio and its five associated missions evolved into a relatively poor, militarized ranching community, which one Franciscan historian described as "a town so miserable that it resembles at most a wretched village."[43] Making the most of their marginal position at the edge of the

[42] For the founding and early development of Natchitoches, see Ralph A. Smith, ed. and trans., "Account of the Journey of Bénard de la Harpe: Discovery Made by Him of Several Nations Situated in the West," *SWHQ* 62:1 (July 1958): 85; H. Sophie Burton and F. Todd Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches: A Creole Community on the Louisiana-Texas Frontier* (College Station, 2008), 1-15; 55. For the Chitimacha wars, see Daniel H. Usner, "Americans Indians in Colonial New Orleans," in Peter H. Wood, Gregory A. Waskelov, M. Thomas Hatley, eds., *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast* (Lincoln, 1989), 165-166.

[43] Morfi, *History of Texas*, I: 79. For an overview of the colonization of northern New Spain and the attendant conflicts with indigenous peoples, see David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven, 1992); Roberto Mario Salmon, *Indian Revolts in Northern New Spain: A Synthesis of Resistance* (Lanham, 1991), 1-19. For

Southern Plains, *Bexarenos* (Hispanic San Antonians) became "excellent horsemen" as they organized their society around ranching and trade with indigenous peoples.[44] As the expanding Spanish presence in central Texas became permanent, conflicts developed with neighbouring Apache bands over livestock. Having expanded their buffalo-hunting and trade networks across Texas during the preceding generation, Apache bands pressured by Comanche competition viewed semi-wild and feral livestock as alternative food sources. European animals accelerated changes in the land by spreading mesquite seeds that choked out grasslands and further reduced bison populations. Conversely, horse, long-horn cattle, and mule populations exploded during the 1700s, and quickly became staples of Native diets in central Texas.[45]

The shockwaves of colonialism, especially the spread of horses and pathogens, intensified Apache-Comanche conflict and soon swept back towards Texas. Between 1720 and the 1740s, thefts, raids, and ambushes resulted in the deaths a few San Antonio colonists per year as Apache bands targeted Spanish livestock to replace the buffalo-hunting grounds they lost to Comanche expansion. Retaliatory Spanish campaigns provided convenient cover for slave raids. Soldiers, colonists, and allied mission Indians mounted successful campaigns up the Brazos, Colorado, and San Saba rivers in 1723, 1732, 1739-1740, 1745, and 1749, seizing upwards of dozens of captives, along with animals, hides, weapons, and other booty.[46] Fearing their belligerence would doom Franciscan efforts to convert southern Athabascans, a leading friar criticized the 1740 raid by arguing that its real purpose was to gain "a considerable prize of

---

the history of San Antonio, see Gerald E. Poyo and Gilberto M. Hinojosa, eds., *Tejano Origins in Eighteenth-Century San Antonio* (Austin, 1991); Jesus F. de la Teja and John Wheat, "Bexar: Profile of a Tejano Community, 1820-1832," *SWHQ* 89:1 (July 1985): 7-34.

[44] Marilyn McAdams Sibley, ed., "Across Texas in 1767: The Travels of Captain Pagès," *SWHQ* 70:4 (April 1967): 617.

[45] Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 130.

[46] Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 111.

horses, hides, and Indian men and women to serve [the soldiers]."[47] Retaining their primarily female or infant captives, colonial war leaders and their followers deployed them as household servants, herders, and concubines, while others were sold to distant slave markets in the mining districts further south.

For Spain and other early modern European kingdoms, forced, long-distance transfers of hostile or servile populations became an increasingly viable strategy as their empires gained global proportions. Following an extensive inspection of northern New Spain, Brigadier Pedro de Rivera issued a series of recommendations that resulted in the Regulations of 1729. Intended to rationalize frontier defenses, the regulations focused extensively on Native populations, particularly Apaches. In an effort to curb the enslavement of indigenous prisoners by colonists, officers, and priests, among the new policies were orders to extradite captives to Mexico City, where they could be put to work or retained as hostages for future prisoner exchanges. Frustrated and seeking revenge after several murders and horse raids during the preceding years, in Texas local officials first carried out the new orders in 1739, when they convicted the leader of a nearby Lipan rancheria, Cabellos Colorados ("The Red-haired One"), and his family of horse theft. Binding the coffle together, Spanish troops marched Cabellos Colorados, his wife, children, and several other followers towards Mexico City, a four-month journey of 1,300 kilometers from which none of the prisoners ever returned. Horrified by the terminal nature of the deportations, Apache kinsmen launched larger raids on San Antonio, which they nearly destroyed during a nocturnal assault in 1745.[48]

---

[47] Fray Benito Fernandez de Santa Ana quoted in Carlos E. Castaneda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936,* (7 vols. Austin, 1936-1958), III: 47.

[48] Prudencio de Orobia y Basterra, Proceedings concerning the infidelity of the Apache, June 25, 1738, BA. See also, Max L. Moorhead, "The Spanish Deportation of Hostile Apaches: The Policy and the Practice," *Arizona and the West* 17:3 (Autumn 1975): 206-211; Juliana Barr, "A Spectrum of Indian Bondage in Spanish Texas," in Alan Gallay, ed., *Indian Slavery in Colonial America* (Lincoln, 2009): 295-297.

As Spanish aggression broadened conflicts with Apache bands, slaving intensified social chaos within the French plantation zone. On August 17, 1726, Louisiana's attorney general Francois Fleuriau reported that Louis Congo, a formerly enslaved African who became the colony's official executioner, had nearly been assassinated days earlier by three indigenous *marrons* (runaway slaves). The men were part of a larger, well-armed group of slave "deserters" that inhabited the forests surrounding New Orleans. In response, Fleuriau urged the city's Superior Council to punish Native slaves in accordance with the Code Noir.[49] In 1728, colonial patrolmen apprehended several Native maroons. Fulfilling Fleuriau's request that indigenous and black slaves be treated alike, the council sentenced two slaves, Guillory and Bontemps, to be hung.[50] That same year, the governor wrote to his metropolitan superior regarding the "Indian slaves who are being trafficked in this province." He complained that indigenous slaves carried greater risk than their worth, for, "being mixed up with our negroes," their frequent desertions disrupted the plantation regime – already at risk due to the inter-tribal wars stirred by the slave trade.[51]

Supported by the Code Noir, Louisiana's slave regime brutalized Africans and encroached on indigenous lands until the arrogance of French imperium met with the coordinated resistance that was the nightmare scenario of European colonizers. For the Natchez people, who preserved the ceremonial mound-building culture of their Mississippian forebears, the haughtiness of French planters and the depredations of their livestock became increasingly difficult to bear. In 1728 the self-serving and frequently intoxicated local commandant demanded

[49] Fleuriau to the Superior Council, August 17, 1726, French Judicial Records, Louisiana Historical Center (LHC), New Orleans.

[50] Périer and Delachaise, Interrogation of Bontemps, June 14, 1728, French Judicial Records, LHC; Périer and Delachaise, Judgement and Sentence of Guillory and Bontemps , June 14, 1728, French Judicial Records, LHC.

[51] Périer to [the Abbé Raguet?], May 12, 1728, *MPAFD*, II: 573-574.

the relocation of an entire Natchez village in order to provide land for his new tobacco plantation. Outwardly, the Natchez feigned acquiescence. They requested more time to complete their removal and the privilege of borrowing the colonists' muskets in order to hunt game for an upcoming feast. Disgusted with French attempts to make them "walk like slaves," within their temples the Natchez elders resolved to "show that we are really men," and "cut off the French to a man, in one day and one hour."[52] When the signal came on the morning of November 28, 1729, Natchez warriors annihilated the French, killing over 200 colonists.

The rapidly expanding scope of the Natchez War plunged Louisiana into crisis. During their uprising, the Natchez were joined by hundreds of "Bambara" slaves, whose traumatic removal from their Senegambian homelands did not dismantle their capability for collective action in times of crisis. With rumours of a New Orleans slave uprising circulating and the Natchez waging a guerilla war over the tense summer of 1730, French officials called upon their Native allies to help destroy the Natchez. In October 1731, a group of Natchez survivors emerged from the wooded banks and attacked Natchitoches in a desperate attempt to re-provision themselves. As the siege continued for over a week, 350 Caddos and sixteen Spaniards rescued St Denis and his command and then pursued and routed the Natchez. The victorious Caddo-French forces profited from their victory by taking "the slaves that they had to their land." St Denis later informed his superiors that he had also "sent a few of the savage slaves to the Spanish in order to remove them from here, and the French colony." [53] Determined to "root out that nation," over the course of the conflict the French dragged another 500 Natchez prisoners to

[52] Antoine Simon Le Page Du Pratz, *The History of Louisiana, or of the Western Parts of Virginia and Carolina […]*, (London, 1774), 76-77.

[53] St Denis, Documents Related to the Natchez War, Cammie G. Henry Center, Watson Memorial Library, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches (quotes); Périer to Maurepas, December 10, 1731, *MPAFD*, V: 104-105; Du Pratz, *History of Louisiana*, 83-87; Peter Caron, "'Of a Nation which the others do not understand': Bambara slaves and African Ethnicity in Colonial Louisiana, 1718-1760," *Slavery & Abolition* 18:1 (1997): 98-121; Usner, *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves*, 70-72; Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, *Africans in Colonial Louisiana: The Development of Afro-Creole Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge, 1992), 97-104.

New Orleans, from where they were sold into slavery on the Caribbean plantations of Saint Domingue.[54]

The Franciscan missions at San Antonio never faced an insurrectionary crisis on the scale of the Natchez uprising. Nevertheless, missionized Natives made sustained efforts to weaken, alter, or escape the padres' brutalizing labour regime during the mid-1730s. Initially entering the missions to avoid Apache or Spanish aggression, the refugee Coahuiltecan bands who arrived at San Antonio soon reshaped the intended program of extracting indigenous labour. Conflicts between Spanish military and religious authorities over how to profit from the labour of the mission populations exacerbated indigenous resentments due to overwork, sexual violence, and other abuses. Forced to work from "sunrise to sundown," the neophytes protested against poor rations and the severe punishments meted out by the friars, especially whippings and beatings. As starvation set in, many Natives "fled to the hills," to gather "prickly pear, and other fruits," that could supplement their diets. On other occasions they absconded to perform traditional ceremonies, trade with independent bands, or avoid the drudgery of field work. As the padres watched their labour force dwindle, they enlisted the support of the governor and his officers. Governor Manuel de Sandoval regularly sent "squads of soldiers to bring the Indians from their lands," after they "retreated to the most unknown parts of the mountains."[55]

As the violence of exploitation increased, the Coahuiltecans sought to break out of the carceral mission regime. By 1734 desertions from the missions work stoppages in the surrounding fields, followed in 1736 by the mass flight of four Coahuiltecan groups, the Pampopas, Tacames, Sulujames, and Pastias. Bereft of their labour supply and fearful that these

[54] For the deportation of Natchez prisoners, see P*é*rier to Maurepas, August 1, 1730, *MPAFD*, IV: 37.

[55] Jose Antonio de Jauregui y Urrutia to the Viceroy, January 11, 1735, BA; Neophytes to Carlos Benites Franquis de Lugo, August 5, 1737, Bolton Papers (BP), Texas-Coahuila, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; Santiago Aldana to Lugo, August 5, 1737, BP, Texas-Coahuila; Urrutia to Lugo, August 6, 1737, BP, Texas-Coahuila.

Natives would guide or join independent bands in raids against San Antonio, Governor Sandoval again sent troops to hunt them down. After capturing some of the Pamposa fugitives, Sandoval's men "tethered them to posts in the plaza," and gave them "fifty lashes for the term of nine days." The troops administered the whippings "with such harshness and cruelty […] that many died."[56]

Spanish slave raids to replenish the missions specifically targeted the Coahuiltecans' refugee villages, a policy that mirrored French attempts to eliminate maroon communities or prevent others from joining them. Traveling up the Colorado valley, the Tacames constructed a palisaded village and attempted to resume an independent lifeway along the Apache-Spanish borderland. When the Spanish assault came, the Tacames staged a dogged defence of their village before they eventually succumbed to their enemy's advantage in firearms and horses. Exhausted, demoralized, and determined not to return to vassalage, dozens of Tacames "threw themselves off the bluffs" and into the river, where many drowned. The soldiers managed to capture forty-two survivors, mostly women and children. Over the following months, Spanish patrols dispersed or captured the other refugee bands, with the survivors once again flogged in the corral of the San Antonio plaza. Re-inserted into the mission labour regime, the refugees faced poor rations, disease, and continued whippings from the padres.[57]

Depleted by the 1736-1737 uprisings, the Texas missions declined during the succeeding decade even as Spanish forces scoured the surrounding territory for new sources of indigenous labour. Enclosed and often malnourished, Texas mission Indian populations suffered from the frequent outbreak of diseases, including severe epidemics in 1739 and 1751-1752. Persistent sexual contact between colonists and Natives, especially rapes of indigenous women, made venereal disease endemic to the province's entire Indo-Hispanic population. Overall, the mission

[56] Urrutia to Lugo, August 6, 1737, BP, Texas-Coahuila.

[57] Santiago Ximenez to Lugo, August 14, 1737, BP, Texas-Coahuila.

Indian population fluctuated between seven hundred and a thousand individuals between the 1740s and 1772.[58]

Within this maelstrom of diseases and enslavement, communities of indigenous resisters coalesced. The multi-ethnic Native community Spanish officials called *Rancheria Grande* ("Big Village") emerged during the 1720s, a collection of Tobosos, Jumanos, and other refugees who established semi-permanent encampments along the Brazos River valley. The villagers congregated to hunt or defend against Apaches, whose poaching economy they increasingly imitated, while they inter-married and traded with neighbouring Tonkawas, Caddos, and groups residing along the Gulf Coast. Long suspect as a destination for mission deserters, refugees, and even French traders, Rancheria Grande became the target of renewed efforts at reduction when the missions collapsed during the 1740s. Harassed by Apache raiders, in 1745 four Rancheria Grande captains visited San Antonio to request a mission and presidio, but the potential alliance dissolved when it became clear that Spanish troops could not discourage the attacks.[59]

Attempts to reduce the coastal-dwelling Akokisas, Bidais, Deadoses, and Karankawas resulted in similar failures, as these groups visited the missions to trade, take shelter, or obtain food but came and went at will, without submitting to conversion or mission labour regimes. Shielded from the interior by a dense belt of live oak, bog, and "intolerable plague[s] of mosquitoes," the estuaries and islands of the Gulf Coast had been the homeland of ancestral Karankawa groups since at least the thirteenth century.[60] This ecotone sustained the Karankawa

[58] Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 82-84; Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*, 128-135.

[59] Thomas F. Schilz, "People of the Cross Timbers: A History of the Tonkawa Indians," (Ph.D. diss., Texas Christian University, 1983), 74-75; Herbert E. Bolton, *Texas in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century: Studies in Spanish Colonial History and Administration* (Berkeley, 1915), 143-150.

[60] "Itinerary of Senor Marqués de Rubi," in Jack Jackson and William C. Foster, eds., *Imaginary Kingdom: Texas as Seen by the Rivera and Rubi Military Expeditions, 1727 and 1767* (College Station, 1995), 32; 123; 131; 134-136. For an overview of the Karankawa, see W. W. Newcomb, Jr., "Karankawa," in William C. Sturtevant, general ed., *Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 10: The Southwest* (Washington, D.C., 1983), 359-367.

with its bounty of marine life and later served as a barrier to Spanish penetration, with one French traveler remarking that they "escape the yoke of slavery by taking refuge among the rocks, bays, and fastness of the sea-coast."[61] Effective communication and rapid movement by dugout canoe only heightened the defensive qualities of this coastal waterscape. Like many Native peoples, the Karankawas utilized a set of smoke signals to outpace horse-powered Spanish scouts, "some signals calling them together, others warning them to flee."[62] In 1767, a visiting friar reported that there were few Natives at Mission Rosario. Rather, the majority lived "in the woods or on the banks […], or with another nation that is friendly and confederate on the sea coast."[63] In response, the commanding officer at La Bahia spent much of his time leading expeditions to recapture mission fugitives, an effort largely frustrated by the Karankawas' ability to paddle between islands using their canoes.[64] The situation had changed little a decade later, when patrolling La Bahia troops seized a baptized Karankawa woman and her two young sons. The soldiers returned them to Mission Rosario but failed to apprehend a larger group of thirty apostates who retreated in their canoes, leaving only the rags of their mission clothes.[65] Acknowledging the grueling labour regime as the primary reason for the missions' failure, one priest remarked on the Karankawas' "tendency to escape from subjugation and from work, since they love and desire their liberty."[66]

[61] Sibley, "Travels of Captain Pagès," *SWHQ* 70:4 (April 1967): 619.

[62] Mattie Austin Hatcher and Margaret Kenney Kress, eds. and trans., "Diary of a Visit of Inspection of the Texas Missions made by Fray Gaspar Jose de Solis in the Year 1767-68,"*SWHQ* 35:1 (July 1931): 42.

[63] Solis, "Diary," 40.

[64] Francisco Tovar to Hugo O'Conor, June 6, 1768, BA; Tovar to Fray Maria de Escobar, June 27, 1768, BA.

[65] Cabello to Croix, October 17, 1779, BA.

[66] Solis, "Diary of a Visit," 44.

By the 1750s, the San Antonio and Bahia missions functioned primarily as loci for indigenous survivors to reconstitute themselves and develop new patterns of exchange with other bands. The development of inter-ethnic indigenous villages paralleled, on a larger scale, the maroon communities, themselves composites of various African and Afro-American peoples, which formed at the margins of the Caribbean plantation zone, including Lousiana.[67] Like Apache bands or the residents of Rancheria Grande, slaves and maroons co-opted colonial economies for their own purposes. In 1753, the same year he conceived an Apache alliance against Texas, an exasperated Kerlérec issued an ordinance "for suppression of cattle stealing by the slaves." Even in the core plantation zone, "negro hunters" with "arms at their disposal" culled their masters' cattle to supply their own needs.[68] With only three Atlantic slave ships arriving between 1731 and 1743, the expansion of the plantation complex stalled until the end of the French period in 1763, but Africans and their descendants remained "scattered through all the posts," as the enslaved population continued to grow.[69]

Together, the Natchez War and the decline of the Texas missions represented major obstacles to French and Spanish efforts at establishing servile populations that could increase production in relatively poor, isolated colonies. In their aftermath, colonial slavers and their partners focused on obtaining extraneous sources of labour, employing long-distance transfers to obtain captives. For Louisiana planters, this meant increasing reliance on imported Africans while Spanish missions and towns sought increasingly distant Native populations to exploit as

[67] For the Louisiana maroons during the first half of the eighteenth century, see Hall, *Africans in Colonial Louisiana*, 1-119; Sylviane A. Diouf, *Slavery's Exiles: The Story of the American Maroons* (New York, 2014), 39-157.

[68] Ordinance of Governor Kerlérec and Intendant-Commissary, D'Auberville, for suppression of cattle stealing by the slaves, June 1, 1753, in Henry P. Dart, ed., and Heloize H. Cruzat, trans., "Cabildo Archives," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (*LHQ*) 3:1 (January 1920): 91-92.

[69] Vaudreuil and Michel to Rouillé, May 19, 1751, *MPAFD*, V: 80; Kerlérec, "Memoir on Indians," December 12, 1758, *MPAFD*, V: 212. In 1746, Louisiana had a population of 3,300 colonists, 600 soldiers, and 4,100 slaves, see Taylor, *American Colonies*, 385.

unfree workers. As these regimes increased the geographic scope of their violence, survivors formed new communities or joined free associations, such as Apache bands, that could not be collectively destroyed or enslaved. In response to these challenges, colonial officials invested in Native alliances that they believed could buffer their regimes. However, these formations soon spiralled beyond imperial control, provoking fresh turmoil within the pastoral-plantation slaving zone.

Alliances and the Borderland Slaving Zone, 1750-1770

As the French sought to insulate their plantation regime from further disruptions, the ecclesiastical and military branches of Spanish imperialism renewed their attempts to "reduce" Apache bands. Between the 1720s and 1740s, relations between Texas colonists and Apaches stabilized around periodic trade fairs and small-scale exchanges of livestock, meat, hides, and other goods. Nevertheless, stock thefts, murders, deportations, and captive-taking all contributed to a state of "no war, no peace." As Apaches slackened their seizure of branded and semi-wild animals around San Antonio, they began to target the San Gabriel River missions newly established in east Texas for groups associated with Rancheria Grande.[70] Although Apaches never killed more than a few individuals during their attacks, Spanish soldiers and their Franciscan allies sought a decisive resolution to the Apache "problem." In March 1749, a cohort of soldiers, militia, and allied mission Indians departed San Antonio in search of the Lipans and Natages. Overrunning a thinly-defended rancheria along the Guadalupe River, the attackers "conquered them and formed chains of prisoners. Where convenient, they took away their horses and whatever they had that was useful. They burned their rancherias and tents, and spared the lives only of those captives who were likely to be converted to the faith, and the children, whom

[70] Herbert E. Bolton, "The Founding of the Missions on the San Gabriel River, 1745-1749," *SWHQ* 17:4 (April 1914): 323-378.

they brought back to increase the missions and the town."[71] In the 1780s Viceroy Bernardo de Galvez acknowledged that Apache hostility "derives from the little faith that has been kept with them and from the tyrannies that they have suffered, as could be made clear with examples that it is shameful to remember."[72] Indeed, Spanish slaving played a decisive role in Texas colonists' tumultuous interactions with eastern Apaches.

In 1749 the raiders used their captives, mostly women and children, to initiate a truce with the Lipans and allied bands. During a lavish peace negotiation held in San Antonio, Spanish authorities returned most of the 167 captive Apaches to their relatives. To seal their unity as "brothers," Apache and Spanish men dug a large hole at the center of the plaza and danced around it after they entombed the symbols of their raiding economy: hatchet, lance, arrows, and a live horse.[73] Nevertheless, it was a peace born of desperation and exhaustion on both sides. Apache-Spanish rapprochement only reinforced the nascent alliance among eastern Comanches and Wichitas, whose French supporters purchased Apache captives and viewed with satisfaction the deepening isolation of their European rival.

Although the Spanish-Apache peace of 1749 brought relative stability to Texas, warfare and slaving radiated outwards to ensnare other communities. Colonial-indigenous alliances generally functioned as commercially-military pacts that depended on the continuous flow of trade goods and sets of mutually-constructed symbols to maintain relations. Alliances also

---

[71] San Antonio Cabildo, Memorial, [no date], 1787, BA.

[72] Bernardo de Galvez, "Notes and Reflections on the War with the Apache Indians in the Provinces of New Spain," Elizabeth A. H. John and John Wheat, ed. and trans., "A Cautionary Exercise in Apache Historiography," *The Journal of Arizona History* 25:3 (Autumn 1984): 306. For the final word on the document's provenance, see Elizabeth A. H. John, "Bernardo de Galvez on the Apache Frontier: A Cautionary Note for Gringo Historians," *The Journal of Arizona History* 29:4 (Winter 1988): 426-430.

[73] For Thoribio Urrutia's March 1749 campaign and the subsequent peace process, see Cabello, Ynforme, September 30, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1; William E. Dunn, "Apache Relations in Texas, 1718-1750," *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 14:3 (January 1911): 259-262; Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*, 174-175; Minor, *Turning Adversity to Advantage*, 31-34.

depended on war against shared enemies, insuring that conflict became endemic across contact zones. In the Texas borderlands, the decades following 1750 witnessed the broadening of borderland warfare, intimately connected with slaving, that included various Apaches, Caddoans, Comanches, French, and Spaniards. Beyond ensnaring, these alliances also fractured various free associations whose members were prompted to seek alternatives. Provided with Spanish clothing and held in the missions during their imprisonment, some of the Apache captives who returned in 1749 apparently carried smallpox back to their families. Along with Comanche pressure, this outbreak prompted some Lipan traditionalists to reject further intercourse with Spaniards and seek new territory along the upper Pecos and Rio Grande rivers. Lipan oral history records how "disease came to them; there being many/they died. Therefore in this way/ they traveled."[74] Spanish sources then consistently grouped Lipan bands into Upper (*Lipanes de arriba*) and Lower (*Lipanes de abajo*) divisions, in relation to their location along the river valleys. The upper Lipan maintained close relations with the Mescalero and Llanero Apaches to their west, while the lower Lipan extended their territory closer to the coast in order to hunt *mestenas* (feral cattle) and trade with Karankawas, Bidais, Caddos, or Louisiana colonists.[75]

Using the 1749 peace as an opportunity to carry conversion efforts into the Apacheria, Franciscan leaders gained permission to construct two missions along the San Saba River valley, where Lipans congregated seasonally to hunt bison and plant crops. In addition, the valley supposedly offered protection from Comanche war parties. Security appears to have been the Apaches' singular objective in allowing Spanish forces into their territory. Threatened by the construction of two missions and a small fort in 1756, in the spring of 1758 approximately two thousand Taovaya, Tawakoni, Tonkawa, Hasinai, and Comanche warriors splashed across the

[74] Hoijer, *The History and the Customs of the Lipans*; Minor, *The Light Gray People*, 25.

[75] Cordero, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," 355.

Red River to campaign in the San Saba valley. Known to Spaniards as the "Nations of the North" (*Nortenos*), the diplomatic consensus required to assemble such a diverse and well-armed war party was nothing short of remarkable. It was also the realization of imperialists' worst fears: a pan-Indian alliance. On the morning of March 16, 1758, the indigenous army entered the mission, cut-off reinforcements from the nearby presidio, and killed several priests and soldiers before burning the chapel and other structures. Besides eliminating the settlement that sheltered and supplied their Lipan enemies, the attackers were incensed that "the Apaches [were] in possession of [Norteno] prisoners."[76]

Following this shattering defeat, the blood of Spain demanded vengeance. Redeeming the king's honour fell to Colonel Diego Ortiz Parrilla, lest the sack of San Saba embolden the Nortenos to roll back the imperial perimeter. A career soldier steeped in the empire's tradition of violent retribution, in September 1759 Ortiz Parrilla led a force of six hundred Spanish, Tlaxcaltecan, and Lipan troops in search of the Nortenos. Intent on recouping their losses in the form of enemy captives, regardless of their participation at San Saba, the expedition carried sufficient manacles to bind a lengthy slave coffle. After an overnight march led by Lipan scouts, at dawn the expedition fell upon an unsuspecting Yojuane rancheria (possibly the remnants of Rancheria Grande) located along a tributary of the upper Brazos River. Killing fifty-five Yojuane defenders and scouring the creek for survivors, the allies continued northward with 149 prisoners "chained together."[77] Five days later, Ortiz Parrilla and his men met their match outside the

[76] For Spanish accounts of the attack on San Saba, see Deposition of Jose Antonio Flores and Deposition of Fray Miguel de Molina, in Lesley Byrd Simpson and Paul D. Nathan, ed. and trans., *The San Saba Papers: A Documentary Account of the Founding and Destruction of the San Saba Mission*, (San Francisco, 1959), 47-48; 85-88. For the Nortenos' motives at San Saba, see Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 59-60; Ripperda to Croix, April 21, 1777, *ADM*, II: 129.

[77] The Diary of Juan Angel de Oyarzun, Day 1 [Oct. 1-2], trans. Carol Lipscomb, in Robert S. Weddle, *After the Massacre: The Violent Legacy of the San Saba Mission* (Lubbock, 2007), 120. Having assembled at San Antonio, the expedition left the presidio of San Saba on September 1, attacked the Yojuane rancheria on October 2, began the assault on the Taovaya fortress on October 7, and returned to presidio San Saba on October 25, 1759.

palisaded Taovaya villages that straddled the Red River. Outgunned, outnumbered, and hemmed in by the Nortenos after four hours of fighting, the survivors demonstrated the better part of valour by limping towards San Antonio the next morning. Upon their return, they divided the men, women, and children who were the only spoils of war in an otherwise frustrating campaign. The Lipan retained ninety-seven of the captive Yojuanes and exchanged them for Spanish merchandise when they departed the village. The prisoners were then sold among the residents of San Antonio, where they lived as bonded labourers, servants, or ranch hands.[78]

Despite clear signs that Spanish machinations prompted sweeping counter-measures from the Comanche-Wichita-Caddo alliance, colonial authorities persisted in their efforts to reduce allied Apache bands. In reality, as a small group of outsiders attempting to impose alien values on the dominant society, the missionaries set themselves an impossible task. Apaches approached the missions as valuable depots insofar as they could obtain food and supplies while enjoying the protection of Spanish soldiers. Eastern Apaches' interests in any kind residence within the missions were above all tactical and logistical, and even then the missions were laden with risks as sites of ideological contest, violence, and sexual exploitation, as well as fixed locations vulnerable to discovery and attack. Troubles continued at mission San Lorenzo, established in the canyons of the upper Nueces valley in 1762. Comanche warriors hit the surrounding Apache rancherias over the spring and summer, but Spanish cavalry rarely pursued the attackers. Disappointed by their allies' inaction and with Spaniards' own slaving campaigns in recent memory, some Apaches rejected the experiment. While absent from San Lorenzo on a bison hunt, a Lipan shaman called El Lumen ("The Light") dreamt that the Spaniards carried off

[78] The Yojuane were a Tonkawan people. See Andree F. Sjorberg, "The Culture of the Tonkawa, A Texas Indian Tribe," in Thomas R. Hester, ed., *Ethnology of the Texas Indians* (New York, 1991), 354-378. For the captives' fate, see Cabello to Jacobo Ugarte y Loyola, July 3, 1786, BA; Castaneda, *Our Catholic Heritage*, IV: 133-134; Elizabeth A. H. John, *Storms Brewed in Other Men's Worlds: The Confrontation of Indians, Spanish, and French in the Southwest, 1540-1795*, 2nd ed., (Norman, 1996), 350-353.

the women, children, and horses during the hunters' absence. Returning to the mission, El Lumen addressed the other leaders and claimed the soldiers and priests had taken the Apache women as concubines and "were gathering [the men] in the mission to kill them deceitfully." El Lumen and his band soon departed without incident, but the warning of his dreams enjoyed a long afterlife in Apache councils.[79]

After repeated Comanche attacks forced the abandonment of the remaining Nueces missions during the early 1760s, Lipans had seen enough. Within months of leaving the missions forever in 1766, they stole hundreds of horses from the San Antonio corral in a move that presaged the transition of their pastoral economy from one oriented around buffalo-hunting to increased raiding and poaching.[80] Colonists and priests had long complained that Apaches took advantage of peace treaties to harvest branded cattle with impunity. As Apache raids against San Antonio mounted in frequency, turbulence spiked at the missions, where the Native population continued to reject Catholicism and actively seek refuge among independent groups. In a revealing testament to the rigours of the mission regime and the appeal of an Apachean lifestyle, one priest remarked how poor diets and arduous work prompted "our Indians" to "desert the missions [and] under the protection of the Apaches they despise the padres who visit them and find them enjoying the comforts, leisure, and abundance after the example of the Apaches."[81] The situation culminated in 1764 when the Indian governor of the San Antonio missions fled to the Nortenos. He later returned for his family and other followers, and they became integral

[79] Report of the priests quoted in Curtis D. Tunnell and W. W. Newcomb, Jr., "A Lipan Apache Mission: San Lorenzo de la Santa Cruz, 1762-1771," *Bulletin of the Texas Memorial Museum* 14 (July 1969): 173-174.

[80] For the collapse of the Lipan-Spanish alliance, and Apaches' transition from buffalo hunting to raiding, see Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 125-128.

[81] Pedro Ramirez to Manuel Ramirez de la Piscina, June 6, 1762, BA.

members of the northern alliance as guides, warriors, and traders with intimate knowledge of colonial society.[82]

Coinciding with Spain's acquisition of Louisiana in the aftermath of the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), the failure of the missions during the 1760s led Spanish policy-makers to adopt alternative measures for controlling indigenous peoples. Charged with controlling a vast frontier and disgruntled with the Franciscans' perceived lenience towards recidivist opponents of the mission regime, Spanish war leaders increasingly viewed truces as merely buying time for their indigenous foes and encouraging armed resistance.[83] They responded with a brutal and time-tested policy: wars of extermination and the dispersal of survivors. For their part, the British conquest of New France in 1760 prompted French slavers to shift west of the Mississippi, where the demand for labour in the ranching and plantation communities of La Bahia, Natchitoches, Nacogdoches, and San Antonio exacerbated colonists' tensions with indigenous peoples and imperial officials.[84] By this time colonial societies were deeply enmeshed in local slaving cultures, evidenced by one Natchitoches groom who brought property in "Negroes, Indians, a house, land, and [other] movables, valued at 8600 *livres*," to his 1756 marriage.[85]

While Spanish administrators sought to impose their vision of colonial order on Louisiana, drastic policy changes loomed over the impoverished and war-ravaged provinces of northern New Spain. Following an extensive inspection conducted between 1766 and 1768, the Marqués de Rubi prepared a sweeping program for salvaging the frontier. In a style typical of the Spanish soldiery, Rubi lashed at the treachery of the Apache, who lived "under the shadow of

---

[82] Morfi, *History of Texas*, I: 92-101; Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 91.

[83] Cabello to Croix, in Proceedings concerning Croix's instructions on method of warfare against the Karankawa Indians, November 25, 1782, BA.

[84] For such behaviour as evidence of "rogue colonialism," see Dawdy, *Building the Devil's Empire*, 234-239.

[85] Winston De Ville, ed. and trans., *Marriage Contracts of Natchitoches, 1739-1803* (Nashville, 1961), 7.

our inconvenient mercy," and whose presence provoked Comanche hostilities. Dismissing all treaties with the Apache as worthless, the marques instead proposed an aggressive war against them, including the "complete extermination" of those who resisted.[86] In Texas, this meant dissolving the 1749 peace with the Lipan in favour of an alliance with the Wichitas and Comanches, who were to be used as key players in isolating and destroying eastern Apacheria.

These strategic considerations were intimately bound up with the borderland raiding economy, which Spanish imperialists sought to control for their own purposes. In his report, Rubi described "the distribution of booty and the apportionment of captured Indians" as important issues that required attention. Accepting as inevitable the acquisition of prisoners, Rubi recommended their distribution among the soldiers, if only to prevent large numbers from falling into the hands of voracious colonists, "who treat them as slaves, even to the point of selling them."[87] Rubi's recommendations were largely well-received by the Spanish court, which codified them in 1772 as the "New Regulations for Presidios." To implement the Regulations, in 1776 King Carlos III authorized the establishment of the Interior Provinces, a new administrative unit headed by a commandant general who was independent of the viceroy and responsible for the northern provinces from Alta California to Texas. Designed to shield the urban and mining centers from indigenous raiders or Anglo-American penetration, the Interior Provinces only added to the political complexity of an immense, militarized landscape. Pressed by Comanche expansion, *Gran Apacheria* ("Greater Apache Country") shifted southward, creating a vast belt of Apachean peoples who became locked in a state of "no war, no peace" with their many neighbours. Although the Regulations held that "in no case shall the Indians arrested be sent into

[86] Rubi, "Dictamen," in Jackson and Foster, *Imaginary Kingdom*, 180-182.

[87] Rubi, "Dictamen," in Jackson and Foster, *Imaginary Kingdom*, 205.

servitude as has been illegally done in the past," it authorized a standardized system for prisoner exchanges that could be ignored or manipulated by labour-hungry colonists.[88]

As ever, indigenous nations pursued their own visions of power and prosperity. Pressing their advantages in population and horses, eastern Comanches extended their borders to the heavily wooded ridge stretching between the Guadalupe and Colorado, where they came within easy striking distance of San Antonio. Huddled inside their scattered east Texas villages, Spaniards knew this border of *Comancheria* ("Comanche Country") as "the Big Woods, called *El Diablo*."[89] Within its core territory, Comancheria blossomed with livestock, trade goods, and plenty of food. One European observer believed the Comanches so dominant in regional trade that they despised dependent Natives as "slaves of the Europeans," while members of the Wichita confederacy, disgruntled with their ascendant allies, called the Texas Comanches *Natai* – "the Proud, Arrogant People."[90] Careful not to alienate Comanche bands, the Wichitas remained powerful traders and alliance brokers operating from their fortified Red River villages. When the Taovayas redeemed a captured Spanish soldier in 1765, the man confirmed a robust trade between Wichita villagers and westering French traders who obtained "buffalo skins, deer skins, Apache children and women who are captured in war, and the horses, mules, and everything else [the Wichitas] steal from the Spanish."[91] Over the coming decades, allied Comanche and Wichita bands would enmesh themselves in colonial alliances and emerge as the borderland's most powerful actors.

---

[88] "The Royal Regulations of 1772," in Sidney B. Brinckerhoff and Odie B. Faulk, ed. and trans., *Lancers for the King: A Study of the Frontier Military System of Northern New Spain, with a Translation of the Royal Regulations of 1772* (Phoenix, 1965), 35.

[89] Solis, "Diary of a Visit," 56; Over a decade later, Spaniards still recognized this border as the "Monte Del Diablo," see Cabello to Teodoro de Croix, October 20, 1780, BA.

[90] Athanase de Mézières, Report of the Expedition to Cadodachos, October 29, 1770, *ADM*, I: 219; Lila Wistrand Robinson and James Armagost, eds., *Comanche Dictionary and Grammar* (Arlington, 1990), 59.

[91] Proceedings concerning the return of Antonio Trevino by the Taovaya Indians, March 20, 1765, BA.

Conclusion

At the edges of the pastoral-raiding and plantation-agriculture zones, various indigenous and colonial peoples struggled to navigate a world transformed by dispossession, epidemics, and slaving. Operating in a harsh, labour-poor environment, colonists sustained production by targeting nearby indigenous populations. These raids functioned as coercive labour drafts that locked colonists in hostilities with various free associations, whose social organization precluded their total subjugation. In turn, militarized indigenous bands re-oriented their modes of production around equestrian pastoralism, a lifestyle that enhanced the dynamic power of war and raiding. In this context, indigenous societies and slave communities challenged colonies whose own weaknesses in population, logistics, and military power compromised their persistent efforts at social control. The Natchez and Coahuiltecan uprisings of the 1730s, and subsequent failures to reduce or destroy surrounding free associations, prompted colonists to rely increasingly on alliance networks to insulate and sustain their precarious regimes. Within the Louisiana plantation zone, long-distance removal became the central feature of engineering a slave society as deracinated Africans replaced Natives as the primary source of bonded labour. From the 1760s onward, continental slave trades joined with saltwater slaveries in creating diverse communities competing for limited resources. Empowered by pastoral nomadism, Apache and Comanche bands developed alliances with colonial societies predicated on slaving. Coalescing during the early 1770s, new alliances produced inter-ethnic cadres of warriors, traders, and survivors eager to expand their shares of the emerging pastoral-plantation borderland.

Chapter 2: Slaving Communities and the Pastoral-Plantation Borderland, 1770s-1780s

On the night of March 18, 1770, someone fired a musket at the overseer of Natchitoches' largest slave-owner. Although the assailant only frightened the overseer, Noel Verret, their actions plunged North America's westernmost plantation society into crisis. As an important colonial outpost along the Texas-Louisiana border, the assault on Verret shocked the local slavers, surrounded as they were by a large slave population and rival indigenous societies.

Natchitoches planters navigated the precarious dynamics of production and paranoia by subjecting their human property to an assortment of abuses: torture, intimidation, and sale. The preceding January, the commandant of Natchitoches, Athanase de Mézières, issued an "Ordinance against the Blacks," a series of police policies that forbade slaves from traveling or assembling at night, selling goods or services, and possessing horses, knives, or firearms. A number of slaves had apparently organized themselves into rival groups, known as the "Creoles" and the "Africans," hence Mézières also forbid slave associations based on origins.[1]

Despite repeated efforts to regulate slaves' lives, the attempted assassination of Verret exposed the limits of social control. The day before the attack, Verret had severely beaten a slave named Christophe, "to teach him how to saw wood." Christophe soon became the prime suspect among Mézières' bondspeople.[2] The commandant made it clear that the guilty party and any accomplices would face punishments grimly referred to as "the customs of the French." Nevertheless, the subsequent proceedings demonstrated the slave community's abilities to withstand the recent checks on their autonomy. Mézières threatened another planter's black overseer, Cupidon, with a whipping and separation from his family by selling him downriver to

[1] For the "Ordinance Against the Blacks," see Smith and Burton, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 81-82; Mathé Allain and Gerard L. St. Martin, ed. and trans., "A Slave Trial in Colonial Natchitoches," *Louisiana History* 28:1 (Winter 1987): 57-58. In 1770, 40% of Natchitoches' population were enslaved people.

[2] Allain and St. Martin, "Slave Trial in Colonial Natchitoches," 64.

New Orleans, but Cupidon cited his loyalty to the French and insisted that "if they send me to the city it will be a mistake."[3] According to various testimonies, Christophe found temporary refuge (*petit marronage*) among supporters in the surrounding pine and live-oak woodlands. Prior to the beating he received from Verret, Christophe absconded from Mézières' plantation for two weeks, during which he received asylum from a Spanish priest in eastern Texas. During another short-term escape, he received food, weaponry, and other supplies from slaves on the surrounding plantations, and established a reputation for "escape, return, and punishment." Nevertheless, all of the other slaves, totalling eighteen individuals, interrogated by Mézières and his lieutenants held firm in their insistence that Christophe was convalescing from the beating in his hut when the attack on Verret occurred. Ultimately, the lack of evidence allowed Christophe to avoid further punishment.[4]

The trial also revealed the significance of indigenous alliances to a slaving community like Natchitoches. To control maroons and other social outcasts, Mézières fused his roles as diplomat and planter to provide additional security. As they had since the Natchez uprising, the neighbouring Caddos continued to play an integral role in bolstering the plantation regime. During negotiations with Kadohadacho and Yatasi leaders held at Natchitoches in 1770, Mézières secured promises that the former would arrest and return "all the *coureurs de bois* [independent traders], French, Spanish, or blacks, of whom they may have knowledge, wandering in the Indian villages."[5] Months later, when Mézières met with various Wichita leaders, he exhorted them to follow "the good example and inviolable fidelity of the friendly

[3] Allain and St. Martin, "Slave Trial in Colonial Natchitoches," 74.

[4] Allain and St. Martin, "Slave Trial in Colonial Natchitoches," 66.

[5] Mézières, Agreement made with the Indian Nations in Assembly, April 21, 1770, in Herbert Eugene Bolton, ed. and trans., *Athanase de Mézières and the Texas-Louisiana Frontier, 1768-1780* (*ADM*), (2 vols. New York, 1970), I: 158.

Kadodachos," who rallied to the French when the Natchez attacked Natchitoches in 1731.[6] From the 1770s onward, increasing maroon activity within the borderlands confirmed French apprehensions. In July 1771, a Natchitoches slave patrol captured a group of six maroons, a woman and five men, whom Mézières interrogated before auctioning off their weapons and sending them to New Orleans for sentencing.[7] The members of the group had escaped New Orleans between three months and two years prior to their capture at a ranch outside Natchitoches, and all of them had been living in the woods with the assistance of other fugitives, slaves, and "various persons." At the capital, the governor ordered them flogged and one recidivist runaway "treated with the full rigor of the laws and according to the customs of the country."[8]

The entanglement of French planters, fugitive slaves, and Caddo chieftains hint at the precarious dynamics of borderland slaving. Within the multipolar pastoral-plantation borderland of the eighteenth century, demands for unfree labour and the exigencies of alliance altered patterns of conflict among neighbouring communities. Between the 1770s and 1780s, colonial societies intensified their slaving practices, exposing themselves to the problems of controlling a significant enslaved population and maintaining indigenous alliances. In times of peace, colonists augmented their production of staples, cash crops, and livestock, but slaving campaigns increased during this period in order to meet labour demands. Seeking additional sources of unfree labour, colonists enslaved indigenous enemies and relied increasingly on captives from

[6] Mézières, Report of the Expedition to Cadodachos, October 29, 1770, *ADM*, I: 210.

[7] Mézières, Interrogation of several negro maroons from the capital, July 29, 1771; Mézières, Sale of the arms of the said negroes, August 4, 1771 in Vaugine, Rousseau, Bormé, et al., Inventory of notarial transactions and functions at the post of Natchitoches since 1732, October 31, 1785, Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Papeles Procedentes de Cuba (PPC), legajo 198A, Clayton Library, Houston.

[8] "Proceedings transmitted by the Lieutenant Governor of the Post of Natchitoches upon the arrest of some fugitive negroes and concluded in the Tribunal of the Governor General of this Province," July 29, 1771, in Henry P. Dart, ed., and Heloize H. Cruzat, trans., "Cabildo Archives," *LHQ* 8:3 (July 1925): 527-528.

Africa. Indigenous and colonial slavers also mingled their practices of war and diplomacy, exchanging captives to cement or rupture alliances. Thrust between predatory communities, the socializing effects of captivity allowed erstwhile victims to assume significant roles as interpreters, diplomats, and war leaders – individuals who conjured new methods of inter-cultural exchange from their searing experiences. These mixed cohorts of slavers and survivors became crucial to the functioning of the pastoral-plantation slaving zone.

Chronologically, the pattern of conflict coincided with the consummation of alliances that displaced the violence of slaving onto mutual enemies. Despite the San Antonio peace of 1749, Apache-Spanish relations remained unstable for another twenty years as neither side fully invested in the partnership. Insulated from Apache raids by their cordon of Caddo allies, during the 1770s Natchitoches slavers expanded their commercial networks into Texas and across the Atlantic in order to procure additional Apache and African captives. In the aftermath of the Seven Years' War and the first decade of Spanish rule, Louisiana's slave population increased from 5,600 in 1766 to 9,649 in 1777.[9] Beyond the plantation zone, Apache bands centered their new political economy on pastoralism and raiding, increasing the fluidity of peace and war with colonial communities. For individuals and bands committed to traditional beliefs, reduction in Spanish towns or missions proved intolerable. Imitating key elements of the Apache raiding economy, during the late 1770s other indigenous leaders developed their own militarized practices to challenge colonial hegemony.

Natchitoches: A Borderland Slaving Community, 1760s-1770s

In the aftermath of the Seven Years' War, Frenchmen lost the seas but not the rivers. Their presence continued to influence the course of empire. At Natchitoches, the eastern hub of the borderland slave trade, the union of Texas and Louisiana under the Spanish Crown in 1762

[9] Hall, *Africans in Colonial Louisiana*, 278.

further empowered the St Denis family cartel, whose extensive network of planters and traders passed under the leadership of Mézières. Born into the Parisian nobility in 1719, Mézières changed skins as easily as he dealt in them. A veteran of thirty years' service in North America when he assumed command of Natchitoches in 1769, during his earlier career Mézières added potent markings to his chest and legs, which his indigenous partners tattooed with serpents and flowers. Known as El Capitan Pintado ("The Painted Captain") among the local Caddos, Mézières and his partners straddled the orbits of indigenous and Atlantic trade.[10] In this borderland, acculturation could go both ways. By 1765, his personal wealth included thirty-five slaves (among them two Lipan men and two other unidentified Natives), hundreds of animals, and a plantation that produced ten thousand pounds of tobacco annually – making him the most influential man in his community.[11]

Natchitoches slavers developed a catalytic role within the borderland's economy of violence as both predatory agents and the primary consumers of unfree labour. By consuming war captives and spreading violent technologies, these diplomat-traders expanded the reach of colonial slaving to distant victims and far-off markets. Mézières' conduct of indigenous diplomacy emphasized the role of francophone traders who, like himself, were "discharged officers of his Most Christian Majesty, [having] served with great zeal and renown in the last wars of *El Canada*." These agents operated beyond the control of imperial policy-makers, with one Spanish officer complaining that such men had "always lived among those nations, trading

[10] For Mézières' tattoos, see Stéphanie Félicité, comtesse de Genlis, *Mémoires de Madame de Genlis* (Paris, 1878), 32. For Caddo descriptions of Mézières as the "Painted Chief," see Cabello to Croix, August 20, 1779, BA.

[11] "1766 French Census of Natchitoches," in Mills, *Natchitoches Colonials*, 9-14. These statistics are for 1765. See also Katherine Bridges and Winston DeVille, "Natchitoches in 1766," *Louisiana History* 4:2 (Spring 1963): 145-159.

in guns and ammunition."[12] Serving their own interests at the expense of the colonial state by plying their indigenous partners with firearms, alcohol, and other prohibited items in exchange for livestock and captives, Natchitoches slavers partnered with indigenous war leaders to connect the spoils of the raiding economy with the plantation complex of the Lower Mississippi Valley. Labour demands on their tobacco plantations and ranches incentivized the acquisition of slaves through all means available, and the growing accessibility of Africans led them to exploit this new source of enslaved workers. Radiating violence onto distant peoples, Natchitoches merchants spread war into the heart of Apacheria even as their investments in saltwater slaving sucked captives out of West Africa, across the Atlantic, up the Red River, and into the heart of North America.

Career, kinship and property-holding patterns underscore the interconnectedness of Natchitoches' leading slavers. Two of St Denis' lieutenants, Francois Derbanne and Jacques Guedon, married ex-captive Chitimacha sisters, Jeanne and Marie Anne Therese de la Grande Terre during the 1720s. Over the next generation, members of these metis lineages became influential borderlanders. By 1766 Francois' son Pierre Derbanne was Natchitoches' third-largest slave-owner, with sixteen black or mulatto slaves. In 1746 one of the Guedon-Grand Terre daughters married Alexis Grappé, a former marine who became a close associate of Mézières. Often stationed at the Caddo villages, Grappé combined his slaving interests as he developed his trade concession and a successful tobacco plantation back at Natchitoches. In 1766 he was the town's fifth-largest slave-owner, and by 1774 he owned twenty-five slaves (eleven black adults, twelve black children, one Native woman, and a Native girl). When Grappé's daughter married Paul Bouet Laffitte in 1771, her dowry included "one young negresse named Jeanne, who is now

[12] Mézières to Bucareli, February 20, 1778, *ADM*, II: 183; Pacheco to O'Conor, April 20, 1774, *ADM*, II: 43. For Mézières' involvement in the "infamous traffic" of human scalps during the Seven Years' War, see Mézières to Croix, October 7, 1779, *ADM*, II: 295-296.

at the village of the Caddo Indians with her master." Grappé's son Francois preserved the largest share of the family's slaving interests, serving as an Indian trader while developing a large ranch and tobacco plantation north of Natchitoches. Francois had sexual relationships with his female slaves, creating an extended mixed-race family that he emancipated in 1796, including his mistress Marie Louise, their children, and grand-children – a total of eighteen people.[13]

The localized power of francophone colonists posed a serious challenge to the Spanish policy-makers who acquired Louisiana from their French allies in the 1762 Treaty of Fontainebleau, a settlement confirmed by the 1763 Treaty of Paris that ended the Seven Years War.[14] Charged with administering the new province, in July 1769 General Alejandro O'Reilly arrived at New Orleans and began instituting the new regime, collecting data on the population, and replacing Gallic law with its Spanish counterpart. Ordered to end colonists' enslavement of indigenous people, in December O'Reilly issued a proclamation forbidding any subject from continuing to own or trade in Native slaves. Henceforth, not even an "open war against that Indian's nation," could justify captive-taking, while manumission became the only legal means of alienating Native slaves.[15] He followed this up with a prohibition against the borderland trade in horses and mules, as Louisianans' demand for these animals incentivized Wichita and

[13] For the Derbannes, see "1766 French Census of Natchitoches," 158; Burton and Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 30; 39-40. For the Grappés, see Philip C. Cook, "Alexis Grappé: From French Marine to North Louisiana Frontiersman," *Journal of the North Louisiana Historical Association* 34 (Winter 2003): 30-42; "1774 Census of Slaveowners," in Mills, *Natchitoches Colonials*, 31; Winston De Ville, ed. and trans., *Marriage Contracts of Natchitoches, 1739-1803* (Nashville, 1961), 22; Felix Trudeau, Emancipation of Francois Grappé's slaves, November 13, 1796, Volume 27-A, Document 2724, Natchitoches Parish Conveyance Records (NPCR), Natchitoches Parish Courthouse, Natchitoches; Burton and Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 39-40, 80; 103.

[14] For these treaties, see Colin G. Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (Oxford, 2006), esp. 133-149.

[15] Proclamation by Alejandro O'Reilly, December 7, 1769, in Lawrence Kinnaird, ed. and trans., *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794* (*SMV*), 3 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1949), I: 125-126.

Comanche raids against the herds of New Mexico and Texas.[16] O'Reilly nevertheless emphasized the role of slave labour in developing the ranching industry, mandating that land grants around "Opelousas, Atacapas, and Natchitoches," be disbursed only on the condition that colonists possessed "one hundred head of cattle, some horses and sheep, and two slaves to tend these animals."[17] Despite imperial efforts to control the different elements of the inter-colonial economy, colonists continued to traffic Native captives and stolen livestock generated by borderland warfare.

Heeding O'Reilly's orders to summon the unlicensed traders and have them surrender their Native slaves, Mézières did more to replace his rivals with members of the St Denis cartel than to actually curb the regional slave trade.[18] In his May 1770 report to the Louisiana governor, Mézières described the independent traders as deserters, rapists, and murderers – the Arkansas River valley they inhabited being "the asylum of the wickedest persons, without doubt, in all the Indies."[19] Labeled *vagabonds* or *vagabundos* by the colonial authorities, these men lived beyond the laws of the colonial regime and traded freely with indigenous war leaders in captives and stolen livestock.[20] Among their many misdeeds, Mézières singled out the traders' propensity for sexual violence against indigenous women, castigating their "public concubinage with captive

[16] O'Reilly to Mézières, January 23, 1770, *ADM*, I: 135-136.

[17] Alejandro O'Reilly, Regulations concerning land concessions, February 18, 1770, MSS 125.2, Williams Research Center (WRC), The Historic New Orleans Collection, New Orleans.

[18] For the traders, see contract of Juan Piseros with De Mézières, February 3, 1770, *ADM*, I: 143-146; Mézières to Unzaga, March 14, 1771, *ADM*, I: 244.

[19] Mézières to Unzaga, May 20, 1770, *ADM*, I: 166.

[20] H. Sophie Burton, "Vagabonds along the Spanish Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1769-1803: 'Men who are Evil, Lazy, Gluttonous, Drunken, Libertinous, Dishonest, Mutinous, etc. etc. etc – And Those are Their Virtues,'" *SWHQ* 113:4 (April 2010): 438-467.

Indian women whom for this purpose they purchase among the heathens."[21] Between April and June 1770, a series of vagabond traders arrived at Natchitoches and appeared before the commandant. The eight traders possessed fourteen indigenous slaves, all women or young people "acquired" or "purchased among the friendly nations," mainly the neighbouring Caddos. Natchitoches officials identified some of the women as "Panis" or "Cannecis," indicating the role of Caddo-Apache warfare in generating their capture. During extended stays among their indigenous patrons and clients, the traders obtained captive Native women and children to dress skins, collect wood, maintain their camps, and satisfy sexual desires.[22] As slavers, these men connected Plains warfare with borderland plantations, but they could also be disruptive forces within the regional alliance network.

Dependent on their Caddo allies to secure the plantation zone, French authorities subjected transgressors to violent reprisal. Given their differing conceptions of crime and punishment, French and Caddo leaders developed *ad hoc* customs for dealing with criminals. Early in his commandancy, Mézières learned that some neighbouring Nabedache Caddos murdered a group of French and Spanish traders operating illegally in the lower villages. Pleased to be rid of the commercial competition, Mézières nevertheless demanded the "heads of the murderers." He felt the Nabedaches would comply "because since the founding of this town the law of retaliation […] has been established here."[23] Within months, the Nabedaches executed

[21] Mézières to Unzaga, May 20, 1770, *ADM*, I: 166.

[22] Declarations of the traders Jacques Roulleau, Pierre Girard *dit* Leveillé, Nicolas Thibault, and Jean Bureau, April 17, 1770, Volume 3, Document 618, NPCR; Declaration of the trader Francois Morvant, May 7, 1770, Volume 3, Document 640, NPCR; Declaration of the trader Nicolas Chef, May 15, 1770, Volume 3, Document 643, NPCR; Declarations of the traders Jacques Ridde *dit* Bellefleur and Pierre Raymond, June 27, 1770, Volume 3, Document 648, NPCR. Panis was the generic French term for a Native slave, while Cannecis specifically referred to the Lipan, based on the Taovaya term for that nation, see Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance*, 165-173; Burton and Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 57.

[23] Mézières to Unzaga, May 15, 1770, *ADM*, I: 164.

one of the murderers at Mézières' behest.[24] European transgressors faced similar fates. In August 1775, a fur trade worker (*engagé*) named Nicolas Chef warranted retributive justice at the hands of indigenous and French leaders after he murdered a Tawakoni woman and her child in an attempted rape. Traveling to Natchitoches, a Kichai captain informed Mézières that several French traders would be held hostage at the Tawakoni village until the French avenged Chef's crime. Although Mézières sent his men in pursuit, Hasinai villagers were the first to locate the fugitive, whom they killed and delivered to Natchitoches. Once again citing "conformity with what has been practiced in this post," Mézières ordered Chef's severed head placed atop a lance as a sign of "our zeal, impartiality, and promptitude in giving justice."[25] The public display of broken bodies, whether slaves, Natives, or colonists, embodied the terror upon which the plantation regime depended for its control of captive labour. These gruesome symbols also served as boundary markers between the plantation zone and indigenous territory.

Displacing or dismembering their vagabond competitors, Mézières and his men privileged their own interests in the indigenous slave trade by forging alliances that would guarantee their supply of slaves. Serving as the official "interpreter" at the Kadohadacho village, Grappé used his post to ply visiting warriors with munitions. One incensed Franciscan observer met a French "carpenter" who held four or five Native women, "of various nations," as slaves for work in the "infamous traffic of the flesh."[26] Despite these critiques, imperial policies only reacted to the dizzying patterns of violence established on the ground, where Natchitoches

[24] Mézières to Unzaga, October 23, 1770, *ADM*, I: 186-187.

[25] Investigation of the Murder of Two Tuacana Indians, August, 1775, *ADM*, II: 117-119. See also Kathleen Duval, "Cross-Cultural Crime and Osage Justice in the Western Mississippi Valley, 1700-1826," *Ethnohistory* 54:4 (October 2007): 698-701.

[26] Fray Miguel Santa Maria y Silva to Bucareli, July 21, 1774, *ADM*, II: 74. For Grappé's work with Mézières and other Natchitoches traders, see Agreement made with the Indian Nations in Assembly, April 21, 1770, *ADM*, I: 157; Deposition of Domingo Chirinos, October 30, 1770, *ADM*, I: 223.

slavers merged slave raiding and alliance politics to extend the economy of violence deep into indigenous territory. They did so by attaching their demands for unfree labour to the anti-Apache strategy formulated by Spanish officials, grafting their own needs for security and slave labour onto imperial policy. The Natchitoches French had maintained an alliance with the Red River Caddos since the 1720s and they continued these commercial and diplomatic connections under Spanish rule, facilitating the creation of a larger coalition of Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Caddoan peoples, all of whom were invested in the slave trade.[27]

Commissioned Spain's official agent to the Nortenos, in 1770 Mézières traveled to the Red River village of the Kadohadocho, where his party opened negotiations with the "seven chiefs" of the Taovaya, Tawakoni, Iscani, and Kichai – Wichita members of the alliance that destroyed Mission San Saba in 1758. Seeking a détente, Mézières learned from the Wichita diplomats of their continued hostilities with Apaches and their growing estrangement from their Comanche allies. Mézières offered gifts and lectured the assembled leaders on the dangers of becoming isolated within the regional alliance network. But the Wichitas evidently distrusted Spanish motives and refused to visit San Antonio. A treaty was ultimately ratified in 1772, when several Wichita and Comanche leaders, accompanied by men, women, and children, arrived at San Antonio to perform the "feather dance" and wrap the Texas governor in the buffalo robe that symbolized their new union.[28]

Although these collective efforts stabilized relations between Franco-Spanish communities and the Wichita nations, the alliance re-focused predatory actions against eastern

[27] Burton and Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 105-107.

[28] For Mézières' harangue at the Caddo village and the chiefs' rejection of his invitation to San Antonio, see Mézières, Report of the Expedition to Cadodachos, October 29, 1770, *ADM*, I: 208 (seven chiefs quote); 212-213. For the 1772 treaty negotiations, see Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 284-306. For ratification, see Ripperda to Bucareli, July 5, 1772, *ADM*, I: 320-322; 321 (feather dance quote).

Apache bands. Empowered by the 1772 alliance and unwilling to abandon the lucrative trade in "Panis" or "Cannecis" captives, the Natchitoches cartel carefully maneuvered around Spanish efforts to constrain their slaving practices. To insure the continued vitality of the indigenous slave trade, Mézières argued the Wichita-Spanish alliance would spell the final destruction of eastern Apacheria and infuse the local economy with captives and animals. Following the treaty, Mézières proposed to assemble and equip, at his own expense, a large war party in order to ride into Lipan country to "destroy their crops, carry off their stock, [and] raze their pueblos." In recompense, Mézières requested permission "to sell here [San Antonio] the captives that they may bring," as the promise of exchanging prisoners for booty would "encourage such expeditions." Texas Governor Juan Maria de Ripperda wholeheartedly approved this plan, and volunteered to lead a party of three hundred Louisiana hunters to trap the Lipans in a pincer movement. A massive slave raid in all but name, the proposed expedition would swell the coffers of frontier officers, many of whom had sunk their capital in the Indian trade and had become badly indebted. With the number of neophytes flagging since the 1760s, the San Antonio missions would also benefit economically from an influx of Apache prisoners.[29]

The Viceroy of New Spain refused to sanction the raid, but others continued to mobilize the men and resources for successful slaving ventures. On his expedition to the Taovaya's Red River villages, the aspiring Opelousas slaver Jacques Gaignard planned to recruit warriors to raid Apache and Osage villages, and he petitioned the Louisiana governor for permission to sell his captives if "the fortune of war is such that I should have the good luck to get some slaves." Spending nearly a year along the Red River borderland wracked by Wichita-Osage warfare,

[29] Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 313; Ripperda to Bucareli, July 6, 1772, *ADM*, I: 326; Antonio Bonilla, "Brief Compendium of the History of Texas, 1772" in Elizabeth H. West and Marques de Altamira, eds. and trans., *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 8:1 (July 1904): 63. In a letter to Unzaga, Mézières noted his "small means, which are becoming less with the sale of my plantation and slaves for the purpose of satisfying my creditors." Mézières to Unzaga, February 28, 1771, *ADM*, I: 240.

Gaignard failed to organize a campaign even as he dealt with more effective slavers. He observed vagabond traders return from the Arkansas valley enter the Wichita villages "to trade horses, mules, and slaves," while Comanche war parties passed through on their return from campaigns against the "Cannecis." Eager to re-establish trade with the French, a visiting Comanche leader promised to bring news of Gaignard's arrival to other bands. The Comanche later returned with assurances that trade could be opened, and on behalf of the "Great Chief" he brought Gaignard a "little slave girl as proof of his word." Upon his return to Natchitoches, Gaignard sold the girl to a local merchant and slave trader.[30]

Operating with varied levels of imperial sanction, Louisiana slavers played a crucial role in structuring the borderland slave trade that survived the dismemberment of France's North American empire. Pursuing their localized diplomatic and economic interests, members of the Natchitoches cartel and their associates constructed a slave society that drew on both continental and Atlantic networks to supply captives. During the first decade of the Spanish regime royal officials made some efforts to curtail their activities. However, with their execution in the hands of local slavers like Mézières these policies only widened the scope of borderland slaving.

Inter-Colonial Slaving Networks, 1770s-1780s

Colonists' varied slaving interests created new challenges for their metropolitan overlords. Despite levying taxes to fund the ransom of European captives, imperial officials struggled to redeem many colonists because borderland subordinates exploited the system in favour of their own investments in localized slaving. The protocols for redeeming captives held

[30] For the viceroy's refusal, see Bucareli to Ripperda, September 16, 1772, *ADM*, I: 350. For Gaignard's expedition, see J. Gaignard to Unzaga, January 6, 1774, *ADM*, II: 82; Gaignard to Bernardo de Galvez, November 10, 1777, forwarding journal of an expedition to the Indian villages north of Natchitoches, Oct 1, 1773 to Sept 24, 1774, Louisiana Papers (LP), Box 1, Folder 70, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley; Jacques Gaignard, *garcon majeure*, sells to J. Marie Armant "*une sauvagesse esclave nommée Remy*," February 6, 1775, Vol. 7-A, Document 1050, NPCR.

by indigenous enemies stipulated in Title 10, Section 3 of the 1772 Regulations were further complicated by the patterns of inter-tribal exchange that shuttled captives across a vast west-east axis.[31] The western and eastern branches of Comancheria regularly traded captives between them, and eastern Comanches then sold these prisoners to the Taovayas, such that many New Mexicans were available for ransom in Texas.[32] Provincial officers charged with executing the ransom program, already a dangerous enterprise that involved entering hostile territory, were therefore dealing with colonists with whom they lacked personal connections.

These conditions incentivized a profiteering racket, as officials purchased captives originating in the western provinces and then held them until they were reimbursed through official funds or grateful relatives, all for a tidy sum. Although careful not to expose this shadowy practice, official correspondence sometimes gave the game away. Unwilling to press the Taovayas for the return of ten New Mexicans, acquired from the Comanches, Mézières explained that ransoming these captives would only encourage Natives "to make new captures" while unnamed individuals became interested in the "odious profit" generated by the ransom system.[33] In 1778 Commandant-General Teodoro de Croix, reiterated orders to ransom Spanish captives, noting that the "celebrations of exchanges of prisoners" had been carried out "in few instances or not at all." The commanders at San Antonio and La Bahia were among the nine who Croix cited for disciplinary action if they ignored orders.[34] Croix was keenly aware that captives and their families were often too poor to pay ransom costs. So he ordered the establishment in

[31] Brinckerhoff and Faulk, *Lancers for the King*, 33.

[32] For the inter-tribal trade in Spanish captives, see Bucareli to Ripperda, July 26, 1775, BA; Proceedings concerning proposal for a voluntary contribution to ransom Christian captives among the Apaches, June 8, 1780, BA.

[33] Mézières to Croix, April 19, 1778, *ADM*, II: 209.

[34] Croix, Instructions for exchanging prisoners with the Apaches, October 3, 1778, BA.

each province of a communal fund that would collect alms on their behalf.[35] Despite efforts to mitigate graft, in April 1785 Texas Governor Domingo Cabello brought charges against the commandants of La Bahia and Nacogodches for their continual "malversation" in collecting the ransom alms.[36]

This dereliction of duty created opportunities for others, as colonists frequently combined their roles as officers, diplomats, and traders to eke a profit from the ransom system. Antonio Trevino, previously a prisoner among the Taovayas, became San Antonio's official agent among his former captors. He may have engaged in the redemption racket when he retrieved a New Mexican boy from the Taovayas. The youth had been acquired by the Taovayas through the Comanches, and he was to remain in Trevino's home until his family or New Mexico's governor initiated his return, at which point Trevino would receive a bounty.[37] At Nacogdoches, commandant Antonio Gil Ybarbo acquired a stake in redeeming New Mexican captives even as his own district faced steady attacks from Comanche raiders. In 1780 he ransomed a Hispanic New Mexican woman and her infant son from the Comanches, and while arrangements were made for their return, Ybarbo would be paid the price of her ransom and "the price of her travel."[38] Another captive-turned-diplomat, Pedro Vial received sixty pesos from the governor for his ransom of a Spanish youth and an Apache child.[39] In 1785, Governor Cabello failed to

[35] Proceedings concerning proposal for a voluntary contribution to ransom Christian captives among the Apaches, June 8, 1780, BA.

[36] Cabello to Rengel, April 3, 1785, BA. By the end of 1785 only seventy-three pesos were in the provincial fund and this number increased to only eighty-eight pesos in 1790 before plummeting to a measly four pesos the next year. For the lack of alms, see Quarterly report of sum collected for ransoming captives among Indians, December 31, 1785, BA; Nava to Munoz, December 14, 1790, BA; Juan Cortés to Munoz, August 26, 1791, BA.

[37] Croix to Cabello, May 17, 1779, BA; Croix to Cabello, August 15, 1779, BA. At his death, Trevino was illiterate and indigent, see Cabello to Croix, October 9, 1779, BA.

[38] Cabello to Croix, February 6, 1780, BA; Croix to Cabello, June 2, 1780, BA.

[39] Cabello to Rengel, February 20, 1785, BA.

disclose how he disposed of a six year-old "Apacha" who he ransomed, along with a Spanish captive, from visiting Taovaya traders.[40]

Wedding their labour demands and alliance commitments, Natchitoches colonists continued to acquire Native bondspeople throughout the 1770s and 1780s. Conducted under the auspices of the town's planter elite, colonists relied on communal consensus to legitimize enslavement as they literally avoided describing these transactions as slave sales.[41] Instead, the sale of a female slave was termed a "donation," while Mézières couched the sale of his two Apache slaves, Hector and Felix, as a "cession."[42] In another "agreement," the two bondsmen changed hands again nearly a year later.[43] Leading colonists were more likely to openly purchase indigenous slaves. In 1770 the Natchitoches militia captain sold a fifteen year-old Apache girl and her infant daughter to another resident.[44] Tellingly, Governor Miro felt compelled to advise the next commandant not to allow "any trader or resident to make a slave of or purchase any Indian."[45]

These orders had little practical effect. The 1781 will of one planter manumitted the son and daughter of his enslaved domestic servant in consideration for her good services. Aged seven

[40] Cabello to Rengel, February 20, 1785, BA.

[41] For indigenous bondspeople among Natchitoches slaveholders, see the 1774 census in Mills, *Natchitoches Colonials*, 31-33.

[42] Donation of an Indian woman, Francois Fréderic to Claude Mercier, July 22, 1773, Volume 5-A, Document 836, NPCR; Donation of an Indian woman, Roullo to Claude Mercier, December 31, 1773, Volume 6, Document 862, NPCR. Mercier was a physician who arrived at Natchitoches from the Arkansas valley, see Mézières to Unzaga, May 20, 1770, *ADM*, I: 169. Cession of Hector and Felix, *Sauvages*, made by Mézières to Duchene, December 22, 1774, in De Ville, *Natchitoches Documents*, 37; Cession of a *Sauvagesse* by Pierre Gerard *dit* Leveillé to Nicholas Thibault, July 15, 1775, in De Ville, *Natchitoches Documents*, 39; Declaration by Mr. Roujot on a *Sauvagesse* of the Cannecis nation, January 27, 1779, in De Ville, *Natchitoches Documents*, 52.

[43] Agreement between Augustin Duchenne and Gerome Matuliche concerning Hector and Felix, *Sauvages*, November 13, 1775, in De Ville, *Natchitoches Documents*, 40.

[44] Louis Bormé vs Succession of Michel Brumeaux *dit* La Rochelle, May 20, 1776, Spanish Judicial Records, Louisiana Historical Center (LHC), New Orleans.

[45] Miro to Pierre Rousseau, July 4, 1785, *SMV*, III: 133.

and nine, these *griffe* (mixed black-indigenous) children could hardly have been expected to claim any kind of socio-economic independence. Rather, they were likely retained by the family as permanently indentured labourers.[46] In another case of inter-generational enslavement, a wealthy widow baptized the daughter of her Native slave, Thérese, just three days after the infant was born.[47] In 1782, Mézières' successor as commandant, Etienne de Vaugine, obtained a young Native girl, "of fine figure," from a trader returning from the Taovaya villages and the next year he brought forward a twelve year-old Native slave for baptism.[48] In 1787 a recently deceased colonist left four horses to a Native youth in his care, providing another glimpse into how colonists bound indigenous labour within their households despite some post-mortem emancipations.[49] Thus, through a variety of legal fictions created by a culture of raiding and retaining Native captives, colonists undermined imperial efforts to rationalize the economy of violence. For each Apache prisoner that passed into the hands of a French master meant one less available to exchange for Hispanic captives.

The intensity of eighteenth-century slaving wrenched captives across oceans as well as continents.[50] Stability returned to Louisiana following Spain's involvement in the American Revolution (1779-1782) as royal officials attempted to bolster the provincial economy. Sensing

[46] Succession and inventory of the property of Jean Baptiste Dupré, September 1, 1781, Melrose Collection, Cammie G. Henry Center, Watson Memorial Library, Northwestern State University, Folder 582.

[47] Baptism of Maria Luisa, December 26, 1782, *NA*, 284.

[48] Etienne de Vaugine, Statement of Trade Effects, June 9, 1782, Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Papeles Procedentes de Cuba (PPC), legajo 198A, Clayton Library, Houston; Baptism of Hipolito, September 7, 1783, in Elizabeth Shown Mills, ed., *Natchitoches 1729-1803: Abstracts of the Catholic Church Registers of the French and Spanish Post of St. Jean Baptiste des Natchitoches in Louisiana* (*NA*), (New Orleans, 1977), 285.

[49] Will of Sebastien Prudhomme, February 13, 1787, Melrose Collection, Folders 662 and 663.

[50] James Sidbury and Jorge Canizares-Esguerra, "Mapping Ethnogenesis in the Early Modern Atlantic," *WMQ* 68:2 (April 2011): 185-191; Marcus Rediker, *The Slave Ship: A Human History* (New York, 2007); Stephanie E. Smallwood, *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from African to American Diaspora* (Cambridge, 2008); Gregory E. O'Malley, "Beyond the Middle Passage: Slave Migration from the Caribbean to North America, 1619-1807," *WMQ*, Third Series, 66:1 (January 2009): 125-172.

their opportunity, labour-hungry planters mobilized the colonial regime to reinvigorate the African slave trade, a project modeled on the booming plantation economies of the French Caribbean, particularly St. Domingue, Guadalupe, and Martinique. With French planters clamouring for enslaved labourers, Bourbon policy liberalized the slave trade to Louisiana during the first decade of the Spanish regime. In 1777 Governor Bernardo de Galvez issued a proclamation allowing colonists to "sell their goods and products to the French vessels and to receive in payment Negroes from the cargo." In 1782, King Carlos III granted a ten year exemption on duties paid for black slaves imported to the province, and many slaves entered the colony through re-exportation from Jamaica and Dominica throughout the 1780s. In 1791, King Carlos IV again liberalized Spain's Atlantic slave trade policies and extended the duty exemption.[51]

For those drawn upstream, New Orleans was another way-station on a nightmarish journey into the heart of North America, where newly-arrived Africans found themselves labouring alongside Natives and black creoles. Mass baptisms of non-infant Africans arriving at Natchitoches indicate that the liberalization of Spain's Atlantic slave trade policies bore the desired results for borderland planters. In 1784 the parish priest performed a mass baptism of nineteen Africans aged fifteen to thirty-five. Three years later the merchant Etienne Pavie and his partner returned from New Orleans with another coffle of African slaves.[52]

---

[51] Bernardo de Galvez, Proclamation Concerning Louisiana Commerce, November 21, 1777, *SMV*, II: 24; Charles III, Commercial Privileges Granted to Louisiana and West Florida, January 22, 1782, *SMV*, III: 3; Charles IV, Royal Ordinance by his Majesty concerning the Free Trade in Negroes, MSS 125.10, WRC. Under the Spanish regime an estimated 12 to 15,000 Africans slaves were taken to Louisiana, and according to historians H. Sophie Burton and F. Todd Smith African-born slaves composed a "significant minority" of Natchitoches' enslaved population. See Jean-Pierre Leglaunec, "Slave Migrations in Spanish and Early American Louisiana: New Sources and New Estimates," *Louisiana History* 46:2 (Spring 2005): 188-192; Burton and Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches*, 73.

[52] Baptism of slaves, April 10, 1784, *NA*, 287-289; For the importation of African slaves by Pavie and Ailhaud St. Anne, see Jose de la Pena to Miro, June 8, 1787, AGI, PPC, legajo 13. Six years later 24 noninfant Africans were

A native of La Rochelle, one of France's largest slave trading ports, the trajectory of Pavie's career illustrates the socio-economic opportunities opened by involvement in the Atlantic slave trade. Arriving in Natchitoches as an impoverished migrant, Pavie married into a wealthy slave-holding family and became one of the town's wealthiest merchants and most prolific slave traders. In 1776 he brought ammunition, guns, vermillion, and tobacco – all items essential for commerce with the surrounding indigenous nations – on a river barge crewed by four French engagés, two Quapaw men, and two black slaves.[53] Prior to his murder in 1787, Pavie sold dozens of slaves to his neighbours and formed an economically productive partnership with traders that allowed him to amass a fortune in land, livestock, and people.[54] Pavie's career personifies the emergence of Natchitoches as the nexus of the "pastoral-plantation" borderland slave trade, and its increasing consumption of black captives, with many drawn directly from the Atlantic slave trade. Between 1765 and 1795 the black slave population of Natchitoches increased from 239 to 904 individuals, with their proportion of the total population increasing from 40.4 percent to 54.3 percent – a "slave society" by any definition.[55]

While Natchitoches planters diversified their interests in Atlantic and continental slaving, the expansion of slave-based agriculture at rival outposts created a more integrated pastoral-

---

introduced to Natchitoches slavery through another mass baptism, see Baptism of slaves, March 31, 1793, in Mills, *NA*, 313-316.

[53] Luis Unzaga, State of the cargo of the barge belonging to Mr. Pavie, April 22, 1776, Volume 10, NPCR.

[54] For a sampling of Pavie's slave trading, see Pavie to Marin Grillet, sale of two slaves, June 3, 1777, Volume 10-A, NPCR; Pavie to Jean Baptiste Dupré, sale of three slaves, June 3, 1777, Vol 10-A, NPCR; Pavie to Pierre Brusset, sale of two slaves, January 12, 1778, Vol 11-A, NPCR; Pavie to Francois Levasseur, sale of a slave, March 21, 1778, Volume 12, NPCR.

[55] H. Sophie Burton and F. Todd Smith, "Slavery in the Colonial Louisiana Backcountry: Natchitoches, 1714-1803," *Louisiana History* 52:2 (Spring 2011): 165.

plantation borderland.[56] In 1776, Grappé's son-in-law Paul Bouet Lafitte, who operated a ranch outside Natchitoches at Bayou Pierre, received an African woman and other goods he purchased in New Orleans from a rented barge.[57] Soon, the fusion of ranching, planting, and trading operations in the borderlands pushed more black slaves into Texas. At Nacogdoches, the local magnate Antonio Gil Ybarbo and his French partners cut into the Natchitoches cartel's share of borderland commerce.[58] With Nicolas la Mathe, Ybarbo invested in the local horse and mule trade, with slaves sometimes exchanged directly for the draft animals required by Louisiana plantations. In 1778 la Mathe exchanged a nine year old black slave, "still not Christianized," for 220 *granos* worth of cattle from a San Antonian and three years later Ybarbo traveled to Natchitoches to purchase a slave from Lafitte for fifty head of cattle.[59] In 1781, when another Natchitoches colonist purchased an enslaved black woman from an Anglo-American, he paid for her with more than a dozen horses and cattle to be brought "from Nacogdoches."[60] Even if they did not exchange slaves directly for livestock, many Natchitoches planters diversified their

[56] For Natchitoches' role in supplying goods for the trade with the indigenous nations of Texas, see Etienne de Vaugine, List of Trade Goods Distributed to the 19 Friendly Nations of Texas, [no date], 1784, AGI, PPC, legajo 197.

[57] Cargo belonging to Paul Bouet Lafitte, May 27, 1776, Volume 10, NPCR.

[58] The death of Mézières in 1779 weakened his extended family's control over the trade, and the appointment of Vaugine as commandant in 1782 opened the trade to an outsider for the first time in decades. For Ybarbo, Vaugine, and the Nacogdoches cartel, see Francois Grappé, "An Expedition to the Kichai: The Journal of Francois Grappé, September 24, 1783," David LaVere and Katia Campbell, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 98:1 (July 1994): 66-67; Matthew Babcock, "Roots of Independence: Transcultural Trade in the Texas-Louisiana Borderland," *Ethnohistory* 60:2 (2013): 251.

[59] Nicolas la Mathe to Toribio Fuentes, sale of slave, June 10, 1778, BA; Paul Bouet Lafitte to Antonio Gil Ybarbo, sale of slave, September 22, 1781, Melrose Collection, Folder 588.

[60] André Vannoy to Jean D'Jarnat, sale of slave, August 11, 1781, Melrose Collection, Folder 580.

operations by trading in the stolen or wild livestock that grazed along the Texas-Louisiana border.[61]

Censuses taken in Texas during the early 1790s reflect the growing inter-colonial traffic in African and African-descended captives. Although only dozens of black slaves lived in Texas compared to the estimated 25,000 enslaved people in Louisiana, wealthy San Antonio and Nacogdoches colonists acquired slaves, tobacco, and textiles through commerce with the riparian communities of western Louisiana.[62] In 1780 Cabello reported that Felix Menchaca and his brother-in-law brought "a young Negress slave" purchased in New Orleans into Texas. Cabello himself owned several slaves, while the long-serving sergeant of the garrison counted four slaves among his property, making him the town's largest slaveholder.[63] Having fallen out with la Mathe, Ybarbo's prosecution of an officer at La Bahia for smuggling uncovered the efforts of la Mathe to exchange chamois skins purchased from Tonkawa hunters for four black slaves. Apparently la Mathe purchased the slaves in Natchitoches and attempted to use his new partnership to resell them in La Bahia.[64]

The scope of the trade in captive Apache women could be observed in San Antonio and Natchitoches long afterwards. The 1790 census for San Antonio, with a population of 1,383 colonists, recorded twenty *Indios criados* ("Indian servants") attached to colonial households, all

[61] Official letters concerning the permission accorded to the inhabitants of this post to catch wild animals in the province of Texas, May 19, 1785, in Vaugine, Rousseau, Bormé, et al., Inventory of notarial transactions and functions at the post of Natchitoches since 1732, October 31, 1785, AGI, PPC, legajo 198A.

[62] Cabello to Croix, May 9, 1780, BA. See also Cabello to Croix, June 2, 1780, BA and Cabello to Croix, August 16, 1780, BA.

[63] Cabello to Croix, November 30, 1780, BA; Census of San Antonio, December 31, 1787, BA; Julian de Arocha to Jose Granados, slave of slaves, January 24, 1792, BA. In 1783 Texas officials counted 36 slaves, compared with 734 slaves living in and around Natchitoches in 1787. See Census of Texas, December 31, 1783, BA; Burton and Smith, "Slavery in the Colonial Louisiana Backcountry," 165.

[64] Census of Texas, 1790, BA; Census of Nacogdoches, 1790, BA; Census of Bayou Pierre, 1793, BA; Ybarbo, proceedings against Juan Cortés, June 16, 1792, BA; Sierra Gorda to Castro, July 14, 1792, BA.

of whom were held by people identified as *Espanoles* ("Spaniards") by the *casta* system. In addition there were eighteen *lobo* or *coyote* (mixed Native-Hispanic) servants and an unknown, though probably substantial, number of Apaches among the 495 Natives in the town's five missions. Governor Manuel Munoz and one of his subordinates also claimed three Natives between them.[65] The 1793 San Antonio census explicitly identified five persons as "Lipans," three of whom were female servants aged fifteen or younger, and two men living independently as day labourers.[66] Likely reflecting earlier captive exchanges between French traders and their Spanish or indigenous partners, the Nacogdoches census of 1792 indicated that two Apache women, aged thirty-seven and thirty-nine, were married to natives of Lyon and Canada. An Apache man named Miguel Ybarbo, whose name suggests an earlier indenture to one of the town's wealthiest men, also lived in Nacogdoches where he worked as a hunter. The 1793 censuses taken at Nacogdoches and nearby Bayou Pierre, villages at either end of the borderland contraband trade, recorded three Apache women living with Franco-American men.[67]

These enslaved women, and their descendants, became significant contributors to borderland populations and work patterns. In 1806, three years after the U.S. purchased the Louisiana Territory, John Sibley, the Anglo-American Indian agent stationed at Natchitoches, observed the presence "Cances" (Lipan or eastern Apaches) living in the town. Apparently one of the locals informed Sibley about their origins, for his report mentioned how "thirty or forty years ago the Spaniards used to make slaves of them when they could take them […] and sold them amongst the French inhabitants, at forty or fifty dollars a head." As captives, they were

[65] Civil Census of San Antonio, 1790, BA; Military Census of San Antonio, 1790, BA. For total population numbers, see Alicia V. Tjarks, "Comparative Demographic Analysis of Texas, 1777-1793," *SWHQ* 77:3 (January 1974): 303.

[66] Census of San Antonio, 1793, BA.

[67] Census, by family, of Nacogdoches, 1792, BA; Census of Nacogdoches and Bayou Pierre, December 31, 1793, BA.

forced to work as concubines, weavers, and domestic servants "Now free," Sibley claimed that these women and their offspring had been absorbed into Franco-American families, becoming "respectable, well behaved women." For the colonizer-as-historian, the generational fates of captive Apache women completed the narrative arc of enslavement, dispossession, and assimilation.[68]

As the scope of slaving dispersed captives across the borderland, resistance within Louisiana's plantation regime intensified during the mid-1780s. Fugitives sometimes formed larger bands in their bids for autonomy (*grand marronage*), reinforcing Louisiana colonists' need for Native allies to quell armed resistance and return runaways.[69] In the fall of 1784 Lafitte's slave Jean fled his master's ranch only to be apprehended the following spring. Under interrogation, Jean reported that he received food and refuge from one of Vaugine's slaves before stealing one of the commandant's horses and riding for Texas, where local Caddos captured and returned him to Natchitoches.[70] As individual desertions continued, some fugitives formed larger bands that constituted the greatest threat to borderland plantations.[71] Enforcing directives from New Orleans, in 1784 Vaugine reported that a maroon band from Opelousas acquired firearms, several horses, and vowed that if pursued they would "defend themselves at the risk of their lives." In response Vaugine sent a cavalry detachment in pursuit with orders to

[68] John Sibley, "Historical Sketches of the several Indians tribes in Louisiana […]" [1806], in Walter Lowrie and Matthew St. Clair Clarke, eds., *American State Papers: Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States; Indian Affairs, Volume I*, (38 vols. Washington D.C., 1832): 722-723.

[69] Francois Bouligny to Livaudais, May 8, 1784, AGI, PPC, legajo 197. For increasing marronage in Louisiana during this period, see Gilbert C. Din, *Spaniards, Planters, and Slaves: The Spanish Regulation of Slavery in Louisiana, 1763-1803* (College Station, 1999), 44. For marronage in general, see Richard Price, ed., *Maroon Societes: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas* (Baltimore, 1996); Diouf, *Slavery's Exiles*.

[70] Bormé, Interrogation of the slave Jean, April 2, 1785, AGI, PPC, legajo 198A.

[71] For the substantial number of desertions reported by Natchitoches planters during the 1780s, see the reports of *petit marronage* in Vaugine, Rousseau, Bormé, et al., Inventory of notarial transactions and functions at the post of Natchitoches since 1732, October 31, 1785, AGI, PPC, legajo 198A.

"kill them and bring in their heads." But the slave-catchers found only two abandoned mounts where the trail disappeared at the Sabine River. Determined to hunt the maroons into Texas, Vaugine asked Ybarbo to "mobilize the Indians."[72] While planters marshalled colonial and Native troops to combat maroons, desertions became so frequent at Natchitoches that public funds were set aside to defray the costs of their recapture. These measures only reinforced the personal and financial entanglements of the planter class, with one of Pavie's partners charging him for the costs of returning several fugitive slaves captured near the capital.[73]

Throughout their careers, eighteenth-century Natchitoches slavers inter-wove their skills as diplomats, merchants, and war leaders to enrich themselves. Their actions rippled beyond the plantation zone. Reliant on indigenous allies to secure their borders and long-distance slave trafficking to maintain the pace of exploitation, men such as Mézières, Grappé, la Mathe, Pavie, and Lafitte made Natchitoches a central hub of the borderland slave trade during the 1770s. In the pastoral zone outside their control, commercial slaving prompted socio-economic shifts among indigenous societies, many of whom re-invented themselves accordingly.

Spanish Colonialism and Apache Engines of Capture, 1770s-1780s

Colonial slaving perpetuated cycles of violence along New Spain's northern borderland, to which indigenous bands responded with their own militarized tactics. With no end to Apache-Spanish conflict in sight, in late 1777 and early 1778 Commandant-General Croix assembled his frontier officers to reverse the fortunes of war. During three councils held at Monclova, San Antonio, and Chihuahua, senior war leaders discussed Native ethnography and military strategy in their effort to clarify Spanish policy. At each meeting, the veterans echoed Rubi's earlier

[72] Vaugine to Miro, August 10, 1784, AGI, PPC, legajo 197.

[73] Paul Marcollay, General account for the recovery of public funds used in the return of negro maroons, [no date], 1785, Melrose Collection, Folder 654.

insistence that all treaties with the Lipans, and Apaches generally, had been "false and deceitful" and despite irregular contact with the Wichitas and Comanches, they called for an alliance with the latter nations and an unremitting war against Apaches.[74] The commandant general gave Mézières the task of organizing the campaign, and he proposed that a Comanche-Wichita army supported by Spanish troops and French hunters, well-acquainted with Native warfare, would shatter eastern Apacheria. They would then turn north to bring the war into the Osage homeland.[75] After reviewing the necessary supply of weapons, rations, and pack animals, Mézières urged that a "moderate price" be fixed in advance for each captive. As in 1772, the pretense of incorporating Apache prisoners into the mission system shrouded plans for a massive slave raid that promised ample recompense for those who invested.[76] When King Carlos III cancelled these plans with the royal order of February 20, 1779, Croix moaned that the king's "pious principles" ended any prospect of a Comanche-Wichita alliance and dashed Spanish aspirations for the "subjection in detail of all the Apacheria."[77] Instead, reformers within the Spanish empire sought new methods of social control.

Supported by Carlos III and his reorganization of the Spanish empire, what historians have called the "Bourbon Reforms," during the 1770s and 1780s liberal Spanish officers re-evaluated New Spain's Indian policy. In 1786 the young viceroy, Bernardo de Galvez, added another piece to an already formidable codex of imperial tactics. Building on prior directives,

---

[74] "Report of the Council at Monclova," December 11, 1777, *ADM*, II: 154-157; "Report of the Council at San Antonio de Béxar," January 5, 1778, *ADM*, II: 163-170.

[75] Mézières to the Viceroy, February 20, 1778, *ADM*, II: 176-177.

[76] Mézières to the Viceroy, February 20, 1778, *ADM*, II: 186.

[77] Teodoro de Croix, "General Report of 1781," in Alfred Barnaby Thomas, ed. and trans., *Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783* (Norman, 1941), 93-94. For the royal order of February 20, 1779 and its impact, see Max L. Moorhead, *The Apache Frontier: Jacobo Ugarte and Spanish-Indian Relations in Northern New Spain, 1769-1791* (Norman, 1968), 120-123.

Galvez's *Instructions* emphasized the need to induce Native dependency on European manufactures, including alcohol, and the encouragement of hostilities between various bands. In the eastern Interior Provinces, Galvez placed particular emphasis on sowing discord between Mescalero and Lipan bands. Finally, friendship with the Caddoan "nations of the north" was to be preserved at all costs in hopes of orchestrating the "special ruination of the Apaches." While much has been made of Galvez's policy of "peace by deceit," as the violence of slave raiding spun beyond the control of imperial officials, inter-indigenous alliances, empowered by a landscape awash in guns and horses, asserted their respective visions of borderland hegemony.[78]

The Spanish failed to create an anti-Apache coalition during the early 1780s, but powerful inter-indigenous alliances took shape regardless. "Divide and conquer" tactics and efforts to induce dependency on European manufactures are often taken as imperial advantages in dealing with non-state societies. This largely ignores the depth of indigenous efforts to master the encounter. Drawing upon their advantages in mobility and ability to incorporate outsiders, indigenous bands overmatched geo-strategic visions that could only imagine peace and war as opposites – a decisive miscalculation in a borderland of shifting alliances.

Schooled by decades of brutal conflict with European invaders, indigenous bands formed their own constellations of alliance while altering practices of livestock raiding and captive-taking. They did so to survive in a dangerous world, and underwent significant social change as a result. The system of warfare characteristic of the raiding economy, where surprise, terror, and mobility were at a premium, was primordial to neither Natives nor Europeans. Rather, such tactics developed in tandem with the emphasis on seizing captives and livestock. The latter played a critical role in building incremental advantages, for each stolen horse meant one less

[78] Bernardo de Galvez, *Instructions for Governing the Interior Provinces of New Spain, 1786*, ed. and trans. Donald E. Worcester (Berkeley, 1951), passim.; 40 ("peace by deceit"); 79 ("special ruination").

available to the enemy for pursuit. Since Natives and Europeans possessed similar technologies in the eighteenth-century borderlands, only the precise assemblage of people, horses, and weapons explains the shape of power within the economy of violence. Everything depended on organization, and indigenous free associations were well-equipped to press their advantages. As one Spanish officer put it in 1791, "the Apaches, accustomed to war, do not ignore anything that contributes to the advantages of its operations."[79]

Driven from the buffalo-rich plains of central Texas and facing a powerful array of enemies, Lipan Apaches and their kinsmen adapted the kinetic integrity of their social organization to create a raiding economy that could sustain Apache society. Kinship and militarized nomadism allowed Apache bands to survive even as Comanches, who developed an even more formidable war machine, expanded across the region. Horsepower and physical mobility were also essential, as much for hunting and warfare as for escaping counter-attacks. One observer noted in 1780 that Apaches lived "in continual movement in order not to be spied upon or reconnoitered."[80] Evincing the total mobilization of Lipan society within the raiding economy, women often participated in horse raids by seizing the herd while the men distracted Spanish forces. On other occasions, women joined war parties in order to augment the appearance of Apache numerical superiority.[81] Capable of rapid coordination across a vast territory and unencumbered by a coercive political authority, Apaches' mobility and fluid social organization animated the raiding economy that enabled particular bands to survive.

[79] Pedro de Nava to Revillagigedo, April 13, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part II (quotation). For descriptions of Apache and Comanche warfare, see Cabello to Rengel, February 16, 1785, BA; Galvez, "Notes and Reflections on the War with the Apache," 306-307; Cordero, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," 345-347.

[80] Galvez, "Notes and Reflections on the War with the Apache," 305.

[81] Junta de Guerra on proper frontier defense against Indian attacks, June 6, 1778, BA; Cordero, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," 341.

Correctly assessing the magnitude of the Comanche-Spanish-Wichita coalition forming against them, among the principal objectives of Apache war leaders throughout the 1770s and 1780s were the maintenance of access to guns and horses in order to preserve the Gran Apacheria their ancestors carved out during the seventeenth century. As the easternmost Apache nation, the lower Lipan bands were in an advantageous position to tap the flow of French guns from Louisiana, and thereby acquire the firepower necessary to resist the onslaught of Comanche war parties. This branch of the Lipan raiding economy depended on their alliance with the eastern nations of the woodlands and coastal plains, especially the Akokisa, Bidai, and several smaller Caddo and Karankawa bands, all of whom had direct access to French traders.[82] From one of their main rancherias at El Atascoso ("the Muddy Place"), the Sun Otter band used their location on the coastal plain between San Antonio and La Bahia to raid Spanish corrals for horses, harvest the wild cattle roaming around the missions, and organize trade agreements that converted excess animals into other products.

The lower Lipan were particularly adept at inserting themselves between the Spaniards and the eastern nations, regularly intercepting Hasinai and Bidai leaders as they were leaving Spanish settlements. Such practices stretched back to the early 1770s, when the Lipan waited for the Hasinai chief Bigotes and his retinue to leave San Antonio before surrounding them and exacting a trade concession. Spanish troops escorting Bigotes were powerless to intervene as the two sides were "together a whole night carrying on their barter," and a similar agreement with the Bidai insured that the Lipan were "well supplied with fusils and ammunition."[83] Upon Bigotes' death and the ascension of his brother Baltazar, the Lipan were once again on hand to

[82] For early colonial perceptions of the threat posed by the gun and horse trade among the Lipans, coastal nations, and itinerant traders, see Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 305.

[83] Ripperda to Unzaga, December 31, 1771, *ADM*, I: 266-267.

waylay the new medal chief and reaffirm the traffic in firearms.[84] Ties of kinship between the Lipan and their trading partners also facilitated the movement of goods as well as information. Bringing news of an approaching Comanche war party, the Lipan wife of a Hasinai man informed her Apache kinsmen of the impending attack and then led the Hasinai towards El Atascoso, where a large body of Lipans were rumoured to be assembling for a trade fair with the Akokisa, Bidai, Coco, and Mayeye.[85] Despite repeated Bidai assurances that they would cease their trade with Apaches, the Lipans' numerical advantage over the smaller eastern nations made refusing their overtures a risky proposition.[86]

Despite episodic violence, over generations of interaction Lipan bands formed lasting partnerships with the colonial communities of east Texas. By transporting fat, meat, skins, and animals stolen from other Spanish villages to San Antonio, Lipan traders obtained manufactured goods as well as valuable insight into colonial society. Higher-ranking officials were particularly resentful of these exchanges, whose productive relations seemingly contributed nothing to the empire's mercantilist approach. In 1775 Spanish soldiers arrested several Hispanic traders for trading in weapons, and a year later the viceroy intervened directly on receiving reports that Lipan traders openly entered San Antonio to barter with the residents.[87] By the late 1770s, a captive or an unscrupulous trader taught the Lipan how to manufacture gunpowder, while official

[84] Cabello, Monthly Report, September 30, 1783, BA; Neve to Cabello, December 18, 1783, BA.

[85] Cabello to Neve, September 20, 1784, BA.

[86] For Bidai promises to cease trading with the Lipan and Cabello's distrust of their intentions, see Cabello to Rengel, May 20, 1785, BA.

[87] Ripperda vs. Jacinto de Mora and Marcos Hernandez, charged with contraband, April 9, 1775, BA; Ripperda vs. Pedro Jose Leal and Carlos Riojas, charged with illegal trade, June 10, 1775, BA; Bucareli to Ripperda, February 28, 1776, BA.

prohibitions were never enough to cut the supply of guns from Louisiana.[88] In 1786 a particularly enterprising Frenchman established himself along the lower Angelina River, where he traded freely with visiting nations. Castigated by Cabello for his "clandestine commerce and diabolical suggestions," the trader claimed to enjoy the protection of influential Louisiana patrons, as well as the affection of his indigenous clients, making it impossible to crack down on his sale of "fusils, powder, and bullets to the Lipans."[89]

Relationships with individual colonists also engendered important diplomatic advantages. After fending off Tonkawa raiders in the spring of 1779, Lipans swept down on the Tonkawa rancheria of El Pinar ("the Pine Grove") before returning to the governor's house with scalps, jerked meat, and four captives. Led by Joyoso, the Lipan war leaders used their prisoners to sow discord at San Antonio, where relations between Cabello and the Menchaca clan were increasingly strained. Ignoring Cabello, Joyoso offered a young Mayeye girl "as a gift to his very good friend Don Luis Menchaca," the eldest son of the venerable family that Cabello would later castigate as "wretched mulattos." Hoping to incorporate the two youths into the missions and return the Tonkawa woman to her people as a peace offering, Cabello asked to purchase the remaining captives in exchange for eight horses. But the Lipans refused and promptly departed, "for [they did not want] to find themselves under need or obligation of consenting to the barter." By rejecting Cabello's offer and gifting a slave to his rivals, the Lipan delegates isolated Cabello in his own capital and quashed a potential Spanish-Tonkawa rapprochement. Months later, worsening tensions with Mescalero Apache bands brought Lipans and colonists together for their

[88] For Lipans' ability to manufacture gunpowder, see Croix to Jose de Galvez, September 23, 1778, *ADM*, II: 222; for the Lipans' ongoing gun trade with the eastern nations, see "Report of the Council at Monclova," December 11, 1777, *ADM*, II: 153.

[89] For the trader, see Cabello to Rengel, March 12, 1786, BA (first quote); Cabello to Jacobo Ugarte y Loyola, June 26, 1786, BA (second quote). For exchanges between the Lipan trader Francisco Pado and the Kadohadacho, see Cabello to Pierre Rousseau, September 30, 1785, Melrose Collection, Folder 652.

mutual survival. With rumours running rampant in San Antonio that Mescalero and Spanish forces in Coahuila were preparing to campaign against the Lipan, which would push fleeing bands into Texas, Cabello despaired of the province's survival. Although the rumours proved false, Cabello reported that the townspeople were "very anxious about the harm which will befall their friends the Lipan Apaches," and would surely keep the Lipan apprised of Spanish movements.[90] Joyoso and his men returned to the village later that summer and met with the Menchacas before demanding that Cabello inform them of Spanish intentions regarding their conflict with the Mescaleros.[91]

The variety of rumours that passed among villages and rancherias were particularly distressing to the upper echelons of the Spanish colonial administration in Texas. While difficult to parse from paranoia, these rumours pierce at the hegemonic imperial record and offer an alternative glimpse into indigenous-colonial relationships. In 1791, the viceroy himself lamented that anti-Apache campaigns were often compromised "because there are in the communities of [Texas] some persons who share secret intelligence with the Lipans."[92] Official apprehensions over the roles of such persons became so great that in 1793 the governor of Texas issued an ordinance re-emphasizing the prohibition against trading firearms to indigenous people, and stipulated fines for anyone caught passing information to the Lipans. Further, the governor mandated that if the guilty party was of *color quebrado* ("broken color," or mixed race) these fines were to be doubled and accompanied by prison terms – a policy indicative of authorities'

[90] For Mescalero-Lipan tensions, see Cabello to Croix, August 16, 1779, BA; Croix, "General Report of 1781," 89; Cabello to Croix, May 14, 1779, BA (quote).

[91] Cabello to Croix, August 19, 1779, BA.

[92] Revilla Gigedo to Manuel Munoz, June 22, 1791, BA.

concern that those on the margins of colonial society were overly familiar with independent Native groups.[93]

Alongside the goods and information acquired from colonists, Hispanic peoples themselves were an important resource for Apache bands. Frequently targeted in raids, the acquisition of women and children reflected the changes within Apachean productive relations. Pressed off their Colorado and Brazos valley buffalo hunting-grounds, among the richest on the Southern Plains, Apaches embrace of raiding and poaching Spanish livestock precipitated a growing expertise in horse and mule husbandry. With labour divided along gender and generational lines, Apache captors usually deployed children as herders since they could not yet participate in other economic activities. Although never the sole focus of their raids, Apaches did take advantage of opportunities to capture Spanish youths who were left alone or in small groups to manage colonial herds. Such captives were doubly appealing since their age made them propitious candidates for incorporation into Apache bands and they already possessed the relevant experience. The teenager Juan Domingo Ochoa, who escaped from an upper Lipan band in 1776, informed his Spanish interrogators that his captors seized him while he was herding goats, and that the raiding party took another three children during their retreat into the mountains. Queried on his deployment within the band, Ochoa explained that he had been "occupied in looking after his master's horses."[94] Other former captives reported similar experiences: having been captured while tending stock, they were re-deployed in similar roles.[95]

Although more difficult to control and indoctrinate, adult men and women captives also experienced forced adoption into Apache bands, where they assumed roles ranging from wives

[93] Nava to Munoz, September 11, 1793, BA; Munoz, Policies for Relations with the Lipan, October 24, 1793, BA.

[94] Ugarte to Bucareli, December 11, 1776, AGM, PI, Volume 24, Part 1.

[95] Miguel Emparan to Munoz, February 25, 1794, BA; Nolasco Carrasco to Munoz, March 3, 1794, BA.

to warriors to servants. While the path into Apache captivity involved violence and trauma, some colonists, particularly those belonging to lower castes, enjoyed new opportunities. Lacking the socio-economic and racialized stratification of Spanish colonial society, Apache bands offered these outsiders an alternative lifestyle. The youth Ochoa reported that among his captors lived a Spaniard named Andrés, an escapee from the Durango jailhouse, who earned his place as an Apache warrior entrusted with leading small raiding parties. Andrés praised his "life of liberty" among the Apaches and explained to Ochoa that there were many "naturalized captives" living among the Apache, including a mulatto man who secured his insider status by marrying an Apache woman.[96] While lacking the personalized details of Ochoa's account, such individuals surface repeatedly in colonial records. Captured and deported alongside their new kinsmen in 1783 were two young mulatto men. Seven years later the governor of Texas ordered that a captive redeemed near La Bahia be detained until he could be returned to his hometown of Revilla. Without such measures, colonial authorities felt that ex-captives were prone to "run away again with the Indians (as they customarily do whenever they are annoyed by work)."[97] Bourbon officials especially feared these "Apacheanized" Spaniards, for having "reconciled themselves to live cheerfully with the Apaches," they "serve as guides and act with greater cruelty than the savages."[98] Where Spaniards experienced defections and disillusionment, Apache bands wracked by disease and war reconstituted themselves with the help of individuals who brought their labour and skills into Native society, whether by choice or coercion.[99]

Slaving, Ethnogenesis, and "Neo-Traditionalist" Bands

[96] Ugarte to Bucareli, December 11, 1776, AGM, PI, Volume 24, Part 1.

[97] Pedro Tueros to Mathias de Galvez, September 12, 1783, AGM, PI, Volume 24, Part II; Espadas to Munoz, March 11, 1790, BA.

[98] "Junta de Guerra on proper frontier defense against Indian attacks, Chihuahua" June 6, 1778, BA.

[99] Merrill, "Cultural Creativity and Raiding Bands," 144-147.

Hardly restricted to the Apaches, the vitality of the borderland's raiding economy played a central role in the ascendance of other indigenous bands who manipulated colonial designs to survive the adversity of dislocation, disease, and warfare. Embracing elements of the Apachean raiding-and-trading economy, coalescent bands in central and coastal Texas navigated the unstable social environment as they re-invented themselves. These challenges elevated a new cadre of indigenous leaders, generally younger men with direct experiences of the agonizing ruptures provoked by European invaders. Passing through the ranks of honoured warriors, these men assembled militarized cohorts that drew on weaker groups for personnel and plunder, generally gravitating towards the pastoral economy and assuming a predatory stance towards sedentary communities. Along with Natchitoches slavers and their clients, these bands represented the other terminus of the pastoral-plantation slaving zone. Indeed, Tonkawas and Karankawas efforts were led by men who themselves emerged directly from the violence associated with slaving.

For the Tonkawa people of the Colorado valley, Spaniards' mid-eighteenth century effort to reduce them in missions initiated the trend towards an increasingly nomadic and multi-ethnic society capable of weathering the colonial storm.[100] Disabused with Spanish overtures and pressured by the southward sweep of Apache and Osage war parties, by the 1770s inter-tribal warfare led to the rise of the Tonkawa's most distinguished war leader, a man whose career embodied the violent ruptures that redrew the political landscape of the borderlands.[101] Born in a Lipan Apache village and captured by Tonkawa raiders as a youth, the warrior known to

[100] Thomas F. Schilz, "People of the Cross Timbers: A History of the Tonkawa Indians," (Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Christian University, 1983), 74-75; Herbert E. Bolton, *Texas in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century: Studies in Spanish Colonial History and Administration* (Berkeley, 1915), 143-150.

[101] For Apache and Osage pressure on the Tonkawas, see Schilz, "People of the Cross Timbers," 76-77; 82-83; Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 289.

Spaniards as El Mocho ("the Maimed One") earned his sobriquet through the loss of an ear in battle and thereafter rose to prominence among his adopted people. According to Mézières, El Mocho possessed "a certain eloquence which he knows how to adapt to the nature of the tribe in which he has become naturalized," and consolidated power after an epidemic carried off other established leaders. While most of the latter favoured accommodation with the Spaniards, El Mocho made his reputation as "a lover of disturbances, and very capable of stirring them up."[102]

Under his leadership, the Tonkawa embraced the inclusion of other groups in a more concerted effort to undermine Spanish power. Already a diverse nation of Yojuane, Mayeye, Ervipiame, and other Tonkawan peoples, El Mocho's band added captives and mission refugees into their community. This last action directly threatened the Castilian, Catholic, and corporatist society envisioned by Spanish imperialists. During the 1760s the Aranama people fled the La Bahia missions and established themselves among the Tonkawa and Tawakoni "until their number was increased by fugitives from their own nation, when they separated to live alone."[103] Rejecting the regimented and alien social order of the missions, groups of refugees joined forces with the Tonkawa from the 1770s onward.[104] This practice of inter-tribal cohabitation destabilized the mission system through the expansion of indigenous numbers and knowledge. Reiterating a frequent concern regarding mission apostates, Mézières argued that the Aranama gained their hosts' favour by guiding raiders into "the land where they were raised and

[102] For Neques' acceptance of Spanish peace overtures following the 1772 treaty, see Bucareli to Ripperda, January 4, 1774, BA. For El Mocho's background and chieftainship, see Mézières to Croix, September 5, 1779, *ADM*, II: 269.

[103] For the Aranama apostates among the Tonkawa, see Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 291 (quote); Croix to Ripperda, September 12, 1778, BA.

[104] Bucareli to Ripperda, March 1, 1774, BA; Mézières to Croix, September 7, 1779, *ADM*, II: 273; Lopez, "Texas Missions in 1785," 6.

taught."[105] The elected chiefs among the refugees thwarted earlier efforts, but in 1778 Mézières and Father Jose de la Garza secured the return of the Aranama through the intercession of the Tawakoni. Their re-incorporation into the missions did not last.[106] Following the flight of fifty Aranama over two nights in 1784, La Bahia officers and priests charged that the escapes were organized at El Mocho's "instigation," as the Aranama were core members of "the band he had formed."[107]

Despite challenging the colonial regimes based at San Antonio and La Bahia, bands like El Mocho's embraced the possibilities engendered by the violent upheavals of colonialism. After the Franciscans' failure to reduce the Tonkawa, Spanish diplomacy focused on their resettlement at a permanent village where they could take up Mediterranean-style agriculture and receive licensed traders.[108] Wary of Spanish motives and focused on security against marauding war parties, the Tonkawa chose to stay mobile, "the country being dangerous." In 1779 Mézières found El Mocho's band traveling along the upper Brazos. His men**,** among them "six fugitives," were well-provisioned with mounts and weapons as they criss-crossed lands frequented by their Apache enemies.[109] Despite Mézières' orders to induce the Tonkawa to establish a village and surrender their Aranama allies, French traders, including Mézières' nephew, lived among these groups for prolonged stretches.[110] Finally, after years of isolation from the Wichita-Spanish

[105] Mézières, Report of the Expedition to Cadodachos, October 29, 1770, *ADM*, I: 216 (quote); Mézières to Unzaga, May 20, 1770, *ADM*, I: 164.

[106] For Morales and Perico, see Mézières to Ripperda, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 291; for the Aranamas return to mission at La Bahia, see Croix to Ripperda, September 15, 1778, BA; Croix to Cabello, January 16, 1779, BA.

[107] Cabello, Monthly Report, January 31, 1784, BA ("instigation"); Cabello to Neve, July 15, 1784, BA ("formed").

[108] Arricivita, *Apostolic Chronicle*, II: 3-13; Mézières to Croix, March 28, 1778, *ADM*, II: 192-193.

[109] Mézières to Croix, September 22, 1779, *ADM*, II: 278.

[110] For French traders among the Tonkawa, see Menchaca to O'Connor, March 8, 1774, *ADM*, II: 38; J. Gaignard, Journal of an Expedition up the Red River, 1773-1774, *ADM*, II: 97.

alliance network, El Mocho visited San Antonio in 1779 to formalize relations and receive the governor's recognition of his chieftainship. Although El Mocho pledged his people to return all refugees and begin farming, his purported vassalage masked new efforts to shape the economy of violence in ways that suited his neo-traditionalist, multi-ethnic band.[111]

El Mocho's gambit yoked widespread disillusionment with the Spanish alliance to his own ascension as a preeminent war leader. Endangered by aggressive colonial forces and Mescalero Apaches in Coahuila, lower Lipan bands faced a formidable alliance at the same time that Cabello's promises of trade goods for the Tonkawa proved worthless. In 1779, the Tonkawa staged a devastating raid against the Lipan Sun Otter band, killing or "carr[ying] off as captives" three hundred Lipans and taking scores of horses.[112] Yet, within a few years a fledgling alliance between the Tonkawa and several Lipan bands threatened to destroy the Spanish province. In shifting his natal and adoptive peoples from war to alliance, El Mocho slipped between the practices of power in a free association and the centralizing pressures exerted by colonial regimes through the designation of "medal chiefs." Weakened by Mescalero and Tonkawa raids, several Lipan chiefs who requested aid from San Antonio were "astounded" by Cabello's proposal that they first select a supreme chief who would submit to Spanish vassalage.[113]

Undeterred by the internal and external factors militating against the centralization of Apache leadership, El Mocho sought to include Apache bands in a multi-tribal alliance under his direction. Exemplifying the deepening ties between indigenous and colonial societies, the alliance was first broached in San Antonio's quarters for interpreters and visiting chiefs. After enjoying a "big reunion" with Cabello's slaves, El Mocho smoked cigars with the governor, who

[111] Cabello, commission to Tosche, alias El Mocho, as *capitan* of the Tonkawa, October 8, 1779, BA.

[112] Cabello to Croix, March 18, 1779, BA.

[113] Cabello to Croix, November 2, 1779, BA.

encouraged him to raid the small pox-ridden Lipan for horses. But within days a group of Lipan chiefs entered the town and invited El Mocho to their encampment where he might receive a gift of horses. Struggling within the precarious game of borderland diplomacy, an exasperated Cabello asked "whether the most cunning man could duplicate a show and act more subtle and magnanimous than this scoundrel."[114] In the last months of 1782 the Tonkawa and the Lipan assembled peacefully after years of "waging a continuous war." During the ensuing trade fair, Tonkawas joined by the Hasinai, Akokisa, Mayeye, Coco, and Bidai exchanged over two hundred guns for two thousand horses taken in Texas, Coahuila, and Nuevo Leon by Lipan raiders. Spanish troops could only watch as four thousand Native traders (double the Hispanic population of Texas) occupied the coastal plains, leaving only the whitened bones of cattle as a sign of their "great bartering."[115] Amidst by the uproar of the trade fair, El Mocho launched a determined bid for inter-tribal leadership. Arguing his Lipan ancestry made him eligible "to be the Grand Chief," El Mocho proposed to lead a coalition of Mescaleros, Lipans, and Tonkawas that would make the allies "owner of all these lands, cutting them away from the Spanish and to the rest of the nations that did not join [with them]." Distrustful of El Mocho's power play as they had been of Cabello's proposal to appoint a supreme chief, the Mescaleros and Lipans used the arrival of a Wichita war party to end the meeting with the Tonkawa leader's ambitions unfulfilled.[116]

At San Antonio, news of an impending Tonkawa-Apache alliance provoked a resort to violent subterfuge – if medal chiefs were made in colonial villages, it was there that they could

[114] Cabello to Croix, November 30, 1780, BA.

[115] Cabello to Pedro Piernas, January 13, 1783, *SMV*, III: 69 (quotes); Cabello, Monthly Report, January 31, 1782, BA.

[116] Cabello, Ynforme, September 30, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1. El Mocho's speech was recorded by Cabello's spy, André Courbiere.

be destroyed. In having El Mocho murdered inside a colonial town, Spanish officers regretted only that a "loss of confidence would begin among the other tribes we want to attract… [they] might be convinced that their good faith and fidelity were susceptible to being violated someday by our party."[117] Such concerns were as old as the policy of assassinating indigenous leaders, leading colonial authorities to enlist proxies. Plotting to disrupt the Lipan guns-for-horses trade in the early 1770s, Mézières sent Alexis Grappé to inform Bigotes that no Apaches who entered his village should be allowed to leave alive.[118] When seven Lipans entered Bigotes' house, the Hasinai chief and his men cut three of them down before the rest escaped.[119] Plans had likewise been laid to have El Mocho's Tonkawa rivals kill him as early as 1779, but an epidemic carried off the assassins before they could complete their mission.[120] After another failed attempt in 1783, the next year Spanish officers succeeded in luring the Tonkawa war leader into La Bahia, where the garrison assassinated him. The Spanish war leaders who orchestrated El Mocho's murder castigated him as "being of the Lipan nation and of a restless and turbulent nature," who "maintain[ed] a secret inclination towards those of his perfidious race." Eliding their roles in El Mocho's ascendance, Spanish officers remained committed to a military solution even as other indigenous leaders emerged.[121]

As priests and colonists targeted indigenous populations along the lower Rio Grande valley and Gulf Coast, new cohorts of refugees and traditionalists, often with experience in the missions, likewise challenged colonial domination. During his inspection of the San Antonio

[117] Neve to Cabello, December 26, 1783, BA.

[118] For Mézières' instructions to assassinate the Lipan delegates, delivered verbally by Grappé to Bigotes, see De La Pena to Unzaga, September 14, 1772 (first letter), *ADM*, II: 16.

[119] For the murders, see De La Pena to Unzaga, September 14, 1772 (fourth letter), *ADM*, II: 23-24.

[120] Mézières to Croix, September 5, 1779, *ADM*, II: 270.

[121] Cabello to Neve, July 15, 1784, BA.

missions, the Marqués de Rubi noted that without regular expeditions to "extract [Natives] from their very lairs" the missions "would no longer survive," even as the surrounding hinterland's indigenous population continued to plummet.[122] In 1772 the viceroy ordered Governor Ripperda, to investigate troubling reports that the inhabitants of Nuevo Santander were seizing "the children of allied Indians to sell them as slaves." The results of Ripperda's inquest provided a glimpse into the coastal slave trade organized by colonists, soldiers, and friars. Four deponents each testified that groups of Spaniards, led by a Franciscan priest, scoured the coast in pursuit of over sixty mission apostates. Tracking them into a dense thicket, they seized nineteen Native men, women, and children; one captured mother reported that two of her children had been taken from her by local colonists. The children were likely incorporated into colonial households as domestic labourers and the adults put to work as enslaved miners in the Camargo saltworks.[123] Although the viceroy and governor condemned the capture and sale of missionized Natives the matter was only closed seven years later. Tellingly, no priests or colonists were censured. [124] Struggling against Spanish encroachment, detribalized Natives "from the coast" never surrendered their hopes of return, for in 1781 they were still reported to be fleeing from the San Antonio missions to "the homelands where they were born."[125]

By the late 1770s the Karankawas' resistance to the coastal missions centered on the counter-community led by an ex-neophyte named Jose Maria. Like other individuals who withdrew from the coercive structures of colonial labour regimes, Jose Maria's opposition drew upon personal experience. During the mid-1770s the priests at mission Rosario accused Jose

[122] "Itinerary of Senor Marqués de Rubi," in Jackson and Foster, *Imaginary Kingdom*, 188.

[123] Ripperda to Antonio Maria de Bucareli y Ursua, January 16, 1773, BA.

[124] Cabello to Croix, May 28, 1780, BA.

[125] Croix, "General Report of 1781," 78.

Maria of having his men butcher a cow, and the authorities then "slapped him in irons and held him prisoner for a long time, until he escaped."[126] Returning home to navigate rivalries among the anti-Spanish Karankawas, an ascendant Jose Maria extended his influence on an expanding cadre, boasting to a mission Indian in 1780 that "even the non-Christian Indians obeyed him, such that now the old chiefs possessed no authority, he being recognized as the chief of the entire nation."[127] Ensconced on Matagorda Bay's "Culebra Island," Spanish officers viewed Jose Maria's confederacy as a significant threat to colonial order.

As Karankawas and other bands mounted their opposition to the mission regime, imperial agents advocated two interconnected methods to destroy them: campaigns of extermination and the dispersal of the survivors. In his 1768 report, the Marques de Rubi argued that localized slave trades could be curbed in favour of long-distance deportations of Native prisoners, during which indigenous identities would be destroyed in the mines and missions of central Mexico, "as has occurred with several other nations whose legacy has perished from memory."[128] Adopting Rubi's suggestion, Title Ten of the Regulations of 1772 stipulated that women and children were to be indoctrinated into Catholicism by families of good-standing, while men were to be sent to Mexico City and sentenced to hard labour as the viceroy saw fit. The king specified that Native captives were not spoils of war, and that "in no case shall the Indians arrested be sent into servitude as has illegally been done in the past." In response, local officials scrupulously avoided describing prisoners as *esclavos* ("slaves"), instead they favoured the term *piezas* ("pieces") – but the conditions of bondage in Spanish households or labour gangs remained those of *de facto*

[126] Pacheco to Ugalde, September 15, 1787, BA.

[127] Cabello to Croix, May 30, 1780, BA.

[128] Rubi, "Dictamen," in Jackson and Foster, *Imaginary Kingdom*, 181-182.

enslavement.[129] Given responsibility for persecuting the war against the Karankawas, Mézières suggested they "be sent to lands where they may lose the thought of returning; where they may serve God if they wish, and the state whether they wish it or not."[130]

While Apaches remained the main targets, Spanish officials targeted apostates for deportation, as their knowledge of colonial institutions and hardened opposition made them particularly threatening.[131] Regarding the Karankawa who fled Rosario, Croix felt it would be wiser to "to remove them completely from the province to some overseas destination," rather than return them to the San Antonio missions.[132] Shortly thereafter he gave Ripperda specific orders to send Jose Luis, Jose Maria's brother, and Antonio, an Aranama apostate, under guard to San Luis Potosi, from where they would be "shipped to Havana."[133] Antonio died during the smallpox epidemic of 1782, while Jose Luis, after three years' imprisonment, earned his release by offering his services as an emissary to his brother's band.[134]

Despite these diplomatic feelers, warfare remained at the forefront of imperial policy. One proposal called for the enlistment of Louisiana boatmen to drive the Karankawa from their island strongholds and towards the shore where they could be encircled, massacred, and any

[129] "The Royal Regulations of 1772," 31; 35 (quote).

[130] Mézières to Croix, October 5, 1779, *ADM*, II: 302.

[131] For the deportation of Apaches in Texas, see Ripperda to Bucareli, July 4, 1772, *ADM*, I: 318; Pacheco to Bucareli, August 25, 1773, AGM, PI, Volume 22.

[132] Croix to Ripperda, September 15, 1778, BA. Croix repeated this proposal three years later, see Croix, "General Report of 1781," 83.

[133] Croix to Ripperda, September 24, 1778, BA. When delays occurred, Cabello recommended that the two simply be hanged, see Cabello to Croix, March 14, 1779, BA.

[134] Cabello to Croix, November 25, 1782, BA.

survivors sold into slavery.[135] Yet scarce manpower and administrative difficulties consistently compromised the execution this strategy. In 1783 Nicolas de la Mathe, the Pointe Coupée rancher and slave trader, proposed to lead one pincer of the campaign for the "extirpation" of the Karankawa. La Mathe promised Cabello he could provide for the construction of canoes and raise an amphibious force of "about 100 men from the classes of hunters and oarsmen," who would assemble at Opelousas and Camargo to attack the islands. Unlike Spanish regulars, la Mathe and his men would receive no official payment for their services. They were to be incentivized solely by "the booty which they will capture on the islands."[136] While la Mathe held high hopes of seizing loot and captives, the canoe-building stalled and both provinces remained short on military manpower, leaving local officials to shift the blame between themselves even as their superiors plotted new methods for exploiting indigenous labour.[137] By 1785 Jose Maria had been "proscribed" by Commandant General Croix, who hoped that if a general extermination campaign failed to materialize at least he could be lured into peace talks and assassinated.[138]

[135] For the continuity of Spanish strategy see Bernardo de Galvez, "Expedition Against the Karankawas," [no date] 1779, *SMV*, II: 334; Mézières to Croix, October 5, 1779, *ADM*, II: 299-303; Croix, "General Report of 1781," 83-84; Cabello to Croix, November 25, 1782, BA; Cabello to Esteban Miro, September 21, 1783, *SMV*, III: 86-87; Felipe de Neve to Cabello, October 3, 1783, BA; Neve to Cabello, December 18, 1783, BA; Cabello to José Antonio Rengel, June 19, 1785, BA – in this 1785 dispatch Cabello repeated the 1779 proposal to "kill or capture those that flee the islands."

[136] Cabello to Miro, September 21, 1783, *SMV*, III: 86 (quotes). For La Mathe's activities in Texas, see "Proceedings of Nicolas de la Mathe vs. Antonio Gil Ybarbo," June 26, 1782, BA; Cabello to Miro, September 20, 1783, *SMV*, III: 80-82.

[137] In 1780 Cabello levelled twelve charges of graft against Luis Cazorla, the commander at presidio La Bahia, including the embezzlement of funds designated for the construction of canoes for use against the Karankawa, see Cabello, Charges against Luis Cazorla after completion of the review of La Bahia, August 21, 1780, BA. In 1786 Cabello again censured Cazorla for his conduct of Karankawa diplomacy, see Cazorla to Cabello, December 6, 1786, BA; Martinez Pacheco to Juan de Ugalde, December 14, 1786, BA. For La Mathe's failure to build the canoe fleet, see Rengel to Cabello, April 25, 1785, BA; Cabello to Rengel, June 19, 1785, BA.

[138] Cabello to Commandant of Rio Colorado, July 8, 1785, BA. Cabello described Jose Maria as "proscripto." For early concerns that insider knowledge of the missions and settlements made the refugees particularly dangerous, see Mézières to Croix, "Report on the Expedition of 1778 [Letter 1]," March 18, 1778, *ADM*, II: 190.

With the fog of war lying thick on the Gulf Coast, the Karankawa took the offensive. Targeting Camargo, nexus of Nuevo Santander's indigenous slave trade, Jose Maria's band "stole a great part of the horses and flocks of sheep."[139] Aware of Spanish plans for an amphibious assault on their islands, likely through their informants in the missions, the band patrolled the mouth of the Guadalupe River where the best timber stands were located. They killed two carpenters in 1778, and in 1784 a nervous boatwright insisted that "since the Karankawas already know of the expedition being planned against them […] he is convinced they are sure to stake everything on attacking those who are building [the canoes]."[140] Having reduced their enemy's ability to respond, the crowning victory of Jose Maria's 1780 campaign came during a nocturnal raid on the La Bahia missions that liberated twenty-two neophytes.[141] This succession of Karankawa victories forced a sobering reassessment of Spanish capabilities. Cabello chafed at the overconfidence of his superiors, writing that "the current situation is now quite distinct from that for which the [presidio] system was designed," and in his 1780 report on conditions at La Bahia he noted that the inhabitants could not even leave to draw water for fear of attack.[142] The priests closed Rosario in 1781, while the other six missions, nearly empty of neophytes, teetered on the brink of collapse by the end of the decade.[143]

By 1787 epidemics, Apache raids, and food shortages contributed to a relative détente between Spaniards and Karankawas. Inclined towards a peaceful settlement, Governor Pacheco

[139] Cabello, "Account of the Capture of a Spanish Schooner," March 20, 1779, *SMV*, II: 334. In 1786 the Karankawa stole horses from the ranches around San Antonio, see Cabello, "Monthly Report," July 31, 1786, BA.

[140] Cabello to Neve, March 1, 1784, BA.

[141] Croix, "General Report of 1781," 77.

[142] Cabello to Croix, May 30, 1780, BA (quote); Cabello, General Report on La Bahia, January 12, 1780, BA.

[143] For the plight of the missions, see Jose Franco Lopez, "The Texas Missions in 1785," J. Autrey Dabbs, ed. and trans., *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* (Austin, 1940), 5-23; Ugalde, Diary of a journey from San Antonio to San Juan Batista, April 13-June 12, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111; Kathryn Stoner O'Connor, *The Presidio La Bahía del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga, 1721 to 1846* (Austin, 1966), 30.

sent a few soldiers to conduct Jose Maria and his lieutenants to San Antonio for negotiations. The planned meeting never occurred, however, as a dispute at the Karankawa encampment ended with the death of a sergeant and the flight of the remaining troops. Reinforcements sent to recover the body discovered that it had been mutilated, burned, and left hanging by the feet.[144] The conflict resumed, and in 1789 La Bahia soldiers and Native auxiliaries discovered and attacked a large party of Karankawas who left their coastal islands to hunt and forage, killing ten and wounding many with a canon.[145] After Jose Maria died of disease some months later, a new cohort of Karankawa leaders sought an end to the protracted bloodshed but tensions persisted as the missionaries relied on soldiers, who often assaulted Native women, to enforce Catholic conversion and regimented labour.[146]

Apache bands and their imitators among the Tonkawa and Karankawa developed intricate engines of capture to survive the violence of colonialism, especially the slaving campaigns and epidemic diseases that reduced their populations. At the band level, assimilated captives contributed valuable skills, knowledge, and reproductive capabilities to social formations that were becoming increasingly militarized, mobile, and ethnically diverse. As the careers of El Mocho and Jose Maria demonstrate, individual experiences with captivity and slaving were integral to this process. Alongside Euro-American traders, planters, and soldiers, these indigenous leaders mobilized widening networks to consolidate and exchange resources (humans, animals, trade goods) within a borderland political economy straddling pastoral and plantation zones.

---

[144] Cazorla to Pacheco, August 5, 1787, BA.

[145] Antoine de Mezieres, Diary of Operations carried out during Campaign against the Karankawas, February 8-12, 1789, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part II.

[146] Munoz to Mariano Rodriguez, March 12, 1793, BA; Rodriguez to Munoz, May 23, 1793, BA; Cortés to Munoz, December 5, 1793, BA.

Conclusion

Over the second half of the eighteenth century indigenous and colonial societies transformed the borderlands into an expansive slaving zone. Multi-ethnic cohorts of raiders and traders were the principal architects of this economy of violence. Intertwining the roles of raiders, merchants, and diplomats, borderlanders like Mézières, El Mocho, and Jose Maria shuttled captives, livestock, and weapons between villages desperate for labour and security. The procurement of captive labour transformed these societies. Colonial towns functioned as consumers of unfree labour and purveyors of violent technologies even as they infolded into a landscape dominated by the kinetic power of militarized nomadic bands. Honing their expertise in mobile warfare and alliance-making, indigenous free associations pushed European imperialists to modify their conceptions of war and peace. Inter-communal relations were inextricable from this contest, as long-distance slaving created a multi-ethnic cauldron staggering under its own weight.

Chapter 3: War and Slavery in the Borderland, 1785-1795

By the spring of 1791 the men had been riding hard for weeks. Periodically, they selected fresh mounts among the hundreds of horses, donkeys, and mules they drove eastward. They chose their camps carefully, choosing the most defensible locations, and sustained themselves on barbequed equine meat. Led by a *nantan* (Lipan: "leader") the Spanish called El Canoso ("The Grey-Haired One"), during the preceding months this cohort of lower Lipan Apaches raided the towns and ranches along the northeastern sector of the Rio Grande Valley. They struck and retreated with equal suddenness to avoid the Spanish soldiers, militia, and allied Natives pursuing them. Targeting the animals that served for transportation, security, food, and trade, the Lipans sought to avoid direct engagements with colonial forces. Nevertheless, they decided to capture five Hispanic boys they discovered tending colonists' livestock, a role that made their lives precarious as warfare engulfed the region. Themselves the targets of a powerful alliance, the men planned to use this assemblage of stolen people and animals to obtain the firearms and munitions needed to defend Lipan elders, women, and children. Drawing on long-standing commercial connections to effect these exchanges, the Lipans knew their partners would be waiting.[1]

From their coastal and riverine villages, indigenous and French traders traveled overland or by *pirogue* (a cypress dugout canoe) to meet the Lipans in the pine woods of the Louisiana-Texas borderland. Once the Lipans arrived, they exchanged "horses and mules and captives" for new weapons, especially short-barrelled muskets that could be used on horseback.[2] Then French

[1] For descriptions of Apache raiding tactics, see Domingo Cabello to Jose Antonio Rengel, February 16, 1785, BA; Cordero, "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," 345-347; Manuel Merino y Moreno, "Views from a Desk in Chihuahua: Manuel Merino's Report on Apaches and Neighbouring Nations, ca. 1804," Elizabeth A. H. John and John Wheat, eds. and trans., *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (*SWHQ*) 95:2 (October 1991): 152.

[2] For Canoso's raiding band and their meeting with French traders, see Espadas to Manuel Munoz, August 17, 1790, BA; Munoz to Revilla, October 25, 1790, Archivo General de Mexico (AGM), Provincias Internas (PI), Volume

traders moved their livestock towards the lower Mississippi valley plantations that needed animal labour to support the exploitation of an increasingly large and diverse slave population. During the same period that Spanish-Apache warfare subsumed a burgeoning livestock-captive-gun trade network in Texas, black and *mestizo* slaves labouring on Louisiana's cotton, indigo, and tobacco plantations sought to escape the brutality of monoculture production by launching legal suits, and, eventually, an apparently widespread plan to overthrow the plantation regime by force. Although seemingly unconnected, Lipan raiders and slave rebels shared common ancestors among the Native women seized during the slaving campaigns of the previous decades, hinting at the violent interlocking of pastoral and plantation economies.

War and slaving coursed together between 1785 and 1795, connecting disparate zones of production as borderland peoples entangled varied engines of capture. Complex alliance systems catalyzed the raids that moved captives, animals, and other goods across the region, even as these formations buffered a plantation regime that increased production by consuming a widening scope of victims. Emphasizing the diplomatic fluidity that allowed them to expand their access to potential allies, partners, and kin, in 1785 Comanches and Wichitas accepted Spanish proposals to form a commercial-military pact against the *Apacheria* ("Apache territory/homeland"). This war dominated borderland politics for the next decade, allowing allied bands to avoid the most grievous aspects of Spanish colonial policy even as they scoured New Spain for Apache *rancherias* (semi-mobile encampments) to pillage for captives, livestock, and other plunder. Apache bands persevered by launching their own raiding campaigns and making new compromises with the San Antonio mission regime that sought to transform them into subjugated agricultural workers. Although the belligerents reached a détente during the early 1790s, the

---

159, Part I, Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas; Munoz to Revilla, March 2, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 162, Part III (quote); Antonio Gil Ybarbo to Munoz, June 13, 1791, BA.

blowback from a century of borderland slaving soon erupted within the plantation zone. Informed by the revolutionary currents of the late eighteenth century, African and Afro-indigenous slaves launched determined legal bids to overturn their status and secure a measure of autonomy within colonial society. Together, the events of the 1790s reveal the violent dynamics that underwrote captive exchanges across the pastoral-plantation borderland, provoking social disorder at each end of the spectrum.

The Comanche Alliance, 1785-1787

In 1785, as the travelers rode westward towards the distant buffalo-hide tents of the *Comancheria* ("Comanche territory/homeland"), the violence of the preceding years loomed over their mission. Although at least one Comanche band attended the peace conference held at San Antonio in 1772, panicked or confused Nacogdoches colonists killed several Comanches in 1779, sparking a half-decade of warfare. In February, 1781, a hundred well-armed Comanches pinned down and killed six San Antonio troopers. Colonial forces exacted their revenge a year later when they routed a Comanche war party and returned home with the heads of eight warriors, for which the governor paid each man five *reales* and "thanked them in the name of the King."[3] As Texas teetered on the brink of collapse, eastern Comanche bands were themselves ravaged by war and a terrible smallpox epidemic that swept the region between 1780 and 1782.[4]

Pierre Vial and Francisco Chaves relied on the diplomatic expertise of the two Wichita captains who also served as guides within *Comancheria*. The two Euro-American men also brought their own experience to bear as they sought to end Comanche-Spanish warfare. Vial, a French native of Lyons, lived for many years among the Taovayas, where he worked as a

[3] Cabello, Monthly Report, February 28, 1781, BA; Cabello, Monthly Report, September 30, 1782, BA.

[4] Pierre Vial and Francisco Xavier Chaves, "Inside the Comancheria, 1785: The Diary of Pedro Vial and Francisco Xavier Chaves," ed. and trans., Elizabeth A. H. John and Adan Benavides, Jr., *SWHQ* 98:1 (July 1994): 38.

gunsmith and became known as "*El Manitou*." Originally from New Mexico, Comanches captured Chaves when he was a boy and later traded him to the Taovayas after his master died. In 1784 he joined a large Taovaya raiding party bound for San Antonio, but decided to abandon the expedition and turn himself in to Spanish authorities. Now in the service of empire, Vial and Chaves worked diligently to consummate an alliance between their new overlords and their old partners. The resulting pact inaugurated a new era of war and slaving in the borderlands.

By 1785, voices of moderation were ascendant within Comanche councils as eastern bands hoped to gain more by peace than war. While scholars routinely identify the 1785-86 Comanche-Spanish treaties in New Mexico and Texas as turning points in borderland history, these diplomatic watersheds point to the importance of intra and inter-band dynamics in determining policy. Given the egalitarian nature of their society, the power of the alliance stemmed more from coordination *among* Comanches than it did on their relationships with Spaniards. During their negotiations with the members of twelve eastern bands, Vial and Chaves repeatedly mentioned the importance of participation, transparency, and consensus to Comanche politics. At the grand council convened to hear their proposals, over 700 senior Comanche men sat in concentric circles, with this assemblage itself surrounded by "an infinity of young men, women, and children, who were standing." After Vial laid out Cabello's proposals, "a commotion erupted among all the Comanches in the circle […] this seemed like something never seen."[5]

Thus, with substantive efforts on all sides, in December 1785 Comanche, Taovaya, Tawakoni, French, and Spanish diplomats concluded a peace process that began within

[5] Vial and Chaves, "Inside the Comancheria," 39; 44 (quotes).

Comancheria and ended at San Antonio.[6] Three Comanche diplomats requested the burial of live horses and weapons at the road entering the town, "all of which afterwards would be covered with the same earth by both parties […] to show that the war we have had is buried and that both one and the other may travel freely and securely." It was a proposal strikingly similar to the rituals that sealed the Lipan-Spanish treaty of 1749.[7] The "peace" of 1785 facilitated slaving and radiated violence onto outsiders, with the allies pledging "that they have as declared enemies all the [Mescalero] Apaches and Lipans," until they were "exterminated."[8] In the months following the peace ceremony, Comanche traders arrived at San Antonio and sold two young Apache girls to a colonist for nine horses, establishing the first direct links between Comanche raiders and Spanish consumers of captive labour.[9]

Focusing their violence on Apaches allowed indigenous allies to avoid the most oppressive elements of Spanish colonialism. Following the 1785-1786 peace treaties, New Spain's indigenous allies placed hard limits on the scope of deportations.[10] Senior Comanche, Wichita, and Spanish leaders acknowledged from the outset that ambitious young men, eager to obtain horses, were a persistent threat to amicable coexistence. Although eager to meet their alliance obligations, Comanche and Wichita captains refused to allow their supporters to suffer banishment and death at the hands of their allies. Small-scale horse raids, involving a few dozen

[6] For the mutuality of Comanche and Spanish interests in peace, see Neve to Cabello, January 9, 1784, BA; Vial and Chaves, "Inside the Comancheria, 1785," 40-45; Cabello to Rengel, October 3, 1785, BA.

[7] Cabello to Rengel, November 25, 1785, BA. Along with its counterpart in New Mexico, the 1785 Comanche-Texas alliance is much-celebrated by both contemporaries and scholars. See John, *Storms Brewed*, 664-716; Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 112-117. For the Comanche-Ute-New Mexico peace, see Blackhawk, *Violence Over the Land*, 102-105.

[8] Cabello to Rengel, November 25, 1785, BA.

[9] Cabello to Rengel, January 11, 1786, BA.

[10] For earlier deportations of Comanche prisoners, see Bucareli to Ripperda, March 24, 1772, BA; Bucareli to Ripperda, April 28, 1772, BA; Ripperda to Unzaga, May 26, 1772, *ADM*, I: 273-274.

men, meant that indigenous warriors sometimes fell into the hands of Spanish soldiers guarding the herds. These incidents prompted protracted negotiations among indigenous and colonial diplomats, with the former successfully isolating their people from the deportation policy aimed at enemy groups. Although Texas Governor Domingo Cabello received much of the credit for securing the 1785 Comanche-Texas-Wichita peace, his successor, Rafael Martinez Pacheco, charged that the death of two Taovayas during Cabello's administration endangered the alliance. These killings reportedly "so angered [the Wichita] nations that they broke off their peace and prepared to avenge the deaths with two hundred warriors." With the fate of their Apache enemies instructive in colonial methods of social control, the Taovayas and other bands used the threat of catastrophic raids against colonial communities to secure the return of their kinsmen. On January 29, 1787, soldiers captured fifteen Taoyava scouts around San Antonio and over the succeeding weeks Pacheco released several prisoners as emissaries to the Taovaya towns. Following harsh winter rains, a delegation of Taovaya chiefs arrived at San Antonio to renew their friendship with Texas and accept the return of the prisoners.[11]

This initial repatriation of indigenous captives established a pattern of exchange that persisted between the Wichita towns and San Antonio. In May and November of 1788, Spaniards apprehended Taovaya men near the corrals, and on both occasions released the prisoners soon after.[12] The disparate fates of Taovayas and a "mulatto" prisoner illustrate the influence of alliance politics on the composition of the colonial labour regime. Capturing them together after they wounded a shepherd, Pacheco sent the two Taovayas and the mulatto man to the jail at Santa Rosa, Coahuila. No doubt under pressure from the Taovaya leadership, frontier officers decided to release the Taovaya men rather than authorize their deportation – the mulatto man

[11] Pacheco to Ugalde, September 29, 1787, BA (quote); Pacheco to Ugalde, October 12, 1787, BA.

[12] Pacheco to Ugalde, May 29, 1788; Pacheco, Monthly Report, November 30, 1788, BA.

was exiled.[13] As the most influential members of the alliance, eastern Comanche bands likewise established their exemption from deportation.[14] Conversely, in 1788 Ugalde prepared orders for his subordinates that called for the transfer of Apache and other prisoners to Havana, Cuba, or even the "Marianas Islands" in the western Pacific Ocean.[15] The same month Ugalde authorized the transfer of a *collera* ("coffle") of fifteen Apache women and children from San Antonio to Mexico City via Monclova.[16] Over the course of the 1780s and 1790s San Antonio continued to serve as a waypoint for Apaches and other captives as borderland warfare pushed prisoners into the interior of New Spain.[17]

Perceiving the forces arraying against them, Lipan bands made desperate efforts to prevent the consummation of Comanche-Spanish-Wichita partnerships by shifting their application of violence to disrupt negotiations. When a Taovaya party traveled to La Bahia to receive gifts in 1784, Lipans intercepted them, killing four and capturing another. From their Taovaya prisoner the Lipans confirmed their distrust of Spanish motives. The Lipan war leader Casaca ("The Jacket") visited San Antonio days later to chastise Cabello over his rapprochement with the Taovayas and to complain about the lack of trade opportunities for his people.[18] As peace negotiations unfolded at San Antonio, over one hundred Lipan warriors appeared outside the town, intent on picking off any Comanche or Wichita diplomats foolish enough to leave

[13] Munoz to Ugalde, August 15, 1788, BA; Munoz to Ugalde, Sept 10, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 99, Part II; Echegaray to Munoz, September 18, 1788, BA; Revilla to Munoz, October 12, 1788, BA; Ugarte to Munoz, November 2, 1788, BA.

[14] For the release of four Comanche horse thieves, see Bustamente to Munoz, April 9, 1793, BA.

[15] Ugalde, Proposal for War against the Entire Mescalero Nation, April 28, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111.

[16] Ugalde to Flores, April 28, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111.

[17] Pacheco to Ugalde, January 7, 1788, BA; Nava to Munoz, February 26, 1791, BA.

[18] Cabello to Neve, June 20, 1784, BA.

without sufficient escort.[19] Even as Comanche diplomats dismantled the Apache alliance within San Antonio, Lipan attacks stalled their enemies' embrace. In 1786 Lipans ambushed a party of Taovayas en route to La Bahia before turning north to steal horses from the San Antonio corral.[20] The guns and munitions acquired from Bidai and French traders facilitated Lipan abilities to raid, crack rival alliances, and defend themselves against superior forces. Campaigning Toavaya and Tawakoni warriors discovered as much when the lower Lipan band led by Zapato Sas ("Peaked Moccasin") met them with substantial firepower near their encampment along the Frio River. The same year, one of the "great captains" of the eastern Comancheria met his death when his war party encountered a much-larger and well-armed group of enemies, probably Mescaleros, along the Pecos River.[21]

As Apache-Comanche warfare intensified during the second half of the 1780s, lower Lipan bands congregated on the wooded plains around San Antonio and La Bahia in hopes of renewing their peace with Spaniards. These efforts incited Governor Pacheco to accept Lipan overtures and allow them to enter the missions, where they hoped for some reprieve from Comanche attacks. The pastoral-plantation borderland thus witnessed the passage of mobile, militarized cohorts of Apaches and other indigenous peoples into the ranks of the sedentary, food-producing class, as well as the inverse. Lipan ties to the San Antonio missions extended back to the peace of 1749, when the marriage of Apache women to mission-dwelling Native men first established bonds of kinship between the two communities.[22] The shifting diplomatic

[19] Cabello to Rengel, November 25, 1785, BA.

[20] Cabello to Rengel, April 18, 1786, BA.

[21] Cabello to Ugarte, September 11, 1786, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, December 22, 1787, BA. Cabello to Ugarte, July 30, 1786, BA; Cabello, Monthly Report, July 31, 1786, BA.

[22] Fray Benito Fernandez de Santa Ana to the auditor of war, February 23, 1750, in Diana Hadley, Thomas H. Naylor, and Mardith K. Schuetz-Miller, eds. and trans., *The Presidio and Militia on the Northern Frontier of New*

landscape created by the Comanche-Spanish peace of 1785 prompted new accommodations as Governor Pacheco argued that Texas could enjoy an all-encompassing peace by allowing the lower Lipans to access the missions.[23] Some Lipans entered the San Antonio missions in 1787, where they received food and trade goods, had their firearms repaired, and even helped recapture Taovaya prisoners who escaped the town's jail.[24] Lipan infiltration of Spanish communities horrified the missionaries and the governor's superiors. Already depleted by disease, desertions, and food shortages, the missionaries griped at orders to accommodate the Lipans, who "hate the missions," but used them to re-supply for their ongoing struggle to survive the violence propelled by slaving.[25]

Given their entanglements with indigenous bondage and the violent legacies of the San Saba and San Lorenzo missions, Lipans had ample reason to be wary of the San Antonio missions. Their distrust deepened when Governor Pacheco sought to enforce their stay by sending troops to the Atascoso rancherias in order to escort seven bands back to the missions. An outbreak of measles among the Lipans could not have increased the appeal of entering the confines of Hispanic society. When the troops arrived at his rancheria, Casaca accepted Pacheco's trade goods but then angrily dismissed the Spanish escort, claiming that more soldiers would arrive to kill the men and enslave their families. The prevalence of slaving in the borderlands frequently undermined peace. Echoing El Lumen's dream of three decades earlier, Casaca charged that Pacheco "planned to gather all the Lipans and, once they were here, to

---

Spain: A Documentary History, Volume Two, Part Two: The Central Corridor and the Texas Corridor, 1700-1765 (Tuscon, 1997), 484.

[23] Pacheco to Ugarte, March 10, 1787, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, September 29, 1787, BA.

[24] Pacheco, report of expenses incurred supplying gifts to the Lipan, February 23, 1787, BA.

[25] For critiques of Pacheco's Lipan policy, see Ugarte to Pacheco, February 1, 1787, BA; Jose Raphael Oliva to Pacheco, February 11, 1787, BA (quote); Ugalde to Pacheco, August 23, 1787, BA.

shackle them and send them off to Veracruz, to board them on ships and to put them in some dwellings which were in the middle of the ocean, there to live out their days in labor."[26] This fear was not unfounded. Spaniards had long exported Apache captives to distant locales, from Mexico City to Havana.[27]

Although the majority of Lipans never resided in the missions, Spanish priests and soldiers feared that "all the Lipan Indians will come to a mission when they are harassed by a war to punish them." From 1787 onwards, a small group of Lipans established longer-term residences within the Texas mission complex, particularly mission San Antonio de Valero. These resident Lipans, led by baptized Lipan men named Bautista and Mariano, built upon and extended the connections between San Antonio and autonomous Apache bands even as their own objectives at mission Valero centered on subsistence and security. Lipan leaders apparently used the mission to sequester vulnerable women and children, as infants and adult women accepted baptism and entered the mission during the early late 1780s and early 1790s. Pacheco claimed that five Lipan women accepted baptism *in rigor mortis* in 1787, and others followed over the succeeding years.[28]

Indigenous-colonial alliance politics determined the application of violence and the concomitant flow of captives. Established in 1785, the alliance between Comanches, Spaniards,

---

[26] Jose Antonio Curbelo to Pacheco, September 19, 1787, BA.

[27] For the deportation of Apaches and other indigenous prisoners of war, see Christon I. Archer, "The Deportation of Barbarian Indians from the Internal Provinces of New Spain, 1789-1810," *The Americas* 29:3 (January 1973): 376-385; Max L. Moorhead, "The Spanish Deportation of Hostile Apaches: The Policy and the Practice," *Arizona and the West* 17:3 (Autumn 1975): 205-220; Mark Santiago, *The Jar of Severed Hands: Spanish Deportation of Apache Prisoners of War, 1770-1810* (Norman, 2011); Paul Conrad, "Indians, Convicts, and Slaves: An Apache Diaspora to Cuba at the Start of the Nineteenth Century," in James F. Brooks and Bonnie Martin, eds., *Linking the Histories of Slavery: North America and Its Borderlands* (Santa Fe, 2015), 67-95.

[28] Jose Francisco Lopez, "Report on the San Antonio Missions in 1792," Benedict Leutenegger and Marion Habig, eds. and trans., *SWHQ* 77:4 (April 1974): 495 (quote); For Lipan baptisms, see Pacheco to Ugalde, September 29, 1787, BA; Fray Jose Francisco Lopez, Record of Lipan Baptisms, October 15, 1787, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, March 31, 1788, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, February 16, 1789, BA. For Lipan women who visited and remained at the missions, see Revilla Gigedo to Sierra Gorda, June 6, 1792, BA; Castro to Munoz, September 29, 1792, BA.

and Wichitas constituted one of the most important and enduring compacts in the history of the Texas borderlands. Designed to dismantle Apache territory in central Texas and along the Rio Grande, war and slavery lay at its heart. Targeted for dispossession, enslavement, and deportation, most Apaches responded by intensifying their efforts to procure horses and guns, while others established a redoubt within the San Antonio missions. Conversely, the alliance allowed its Comanche and Wichita members privileged access to colonial markets, while also offering reprieve from decades of Spanish hostility and the dreaded deportation program. Focused on their mutual enemies, Comanche and Spanish leaders soon brought war into the Apacheria.

Borderland Warfare, 1787-1791

Beginning in 1787-1788 the Comanche-Spanish-Wichita allies launched a series of devastating attacks against Lipan and Mescalero rancherias, transforming the Rio Grande valley into a war zone interlaced with slave trades. In December 1787 a substantial Comanche delegation led by Oabancemeconequic, called El Gordo Cojo ("The Fat Lame One"), entered San Antonio to recount their recent successes against Lipans in the San Saba valley. Reflecting the growing scope of military coordination among Comanche bands, the governor reported that among the twenty-two visiting chiefs seventeen had never before visited the colonial capital, including one Yamparica leader from the western branch of Comancheria.[29] El Gordo Cojo's delegation also brought Apache captives to exchange, and from their new partners Spaniards also retrieved Hispanic captives taken during earlier hostilities in Texas and New Mexico.[30] The next

[29] Pacheco to Ugalde, January 7, 1788, BA.

[30] Pacheco to Ugalde, January 7, 1788, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, February 16, 1788, BA; Pacheco and Menchaca, Receipt for ransom of a Spanish captive, August 25, 1788, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, September 30, 1789, BA.

year Sojais, an influential eastern Comanche leader, brought another two Apache girls to San Antonio after he ambushed their parent's camp on his way to join Spanish forces.[31]

Juan de Ugalde, Commandant General of the Eastern Interior Provinces, frequently organized and led Spanish campaigns. A veteran war leader who developed a particular animus towards the Mescaleros during his earlier governorship of Coahuila (1777-1783), Ugalde's offensives combined violence and enslavement to devastate eastern Apaches.[32] In the spring of 1788 he proposed a general war against the Mescaleros involving the coordination of Spanish forces across three provinces (Texas, Nuevo Santander, and Coahuila) in the hopes of driving the Mescaleros north of the Rio Grande where they could be trapped and destroyed in a decisive encounter.[33] As he prepared to launch his attack, Ugalde ordered Governor Pacheco and his men to encircle the retreating Mescaleros and "annihilate them, sparing no lives other than those of children seven years old or younger […] the troops are not to concern themselves with taking prisoners."[34] Although Ugalde hoped the attack could be launched without drawing the Lipans into the conflict, many upper Lipans encamped alongside the Mescaleros survived the assault and informed their kinsmen of the "great slaughter." In response the lower Lipans immediately abandoned their encampments in central Texas, took horses from the San Antonio corral, and regrouped in the hill country to the west.[35]

[31] Pacheco to Ugalde, December 23, 1789, BA. For another sale of an Apache captive at San Antonio, or La Bahia, see Nava to Munoz, April 9, 1794, BA.

[32] Ugalde, Account of Four Campaigns against the Mescaleros, March 26, 1783, AGM, Historia, Volume 29.

[33] Ugalde, Proposal for War against the Entire Nation of Mescalero Apaches, April 28, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111.

[34] Ugalde to Pacheco, August 12, 1789, BA.

[35] Pacheco to Ugalde, August 31, 1789, BA.

As war engulfed the borderland, senior Spanish commanders issued directives that implicitly connecting Apache extermination with enslavement. With Apache warriors short of horses, in August 1791 Ramon de Castro, Ugalde's successor as Commandant General of the Eastern Interior Provinces, instructed Pacheco to prepare for the impending raids on Spanish corrals. Rather than focus on the recovery of the horses, however, Castro emphasized the need to surround and destroy the raiders themselves and to collect the ears and heads of slain Apaches. Castro later distributed orders to the provincial governors outlining their duty to pursue Apache men towards their main encampments, where their families could be attacked.[36] Castro also advocated the ongoing Spanish tactic of "receiv[ing] with deceit" Apaches who entered Spanish villages in order to parley. There they could be disarmed, surrounded, and "apprehended by surprise with their wives and little children." Ugalde first deployed such measures in 1789 when he seized five chiefs and their families, totalling sixty-six people, who visited Santa Rosa to negotiate a truce. At La Babia Castro himself refused to honor his part of a captive exchange and in the ensuing hand-to-hand combat he and his men killed the fourteen Apache men and women who had brought a Spanish captive to the *presidio* (a Spanish fort). In another murky episode, Pacheco suspected six Lipans who entered his quarters of planning his assassination and so pre-emptively arrested them. The troops killed five Lipans who allegedly resisted, and perhaps to cover his own suspect actions, Pacheco immediately executed the sole survivor.[37]

Spanish warriors coupled these duplicitous measures with seasonal attacks on Apache rancherias, frequently coordinating these raids with their Comanche and Wichita allies even as

[36] Castro to Pacheco, August 8, 1791, BA; Castro, Instructions to the Governors for Combating Hostiles, September 7, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part 1.

[37] Castro to Pacheco, August 8, 1791, BA; Castro, Instructions to the Governors for Combating Hostiles, September 7, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part 1; Ugalde to Flores, March 24, 1789, AGM, PI, Volume 159; Juan Gutierrez de la Cueva to Revilla, May 2, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part II; Castro to Revilla Gigedo, June 29, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part II; Pacheco to Espadas, December 29, 1789, BA.

various Lipan and Mescalero bands began to coordinate their actions in the face of general hostilities.[38] Over the winter of 1789-1790 two hundred Comanche men from at least three major bands joined Wichitas and Ugalde's men in the San Saba hill country and pursued retreating Apaches down the Colorado River valley. In early January the allies encircled a large body of Mescaleros and Lipans along Soledad Creek west of San Antonio and inflicted enormous casualties. Pacheco, who claimed never to have witnessed Apaches sustain such casualties in thirty-five years of frontier service, described their losses as "all their property and more than two hundred persons of both sexes and all ages," including the capture of "part of the women and children who could not escape."[39] At peace with Spanish villages they had formerly raided, Comanche war parties entered the Rio Grande valley over the following years to press their offensive against eastern Apaches. Sometimes accompanied by Spanish troops, Comanches frequently seized Apache women and children, whom they either sold at colonial outposts on their return journeys or brought back to their own villages for deployment as servants, wives, or herders.[40]

Spanish warfare and deportations also targeted the numerous indigenous bands, many drawing on apostates and *ladinos* (acculturated or Spanish-speaking Natives), who adopted Apache pastoralism and raiding to survive amid colonial designs for their dispersal, extermination, or enslavement. Such groups often emerged directly from those who escaped the missions, colleras or *obrajes* (textile workshops), and officials dreaded the possibility that such

[38] Pacheco to Ugalde, September 30, 1789, BA.

[39] For the campaign's preparation, see Ugalde to Pacheco, December 19, 1789, BA. For the battle itself and Apache losses, see Pacheco to Revilla, March 6, 1790, Nacogdoches Archive (NA), Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago; Pacheco to Revilla, June 6, 1790, BA.

[40] For Comanche-Spanish raids and captive taking, see Munoz to Emparan, September 9, 1790, BA; Castro to Revilla, July 12, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part 1; Castro to Revilla, August 10, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part 1.

individuals would "confederate" with Apache raiders operating below the Rio Grande.[41] Following a sustained campaign in the mountains of Nuevo Santander, the governor organized the deportation of 113 Aracates, a group native to the Sierra Madre Oriental range of northeastern New Spain. Officials sent these prisoners to Mexico City and then on to Veracruz, deploying them to repair the city's fortifications.[42] The Aracate deportees "escaped frequently and returned to the mountains, where they became the cruelest enemies." A later expedition into the mountains captured two apostates formerly imprisoned at Veracruz.[43] Indeed, Spanish attempts to relocate indigenous populations only increased the radius of resistance by spreading fugitives across the Interior Provinces. In the fall of 1783 the San Antonio friars and their colleagues transferred a large number of Borrados, a Coahuiltecan group, from the mission complex at Camargo. Wrenched from their homeland and disillusioned with Hispanic society, the following spring ninety-two of the 112 Borrados held at mission San Jose y San Miguel de Aguayo slipped away in the night. The governor immediately sent a detachment of soldiers and Native auxiliaries in pursuit. The party returned three days later, having captured thirty-two Borrados, and informed Cabello that the rest escaped into the thickets of the "Monte de la Laguna."[44]

With the failure to subjugate the Borrados, the brutalities of reduction galvanized indigenous opposition. Furthermore, dislocation spread this protean resistance across a vast area. In 1788 Ugalde informed the viceroy that the Borrados "had become as warlike as the Apaches,"

[41] Diego de Lasaga to Martin de Mayorga, February 9, 1783, AGM, PI, Volume 64.

[42] Lasaga to Mayorga, August 3, 1782, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1; Lasaga to Mathias de Galvez, February 18, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1.

[43] Lasaga to Galvez, 18 February, 1784, AGM, PI, Volume 64, Part 1 (quote); Sierra Gorda, State of the Indians surrounding Nuevo Santander between August 25 and October 31 [1790], and advantages gained in punishing their robberies, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I.

[44] Cabello, Monthly Report, March 31, 1784, BA.

and were raiding missions and colonial nodes along the coast as far south as Huasteca. There were even rumours that some Mescaleros broached an alliance with the Borrados in order to raid the coastal ranches of southeastern Texas.[45] During an inspection of the province Ugalde remarked bluntly on "the deplorable state of the seven missions of Texas," as apostate bands of Aranamas, Borrados, Karankawas and others groups disrupted the colonial labour regime.[46] The same year, a Borrado attacked a colonist outside San Antonio, although it was unclear whether the culprit "was from the coast or one of those who have fled from some mission."[47] Throughout the early 1790s the governor of neighbouring Nuevo Santander launched expeditions into the mountains, where his men terrorized indigenous populations already put to flight by earlier incursions. During these operations Spanish forces destroyed villages, killed dozens of warriors, and sent large numbers of women and children into bondage, generally transporting these captives southward across vast distances.[48] Yet competition between imperial and local authorities persisted over the distribution of captives, especially children, who were unlikely to survive the harsh conditions of the colleras and were more often retained locally for labour in frontier households. Following a campaign against a "Saraquais" rancheria and other bands living in the mountains, the governor reported that among twenty-two captives, nineteen children were placed in the royal jail but soon "put in the care of the said villagers" – a euphemism for enslavement.[49] Despite the logistical difficulties attending the deportation program, the highest-

[45] Ugalde to Flores, January 9, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111.

[46] Ugalde, Diary of a journey from San Antonio to San Juan Batista, April 13-June 12, 1788, AGM, PI, Volume 111.
[47] Pacheco to Ugalde, September 29, 1788, BA.

[48] Munoz to Revilla, April 12, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I; Sierra Gorda to Revilla, August 16, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I. In conformity with orders mandating the post-mortem mutilation of indigenous warriors, Spaniards took the ears and heads from slain warriors. For these orders, see Castro to Munoz, August 8, 1791, BA.

[49] Sierra Gorda, State of the Indians surrounding Nuevo Santander between August 25 and October 31 [1790], and advantages gained in punishing their robberies, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I.

ranking officials in New Spain relied on the policy as part of their arsenal for controlling Native populations.

As Comanche, Wichita, and Spanish slavers animated the traffic in captives that stretched across the borderlands, eastern Apache bands renewed their efforts to survive the onslaught. In the immediate aftermath of Ugalde's 1788 offensive, Mescalero warriors organized a series of raids against the ranching towns of the Rio Grande valley. The Mescaleros received assistance from their upper Lipan kinsmen, while lower Lipan bands retreated into the Texas hill country for their winter buffalo hunt before returning to raid livestock around San Antonio and La Bahia.[50] In September 1789 Lipans made off with a herd of Spanish horses and killed a soldier and five miners at their camp near the Pedernales River. Although shaken by their enormous casualties during the massacre at Soledad Creek in January 1790, the bloodshed continued into the next year as Lipans repeatedly hit the San Antonio corrals in search of horses and frequently clashed with defending troops and colonists.[51] Pressing southward in search of livestock and armaments, upper and lower Lipans also joined forces to raid along the Rio Grande. In one stunning attack, two hundred Lipan warriors waited until the troops left town and then took Laredo by surprise on the afternoon of April 7, 1790. Entering the plaza, the raiders seized and emptied the gunpowder arsenal before retreating with two hundred head of cattle.[52] Outgunned and outnumbered by Comanches and Spaniards, these efforts entailed enormous risks for Apache warriors. Trapped and starving within their Nueces River encampments, in 1792 Zapato Sas and fifteen of his men descended on Reynosa where they seized a young boy and horses before

[50] Pacheco, Monthly Report, January 31, 1789, BA; Pacheco to Ugalde, August 31, 1789, BA.

[51] For the murder of Lieutenant Curbelo and the miners, see Pacheco to Ugalde, September 6, 1789, BA. For Lipan raids on San Antonio and La Bahia, see Espadas to Pacheco, February 12, 1790, BA; Espadas to Pacheco, March 4, 1790, BA; Pacheco to Espadas, March 21, 1790, BA; Pacheco, Report on the Lipans, July 3, 1790, BA.

[52] Jose Menchaca to Miguel de Emparan, April 9, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 24, Part II; Jose Gonzales to Sierra Gorda, April 8, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I.

troops from Laredo cut-off their retreat and killed the entire war party.[53] Casualties were high on all sides. Spanish authorities meticulously recorded the death or capture of dozens of colonists and the theft of thousands of animals in the provinces of Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, and Nuevo Santander between 1790 and 1791.[54]

With the death of Zapato Sas, Canoso's band balanced raiding along the coastal plains against renewed commercial relationships with the other eastern nations. After raiding in Nuevo Santander, Canoso and his people drove "horses, mules, and many herds of mares" east of La Bahia, where they harvested some of the thousands of wild cattle that roamed around the nearby missions. With their surplus of livestock, meat, and captives, the band traveled towards Louisiana to trade for guns with Bidai, Akokisa, Attakapa, and French traders from Opelousas.[55]

By pursuing this course, Lipans maintained their access to weapons even as they worked diligently to negotiate peace and redeem the people they had lost at Soledad. Bearing a crucifix, in the months after the massacre, two Lipan men approached Spanish ranchers in the hopes of retrieving their wife and sister, respectively.[56] Determined to "recover all the captives taken" by Ugalde's forces, this move initiated a prolonged series of negotiations. Lipans dispatched their diplomats, often elders or women, in attempts to secure the return of captives in exchange for

[53] Sierra Gorda to Revilla, March 24, 1792, BA. In his report Sierra Gorda noted that he "sent to the commandant general the head of the aforesaid chief and the fifteen pairs of ears."

[54] Sierra Gorda, Number of People Killed or Captured and Livestock Stolen between March 17 and July 22 [1790] by the Lipans and Apaches in the towns of Laredo, Revilla, and Mier, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I. This report claimed fifty-two killed and seven captured; 257 mules; 564 horses, 1,286 cattle, and 3,756 goats have been stolen. Castro, Table of People and Livestock Killed or Captured in the various towns of Coahuila, September 6, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part 1. Castro reported nineteen Spaniards captured, nineteen killed, 1,084 horses stolen, 2,400 cattle killed, and two captives retaken.

[55] Espadas to Munoz, August 17, 1790, BA; Munoz to Revilla, Oct 25, 1790, AGM, PI, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I; Munoz to Revilla, March 2, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 162, Part III (quote); Ybarbo to Munoz, June 13, 1791, BA.

[56] Pacheco to Espadas, April 14, 1790, BA; Pacheco, Report on the Lipans, July 3, 1790, BA.

Spaniards held by the Apache.[57] This endeavor involved substantial risk given past Spanish treachery. Yet Apaches balanced this consideration against the knowledge that their kinsmen risked being dispersed across New Spain the longer they waited.[58]

Embedded within Hispanic society, the Lipan community at San Antonio's mission San Valero remained vulnerable to the vagaries of Apache-Spanish warfare that persisted outside the town. As Ugalde's campaigns against the Mescalero and upper Lipan intensified between 1789 and 1791, all of the mission Lipans, save two families headed by Mariano and Jose Maria, fled for fear that they would murdered or enslaved.[59] As the resident and independent Lipans continued to exchange information and trade goods between them, in March of 1791 Commandant General Pedro de Nava ordered the temporary expulsion of the remaining Lipan from the missions in order to conceal preparations for a major attack on the lower bands, who continued to cull animals from Texas ranches and the surrounding herds of wild and semi-wild cattle.[60]

Notwithstanding the ulterior motives that characterized the relationship between Spaniards and mission Lipans, the latter served as valuable auxiliaries for the colonial regime even as they preserved their cultural autonomy and ties to other Apaches. The mission Lipan leader Bautista and his men volunteered to recapture other indigenous runaways, thus playing a role similar to that of the Caddo slave catchers who insulated the French plantations in Louisiana. In 1792 they "captured and turned over" three Native fugitives whom they pursued on

[57] Munoz to Revilla, September 10, 1790, AGM, PI, Volume 159, Part I; Juan Gutierrez de la Cueva to Revilla, December 12, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 162, Part II; Revilla to Munoz, February 2, 1791, BA; Munoz to Revilla, February 4, 1791, NA (quote); Espadas to Munoz, June 2, 1792, BA.

[58] For Lipans' distrust of Spanish actions, and Ugalde in particular, see Munoz to Revilla, February 4, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 162, Part III.

[59] Pacheco to Ugalde, August 31, 1789, BA.

[60] Nava to Munoz, March 11, 1791, BA.

horseback.[61] A year later Mariano traveled to the lower Lipan rancherias to deliver Spanish peace overtures. He returned with three mestizo cowhands whom the lower Lipan captured during their attempt to aid Tonkawa raiders in stealing Lipan horses. Hoping to seal the peace between the lower Lipans and San Antonio, Spanish officials ordered the erection of two posts in the plaza, where the guilty *vaqueros* would be given "a hundred lashes in the presence of the greatest number of Lipans that can be assembled."[62] Although the mission Lipan supported their hosts' efforts to stabilize relations with other Apaches, they maintained their enmity towards Comanches, and Bautista himself led war parties that targeted Comanche delegations approaching San Antonio.[63]

As both sides tested the limits of cohabitation, labour remained a central concern. Imperial officials questioned why mission Lipans had not "been put to work in agriculture after being congregated so long in the aforesaid mission," as had many Apaches living on reservations in Nueva Vizcaya.[64] Yet, the mission Lipans demonstrated no interest in farming, and instead continued to conduct buffalo hunts on the surrounding plains or leave the mission to harvest prickly pear.[65] Not only did these Lipan reject Catholic indoctrination and forced labour, but after half a decade of residence at Mission Valero they insisted on preserving their separation from other mission Natives and petitioned against a proposal to merge the indigenous populations of the five missions.[66]

---

[61] Revilla Gigedo to Munoz, October 24, 1792, BA.

[62] Galindo Navarro to Nava, July 9, 1793, BA.

[63] Fernandez to Munoz, February 2, 1793, BA.

[64] Revilla Gigedo to Sierra Gorda, June 20, 1792, BA.

[65] Cortés to Sierra Gorda, July 15, 1792, BA.

[66] Nava to Munoz, July 4, 1793, BA.

With all sides threatened by the spiralling violence, peace efforts gained traction as early as 1791 when some Mescalero bands concluded a treaty in Nueva Vizcaya, followed shortly by a peace with the upper Lipan in Coahuila.[67] Although some discord persisted between those seeking peace and more militant Apaches, in early 1793 the lower Lipan bands led by Canoso, Moreno, and Jose Chiquito agreed to terms. The treaty stipulated that these bands would confine their trading in Coahuila to the towns of San Juan Batista and San Fernando de Austria while still permitting the Lipans to visit Spanish villages in Texas. The issue of captive exchanges, however, was left undetermined. Spanish officials increasingly deported their indigenous prisoners to distant locations while Apaches professed to have few captives in their possession, or at least few who were willing to return to their old lives as colonists.[68]

Gender, Violence, Captivity

The mechanisms of borderland warfare and slaving, which intensified between 1785 and the early 1790s, contained strongly gendered dimensions. Whether rivals or allies, war cultures shared by indigenous and Euro-American men informed a militarized, masculine ethos sanctioning the capture and control of women, children, and others construed as subordinates. The experiences of three Native and Hispanic women being violently shuttled across the slaving zone demonstrate larger patterns of exchange and social control. These cases also reveal the possibilities, however limited or fleeting, that captives could alter relationships based on physical and sexual exploitation.

A "native from the coast of Camargo," Maria Gertrudis de la Pena was in her mid-twenties when she appeared at San Antonio before Governor Cabello in 1785 to sue for her

[67] Nava, Regulations to be Observed with the Apaches now at Peace in Nueva Vizcaya, October 14, 1791, BA; Nava, Treaty with the Lipan chiefs, February 8, 1791, AGM, PI, Volume 224, Part II.

[68] Castro to Munoz, December 2, 1792, BA; Munoz to Bernardo Fernandez, February 22, 1793, BA; Nava to Munoz, June 6, 1793, BA.

freedom. Like most children wrenched from their natal communities, she could not recall the details of her early life. She was probably from a coastal Coahuiltecan band that became the target of Spanish raiders. In 1768 her first owner, a miner, sold the "little Indian girl" for fifty pesos to a resident of Saltillo, Jose de la Pena. Working in Pena's household as a domestic servant meant that Maria Gertrudis spent her formative years of captivity close to her homeland, even if that world became increasingly distant in her memory. After Pena raped and impregnated her, he sold her to another man, again for fifty pesos, so that she could give birth in another household and "avoid a scandal in the Villa of Saltillo of which he was at that time the second mayor." Brought to Rio Grande presidio, her child died a few days after being born. The third owner sold her a final time, again for fifty pesos, to a resident of San Antonio, Angel Navarro, with the stipulation that she would work for Navarro for three years in order to cover the fifty pesos – allegedly the cost of her upbringing. Thinking that "her status would improve" after several months of physical abuse at the Navarro household, where she lived "under the name of slave," Maria Gertrudis took action.[69]

With the help of other San Antonio residents, who probably informed her that Native slavery was illegal under Spanish law, Maria Gertrudis obtained the documents recording her prior sales and testified to her alienation from Native parents to the Vallecillo mines to Saltillo to a Rio Grande fort and finally to San Antonio. Reviewing the royal laws, which "greatly favour the freedom of the Indians," Cabello ruled on her behalf on the basis that she could not be enslaved "due to her nature." The governor, himself deeply implicated in sponsoring anti-Apache

[69] Maria Gertrudis de la Pena, Deposition, February 7, 1785, BA.

slaving campaigns, decreed that she was a free person and voided any further obligations to Navarro.[70]

While demands for domestic and sexual labour drew indigenous captives into the missions, mines, and ranches of the lower Rio Grande towns, unlicensed traders in the interior continued to ignore or exploit the ransom system. Buying or otherwise obtaining indigenous women was a long-standing practice among the mostly francophone slavers who spent long residences among their indigenous partners. Although the ransom fund meant that many European captives could be redeemed, a 1786 murder at Nacogdoches exposed the shadowy networks of exchange and exploitation that prevented many from returning home.

With Ybarbo on a trading expedition, during the summer of 1786 the interim commandant of Nacogdoches accepted the passports of two French traders. They claimed to be going on a hunting expedition, but the officer feared they were heading to the Taovaya villages to encourage the warriors to "steal our horses to use for bartering in trade." On their return from the Taovaya village the traders stopped to visit a friend, another Frenchman residing at Nacogdoches. After an evening spent drinking brandy, a dispute erupted and the traders savagely beat their host to death with a stick: "the entire left eye was caved in [and] the entire body was black from the many blows they had given him." Apprehended before they could flee, the Frenchmen had in tow a Spanish woman, Anna Maria Baca, and her young child, whom they ransomed from the Taovayas in exchange for several guns and other goods. Holding the accused in the stocks, the interim commandant sequestered Baca and her son, since he suspected the traders planned to sell her into concubinage at Natchitoches, "where there could not but be plenty

[70] Cabello, Decree, March 5, 1785, BA.

of Frenchmen to purchase and molest her, as is their custom, since she is still attractive."[71] In colonial borderland towns, slaving continued to facilitate male sexual violence against the most vulnerable women, especially kin-less ex-captives.[72]

Alongside French slavers, Comanche-Spanish-Wichita warfare against Apaches between 1787 and 1791 brought myriad captives into colonial society. Once again, redeemed female prisoners continued to face a violent and uncertain existence. Hauling captives back to San Antonio in the aftermath of their victory at Soledad, Comanche and Spanish warriors transformed the town into a bustling slave market. Among the officers who profited from the campaign, *alferez* ("ensign" or "second lieutenant") Manuel de Urrutia disturbed other slavers. Alcoholic and temperamental, Urrutia further scandalized his superiors by supplying friendly Lipans with ammunition and weapons and information. Pacheco also revealed that Urrutia acquired "a Comanche woman known as La Yuta," that he took from the Lipans defeated at Soledad. The alferez forced the woman into concubinage but she resisted by fleeing to the homes of his neighbours until Urrutia "disabled her with beatings, and they could not get her away from him." Ultimately, Urrutia's insubordination compelled Governor Pacheco to imprison him in the jail until he could be sobered up and transferred to the Bahia garrison.[73] Eventually returning to San Antonio, Urrutia returned to drinking, often wandering through the town with a bow and quiver, railing against La Yuta for "how ungrateful she was [and] how much it had cost him to rescue her." The official interpreters and other influential alliance members, including Francisco Chaves and a Comanche captain who treated La Yuta "like a sister," eventually secured her

[71] Cordoba to Cabello, report on a murder at Nacogdoches, August 26, 1786, BA.

[72] For the continuity of sexual violence against women in borderland towns, see Manuel de Mier y Teran to Jose Batres, July 7, 1828, in Jack Jackson and John Wheat, ed. and trans., *Texas by Teran: The Diary kept by General Manuel de Mier y Teran on his 1828 Inspection of Texas* (Austin, 2000), 103.

[73] Pacheco to Espadas, April 26, 1790, BA.

release. Adopted by the Comanche leader, on June 11, 1791 La Yuta and her new kinsmen rode out of the town. Insubordinate as ever, Urrutia began to plot with the mission Lipan leader Mariano and "the mute Lipan" new means of kidnapping the woman. Fortunately, her escape proved permanent.[74]

These incidents, and others like them, exemplify the experience of the enslaved women and children shipped between the nodes (trade fairs, towns, missions) of the pastoral slaving zone. Compared with the indigenous engines of capture that determined a captive's degree of integration based on age, gender, and skills, colonial slaving entailed much higher risks of sexual violence, particularly for isolated female captives transferred to borderland outposts where they lacked kin. The long-distance movement of captives continued after the initial captures, bringing Apache prisoners into Natchitoches and other borderland plantation communities. By the 1790s, the descendants of indigenous slaves who passed into the plantation zone began to challenge the racialized conditions of Louisiana's chattel slavery regime. They did so at a time when rumours of Jacobin agents fomenting Indian warfare and slave rebellion plunged the colonial world into crisis.

Panic and Crisis in the Borderland, 1790-1795

Scouring distant worlds for captive labour, slavers infused their own societies with the seeds of crisis, both real and imagined. Mirroring developments across the greater Caribbean world, cycles of panic and terror enveloped the pastoral-plantation borderland during the last decade of the eighteenth century. Reflecting the borderland's Atlantic entanglements, the revolutionary struggles that began with the French and Haitian revolutions found new outlets in the continental plantation zone. For imperial agents and slave masters, the spread of democratic ideologies gave new force to old concerns about the loyalty of French traders, Native warriors,

[74] Jose Manuel Castro to Francisco Amangual, June 12, 1791, BA; Amangual to Munoz, June 13, 1791, BA.

and black slaves. In Louisiana, Spanish officials attempted to seal the province from the revolutionary contagion by ordering the suspension of slave importations from the Caribbean, instead relying on direct imports from Africa. In 1790, the governor forbade "entrance into [Louisiana] of any bought negroes or negro refugees from the French colonies, nor any half-caste person who may be a bad influence on the subjects of His Majesty."[75] Nevertheless, the 1790s witnessed panics over the stability of alliances with Native peoples and the possibility that black Haitians' war for liberation would find imitators in the Louisiana backcountry.

As they had since the 1770s, Spanish officers railed against the continuous exchange patterns between borderland villagers and Apache bands, who could "not be prevented from entering our open towns without walls, moats, stakes, or parapets."[76] Given the localized conditions of war and peace, even the general conflict of 1787-1791 failed to totally disrupt these commercial interactions. Meeting with Apaches or trading with them through intermediaries among the coastal nations, Natchitoches merchants preserved their role in the guns-for-livestock trade. Serving as the Natchitoches commandant during the early 1790s, St. Denis' grand-son, himself deeply implicated in the inter-colonial contraband trade, explained to his Spanish superiors that French traders could not be prevented from entering Texas by land or water.[77]

After Spain declared war on republican France in 1793, long-standing concerns over Apache infiltration of Spanish villages and the ubiquitous role of French traders within the borderland economy intertwined to conjure new fears. Stationed at Chihuahua City, Nava received word from an Apache chief at El Paso that an officer "beyond Coahuila" warned the

[75] Estevan Miro to Luis de las Casas, August 21, 1790, in *Despatches of the Spanish Governors of Louisiana, 1766-1799* (New Orleans, 1939), Book VII: 28, Howard-Tilton Library, Tulane University, New Orleans.

[76] Francisco Crespo to Jose Antonio de Areche, November 22, 1783, AGI, PI, Volume 64.

[77] Louis de Blanc to Munoz, August 1, 1791, BA; de Blanc to Munoz, October 31, 1791, BA.

Lipans and Mescaleros to be wary of Spanish peace overtures, as these were merely a pretext to congregate them near presidios in order "to capture and exterminate them." Furthermore, this officer allegedly offered six guns to each chief who would visit him, and another two to each warrior. Other rumours suggested that Louisiana Jacobins would agitate within the provincial garrisons, composed largely of French-speaking troops, to mutiny while traders at Natchitoches spread rumors "among our Indian allies contrary to the peace [agreement], inducing them to break it and to attack us, either on their own, or joining with them."[78] Nava suspected the Apaches themselves were at the origins of this hearsay, but authorities later traced the rumour to Jean Baptiste Bousquet, a trader Mézières previously assigned to the Tawakonis. Traveling to the Tawakoni village to investigate, a licensed trader from San Antonio reported the arrival of "six men and one black slave," probably Anglo-Americans from the Illinois Country. With the aftershocks of European warfare reverberating into the borderlands, Spanish officials heightened their already substantial fear of French or American traders whom they suspected of recruiting Natives for an invasion of Texas in conjunction with a French naval assault on the Gulf Coast. In reality, the French traders who supplied or repaired firearms for indigenous clients pursued localized commercial interests.[79] Withdrawn from the Tawakoni post and sentenced to exile, Bousquet escaped with his family. Other traders from Opelousas and Natchitoches resumed the trade in firearms, such that one exasperated official complained that "as trade runs with all people in the world, so it runs among the Indians, and from hand to hand, it ends up with the Apaches."[80]

[78] Nava to Munoz, July 9, 1793, BA; Nava to Munoz, July 9, 1793, BA (second letter).

[79] Carondelet to las Casas, April 14, 1792, in *Despatches of the Spanish Governors*, VII: 438; Nava to Munoz, July 9, 1793, BA; Nava to Munoz, August 19, 1793, BA; Nava to Munoz, March 27, 1794, BA; Nava to Munoz, April 23, 1794, BA (quote).

[80] Nava to Munoz, May 13, 1794, BA; Cristobal de Cordoba to Munoz, June 22, 1794, BA (quote).

Officials' fears of weapons entering Apache bands paled in comparison with their dread of revolutionary slaves. As slaving patterns comingled continental and Atlantic captives from the 1770s onward, the emergence of a mixed Native-black servile population exacerbated tensions among Louisiana planters and Spanish officials. In Spanish Louisiana, the first case of a Native slave suing for their liberty under the stipulations of Iberian law dated to 1783, two years before Maria Gertrudis launched her successful suit at San Antonio. Appearing at New Orleans, a slave named Jeanne claimed to be the "natural daughter of Louise *Sauvagesse* and father unknown." Appraised at a value of 500 pesos, Jeanne attempted to purchase her freedom but it is unclear whether she succeeded.[81] No more indigenous slave plaintiffs appeared in the Spanish courts for another seven years, but the influx of Native captives from the borderlands into the plantation zone carried consequences that would soon be felt across the province.

In 1787, the lieutenant-governor of Spanish Illinois returned to New Orleans with two Native slaves. When he died three years later, the enslaved siblings, Pierre and Marie, sued his heirs on the basis of their indigenous heritage, which precluded their enslavement under Spain's 1542 New Laws of the Indies. As we have seen, these prohibitions were very seldom enforced. Maria' suit, no longer extant, resulted in her successful manumission. With this precedent, the governor quickly granted manumission papers to her brother Pierre. He likewise claimed descent from "Catalina" a Native of the "Chise Nation." The governor also manumitted another man, possibly their half-sibling.[82] The next case to appear before the governor involved Marianne, who sued her mistress, a free "mulatta" named Francisca Pomet. With the help of a colonist, she

[81] Jeanne vs. Jean Baptiste Maroteau, August 21, 1783, Spanish Judicial Records, Louisiana Historical Center (LHC), New Orleans. Under Spanish law, the legal action under which slaves were permitted to sue for their liberty was known as *coartacion*.

[82] Pierre and Baptiste vs Bourgignon, January 23, 1790, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC; Pierre vs. Francisco Cruzat heirs, May 4, 1790, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC.

argued that her indigenous heritage made her enslavement illegal under the New Laws of 1542. Despite Pomet's arguments that she "raised and educated her from a young age," and that Marianne's "inept work, indolence, and other misdeeds," made the suit spurious, the governor again granted freedom papers.[83] Months later a mixed-race slave, "Joseph Indian *griffe*, natural son of the Indian Lisette" left his master's plantation south of New Orleans and successfully sued for his freedom.[84] Native slaves continued their efforts during the tenure of Louisiana's next governor, the Burgundian officer Francisco Luis Hector, Baron de Carondelet. With an unwarranted reputation as sympathetic to slaves and Jacobins, Carondelet remained the target of wealthy planters' ire throughout his term.[85] Determined to impose imperial decrees, Carondelet allowed the suits to continue and granted freedom papers in each case.

In one of the most sweeping cases to date, in 1793 an enslaved woman named Cécile, "daughter of Maria of the Patouca Nation, and a negro slave" won her freedom from her Pointe Coupée master and then launched a similar suit on behalf of her sister and her sister's children and grandchildren. Among the evidence she provided, Cécile's 1746 baptism certificate recorded her incorporation into French colonial society, noting that her mother Maria was also an enslaved

[83] Marianne vs Francisca Pomet, January 13, 1791, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC.

[84] Joseph v Juan Baptista Martinez, July 12, 1791, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC. There were two other successful coartacions in 1791, but the condition of the documents makes it difficult to reconstruct events. See Therese vs widow Bienvenu, April 27, 1791, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC; Julien vs Tallon July 12, 1791, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC.

[85] For Carondelet's positive reputation among slaves, see Narcisse vs Croizet, July 5, 1793, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC. For Carondelet's difficulties in appeasing the planter elite, see Ernest R. Liljegren, "Jacobinism in Spanish Louisiana, 1792-1797," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 22:1 (January 1939): 47-97; Paul F. Lachance, "The Politics of Fear: French Louisianans and the Slave Trade, 1786-1809," *Plantation Society in the Americas: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Tropical and Subtropical History and Culture* 1:2 (June 1979): 173-174.

Native woman. Cécile's nieces and nephews thus represented a potential third generation of slaves of Plains Indian descent, probably Apaches.[86]

As the success rate of these suits multiplied, enraged planters launched their own legal offensive. Along with twenty-six others, Julien Poydras, a Pointe Coupée magnate and the wealthiest person in the province, led the planter elite's efforts to halt the emancipations. The planters railed against the "evil seducers of the many slaves pretending to be exempt from servitude" on the "specious pretext of supposing they are the descendants of free Indians." Citing their imminent financial ruin, and hence that of the colony, they requested an immediate suspension of the suits until a royal decree could resolve the issue.[87] Carondelet himself described how "the many Indians presenting themselves and declaring themselves free are ruining a number of families that hold no other slaves other than these, or mestizos, or their descendants." Drawing on the past policies of the French regime, Poydras and his colleagues insisted that Louisiana's history of "just wars" against Native enemies, specifically the Natchez, established their right to "buy, hold, and sell" Native slaves. Likewise suspecting Jacobin agents or other malcontents were the masterminds of the freedom suits, Carondelet feared a repetition of "the dissentions that have ruined the French Colonies [Haiti]." Seeking a resolution that would "satisfy all the masters, as well as the slaves" the governor proposed that "all Indians, or descendants of the Natchez Nation, having been reduced to slavery as punishment for their perfidy," could obtain their liberty for the price of 250 pesos – "the regular price of an African negro." Finally, after the passage of one year, all native slaves or their descendants would be

[86] Cécile vs Jean Baptiste Tounoir, August 7, 1793, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC. Another case also involved a Plains Apache woman enslaved since she was sixteen. See Marie Therese vs Joseph Verloin DeGruy, July 19, 1793, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC.

[87] Julien Poydras, et al., to Carondelet, February 28, 1794, Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Audencia de Santo Domingo, legajo 2563, Monroe Library, Loyola University, New Orleans.

freed.[88] Awaiting the royal response to his proposal, in the interim Carondelet ordered a suspension of all pending freedom suits. Some planters interpreted the suspension as a definitive resolution on their behalf, and at least one master attempted to re-enslave a former bondswoman.[89]

In the months that followed the suspension of the freedom suits, the slave masters of Pointe Coupée confirmed their worst fears during the discovery and brutal suppression of a suspected slave insurrection. Located roughly between Natchitoches and New Orleans along the twisting banks of the Mississippi, by 1788 Pointe Coupée had a ratio of three slaves to every free white, among the highest in the province. Tensions between masters and slaves had been brewing for some time – in 1791 planters uncovered the efforts of a group of "Mina" slaves to seize the post's arsenal and launch a revolt.[90] Relative calm persisted for another four years, but the legacy of the freedom suits re-emerged when planters detected another supposed plot in the spring of 1795. On April 10 two colonists reported that some local Tunica Indians overheard black slaves plotting a massacre "because the whites had denied them their freedom." "Apprehensive that the negroes might succeed in killing them [as well]," the Tunicas named several suspects, followed by denunciations made by other black slaves. Reflecting the paranoia over slave insurrection and Indian war that engulfed Louisiana during the 1790s, Carondelet rejoiced at the plot's discovery, otherwise "it might have spread to the other posts of this province […] as undoubtedly [colonists] would have fallen victims to the fury of the Indians, and

[88] Carondelet to Eugenio Llaguna y Amirola, May 17, 1794, AGI, Audencia de Santo Domingo, legajo 2563.

[89] Francois Duvergès vs St Martin, January 14, 1795, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC.

[90] For populations and social conditions at Pointe Coupée during the 1791 plot, see Ulysses S. Ricard, Jr., "The Pointe Coupée Slave Conspiracy of 1791," *Proceedings of the Meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society* 15 (1992): 116-120.

the province of Louisiana would have been converted into a lake of blood."[91] During the terror that followed, planters and officials rounded up over sixty suspects, eventually hanging twenty-six slaves and exiling or sentencing to hard labour a number of others, including four white and three free black men. From May 29 to June 2 the galley which held the prisoners meandered downriver, the crew stopping at each plantation district to perform the executions and mount the victims' decapitated heads as a warning to others. Tellingly, five planters who signed the 1794 petition demanding an end to the freedom suits had slaves implicated in the plot, including twelve from the Poydras plantation. Among them was Antoine Sazarin, a "mulatto" who claimed Native ancestry but had his suit denied.[92] News of the Pointe Coupée terror soon filtered into New Spain. In the fall of 1795 the largest slave-owner at Nacogdoches, French-born Bernard Dortolant, departed his plantation to collect debts at Chihuahua. Upon his arrival Dortolant informed Commandant General Nava of the uprising "meditated by the negroes of Louisiana" and the added threat posed by future insurrections if Spanish officials failed to maintain the amity of the Comanches, Caddos, and Wichitas as a security buffer.[93]

Despite decades of indigenous and colonial participation in raiding and human trafficking, by the early nineteenth century it was possible for a newcomer to miss the connections between the pastoral economy of violence and Louisiana's plantation regime. Pierre-Louis Berquin-Duvallon, a French sugar planter who fled the Haitian Revolution, arrived in New Orleans in 1799. He later published a description of Louisiana to raise Bonapartist interests in

[91] Carondolet to las Casas, June 16, 1795, in *Despatches of the Spanish Governors*, V: 247-249 (quotes).

[92] For the 1795 plot and its aftermath, see "Criminal Proceedings against the negroes of Pointe Coupée on the crime of revolution or conspiracy against the Whites, 1795," May 2, 1795, Spanish Judicial Records, LHC; Carondolet to las Casas, June 16, 1795 and August 22, 1795, in *Despatches of the Spanish Governors*, V: 250-252; 351-358. For Sazarin's plight, see Stephen Webre, "The Problem of Indian Slavery in Spanish Louisiana, 1769-1803," *Louisiana History* 25:2 (Spring 1984): 132.

[93] Nava to Munoz, October 6, 1795, BA.

reviving France's North American empire. Like other fleeing masters, he brought several slaves with him. In the ethnographic section of his account, Berquin-Duvallon espoused the contemporary racial discourse that depicted Africans as a people "nature has seemingly destined for slavery." By comparison, the indigenous peoples of North America were "such enemies of subjugation," – a fact proven by "time and experience" – that they could never be enslaved.[94] Although Berquin-Duvallon was a colonial booster and not a historian, his ignorance of indigenous slavery points to the ubiquity of black captives within Louisiana's slave regime.[95]

The rapid decline of French interests in Native captives was hardly a "natural" process. The waning of colonial-indigenous warfare in Texas and other borderland provinces substantially decreased the supply of indigenous captives and precipitated the dissipation of the indigenous slave trade during the turn of the nineteenth century. Even at peak levels, the pastoral economy of violence could not meet the soaring labour demands on Louisiana plantations, where slavers now looked exclusively to Africans and African-Americans to produce cotton, indigo, and sugar. With the passing of borderlanders such as de Mézières, Grappé, Pavie, and Ybarbo – men who straddled the worlds of continental and saltwater trade – a new generation of slavers embraced the potential for Atlantic slavery to generate enormous capital. During the early

---

[94] Pierre-Louis Berquin-Duvallon, *Vue de la Colonie Espagnole du Mississippi, ou des Provinces de Louisiane et Floride Occidentale, en l'Année 1802* (Paris, 1803), 255, 256, 259 (quotes). For the role of St. Domingue planters in the Louisiana slave regime, see Carl A. Brasseaux and Glenn R. Conrad, eds., *The Road to Louisiana: The Saint-Domingue Refugees, 1792–1809* (Lafayette, 1992); Robert L. Paquette, "Revolutionary St Domingue in the Making of Territorial Louisiana," in David Barry Gaspar and David Patrick Geggus, eds., *A Turbulent Time: The French Revolution and the Greater Caribbean* (Bloomington, 1997), 204-225.

[95] Natural increase and the importation of an estimated 12000 to 15000 black slaves during the Spanish regime, and another 12000 during the early American regime (1803-1810), brought Louisiana's slave population to nearly 25000 in 1806, see Paul F. Lachance, "The Politics of Fear: French Louisianans and the Slave Trade, 1786-1809," *Plantation Society in the Americas: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Tropical and Subtropical History and Culture* 1:2 (June 1979): 196. For slave importations from the Caribbean, Africa, and other sources see Jean-Pierre Leglaunec, "Slave Migrations in Spanish and Early American Louisiana: New Sources and New Estimates," *Louisiana History* 46:2 (Spring 2005): 209; Gregory E. O'Malley, "Beyond the Middle Passage: Slave Migration from the Caribbean to North America, 1619-1807," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 66:1 (January 2009): 153. Natchitoches' slave population was 936 in 1802, and 1476 in 1810, see H. Sophie Burton and F. Todd Smith, *Colonial Natchitoches: A Creole Community on the Louisiana-Texas Frontier* (College Station, 2008), 92.

nineteenth century monoculture and ranching vastly outstripped the "Indian trade" as sources of colonial revenue. The vagaries of supply, credit, and alliance politics further discouraged ambitious colonists from investing in the economy of the Plains. This preference is striking given the social discord endemic to plantation society, especially during the revolutionary period when the "spirit of St. Domingue" conjured the slave masters' apocalypse. Poydras, who complained that Spanish authorities "hung 20,000 *piastres* worth of my negroes" following the 1795 Pointe Coupée terror, later warned a friend that "as for commerce with the *sauvages* it is a trap; those who have fallen in, have never been able to get out […] Try to make as good a crop as you can."[96] Another St Domingue refugee and commentator on Louisiana's economic potential, James Pitot, still believed it possible to profit from the livestock and fur trades even as he pointed to the reduction of eastern Caddos by the "Osage War and smallpox" and Spain's failure to establish a trading post within the Comancheria.[97] Nevertheless, Pitot himself soon wedded his financial fortunes to Atlantic slaving, with his New Orleans firm selling both creoles and African-born slaves.[98] The comingled slaving cultures that had created the pastoral-plantation borderland were beginning to disaggregate.

Conclusion

Between 1785 and 1795, the militarized slaving practices of the preceding decades plunged borderland societies into varying degrees of crisis. Seeking better sources of trade, Comanche and Wichita bands formed an expansive alliance with their former Spanish foes, a

[96] Poydras to Claude Poydras, August 25, 1796; Poydras to Antoine des Autels, May 11, 1800, in [Julien Poydras], *Private and Commercial Correspondence of an Indigo and Cotton Planter, 1794-1800* (1794), 22; 80 (quotes). Typescript at the Jones Hall Louisiana Research Center, Tulane University, New Orleans.

[97] James Pitot, *Observations on the Colony of Louisiana from 1796 to 1802*, Henry C. Pitot, trans. (Baton Rouge, 1979), 139-140.

[98] See advertisement for sale of a "likely mulatto girl, about 22 or 23 years of age," by "James Pitot & Co.," in *New Orleans Gazette*, October 29, 1807.

pact that infolded slaving prospects within a general war against Apacheria. Among the captives taken by all sides, women and children remained predominant. Inserted into indigenous and colonial labour regimes, these captives faced quotidian exploitation and abuse among their captors even as some possibilities opened for incorporation or manumission. Reflecting long-term patterns of exchange across the pastoral and plantation economies, by the end of the eighteenth century a generation of indigenous-descended slaves came of age in Louisiana. In a society wracked by rumours of Indian war and slave uprisings, these slaves embodied the connections between continental and saltwater slaveries. By 1800, Comanche hegemony on the Southern Plains and planter rule in Louisiana seemed to restore order for the borderland's most powerful interests, but the increasing divergence of pastoral and plantation economies heralded new social formations, once again driven by slaving.

Chapter 4: Newcomers, Revolution, and Divergent Slaveries, 1800-1820

In the aftermath of the Comanche-Spanish-Wichita alliance's anti-Apache campaigns, economic and military power in the Texas borderland shifted towards the Comancheria. From the 1790s onward, Comanche bands – the mobile nodes of the Plains economy – extended their trade networks from the upper Pecos to the Gulf Coast, bringing together a kaleidoscopic array of colonial peoples and products. Yet continued Cheyenne, Osage, and Pawnee military pressure pushed many bands south of the Arkansas River, and new factions emerged within the changing political geography of the indigenous world.[1] Granted some reprieve from enemy offensives, Lipan bands retreated southward into the Rio Grande valley and encamped near Spanish villages, with whom they traded in hides, meat, and other goods. Further west, many Mescalero bands settled on military *establicimentos* in Coahuila and Nuevo Vizcaya, the first Indian reservations in North America.[2] In 1809, Texas Governor Manuel Salcedo remarked that the region's Native peoples "are peaceful and the worst they are wont to do is to steal mules and horses."[3] Overall, Comanche hegemony brought trade and prosperity.

Despite increased economic activity, the general peace that persisted between 1795 and 1810 masked the deeper instability of indigenous-colonial relations. Over the following decade, local crises and structural differences between Euro-American and indigenous slaving economies erupted into war. Unfortunately for borderland peoples, the implosion of the cruel embrace that once connected the pastoral-plantation borderland augured further violence and upheaval.

---

[1] Kotsotekas ranged east and south, often below the Rio Grande. Yamparicas and Jupes lived along the Arkansas, in western and northern Comancheria. Tenewas were eastering Yamparicas who moved down the Brazos, Colorado, and Red rivers, gradually adopting a new clan identity. See Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 25; 151.

[2] Matthew Babcock, "Blurred Borders: North America's Forgotten Apache Reservations," in Juliana Barr and Edward Countryman, eds., *Contested Spaces of Early North America* (Philadelphia, 2014), 163-183.

[3] Manuel Maria Salcedo, "Report on Texas," August 8, 1809, Nettie Lee Benson, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 71:4 (April 1968): 614.

Between 1810 and the early 1820s indigenous power, particularly the emergence of multi-ethnic, intra-indigenous cohorts, dismantled the colonies of northern New Spain. For pastoralist indigenous societies, this was less a process of destruction than of refashioning northeastern Mexico into an expansive raiding zone that supplied livestock for trade with Anglo-Americans. Spanish officers felt certain they knew the origins of this drastic decline, blaming a decade of Indian warfare, revolution, and foreign invasions for the province's descent into "ruin and destruction."[4] One soldier identified the outbreak of the Mexican War of Independence in 1811 as the turning point. He argued that Comanches turned on their Spanish allies when "the revolution which broke out in the center of the kingdom came to the ears of those Indians […] They took advantage of the occasion when they saw the troops with other duties, and hastened to make war against the unarmed herdsman and peaceable settler, robbing, killing, and seizing prisoners."[5] Stressing external forces, Spanish ethnocentrism elided the complexity of indigenous objectives. Scholars have generally treated these developments in isolation, or have cast Native raiders as the pawns of Anglo-American traders who sent them to empty the corrals of northern Mexico.

An interpretation based on the Native perspective suggests that indigenous actions stemmed from the convergence of kinship, material interests, and war cultures. Developing shared sets of military and ritual practices, Apache, Caddoan, and Comanche free associations retained their protean nature by incorporating members from both Native and non-Native societies. Nomadic pastoralism and diffuse authority structures created highly mobile and socially fluid societies. The warrior-trader stratum focused primarily on acquiring livestock,

[4] Antonio Martinez, Report, May 1, 1821, NA.

[5] Juan Antonio Padilla, "Report on the Barbarous Indians of the Province of Texas," 1820, Mattie Austin Hatcher, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 23:1 (July 1919): 55. For ecological factors, especially the drought of 1780-1820 contributing to the breakdown of peace, see Anderson, *Indian Southwest*, 217.

taking captives on a provisional basis in order to manage their herds or increase reproductive personnel. As herders, guides, interpreters, wives, and warriors, captives became an increasingly numerous and integral segment of indigenous bands, especially Comanches. Surplus animals were exchanged with itinerant Euro-American traders, who moved horses and cattle towards the eastern plantations desperate for animal labour. As intra- and inter-indigenous alliances expanded, they rapidly infolded participants in the colonial civil war raging across the borderlands. Summoning Euro-American traders, rebels, and other "social bandits" into their rancherias, the indigenous war leaders who mapped a new social geography onto Texas between 1811 and 1821 created multi-ethnic coalitions whose scope and power exceeded those of the eighteenth century.

For Apache and Comanche free associations, the resurgence of raiding during the 1810s and 1820s did not signal the end of cross-cultural alliances, but their flowering in unexpected directions as indigenous peoples reassessed their opportunities. Drawing upon engines of capture that shared advantages in mobility, fluidity, and ability to incorporate outsiders, indigenous bands sought each other as valuable partners in maximizing their trade networks. By the early nineteenth century, the long-term consequences of slaving facilitated the expansion of multi-ethnic alliances within the pastoral economy of violence.

Peace, Economic Growth, and Changing Populations, 1795-1810

The structure and composition of borderland unfree labour regimes began to shift beginning around 1800. Within the Southern United States and the Spanish Caribbean, territorial conquests, technical innovations, and economic integration led planters to expand their investments in the Atlantic slave trade. The rise of new plantation zones, what some scholars have labeled the "second slavery," came at staggering human costs: hundreds of thousands of

new victims were inserted into brutalizing cotton and sugar-producing regimes.[6] Not generally associated with these broader changes in the history of plantation slavery, the communities of the pastoral-plantation borderland experienced their own variation of these processes. The stability afforded by the 1785 Comanche-Spanish peace allowed Tejano colonists to increase production by expanding their ranching economy and establishing a cross-border livestock trade with Louisiana, mirroring on a smaller scale the successes of Comanche pastoralism.

The loosening bonds of the pastoral-plantation borderland unfolded amid the expansion of colonial diasporas. Determined to drive profits by increasing their property in human beings, borderland planters demanded access to the Atlantic slave system even as escapes and insurrections threatened the plantation zone. Beyond expanding the scope of African diasporas, the growth of the Anglo-American plantation regime initiated substantial changes to the social composition of the borderland. The rise of the "Cotton Kingdom" in the U.S. South pushed Native newcomers into the borderlands, adding new groups to the constellation of indigenous peoples. In turn, these economic and demographic changes became bound up with indigenous-colonial alliances that determined regional stability.

East of the Mississippi, Anglo-Americans placed mounting pressure on the land base of even the most powerful southeastern nations: the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, and Creek confederacies. Threatened by Anglo-American encroachment, during the 1790s many of these peoples voluntarily moved across the Mississippi into lands already occupied by Caddoan, Akokisan, and Muskogean peoples. Some of the latter groups, such as the Apalachee and Tunica, had fled westward following France's defeat in 1763, when they felt imperiled by British designs

[6] Anthony E. Kaye, "The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century American South and the Atlantic World," *Journal of Southern History* 75:3 (August 2009): 627-650; Javier Lavina and Michael Zeuske, eds., *The Second Slavery: Mass Slaveries and Modernity in the Americas and the Atlantic Basin* (Berlin, 2014); Dale W. Tomich, ed., *The Politics of the Second Slavery* (Albany, 2016).

"to enslave us."[7] Over the ensuing decades these diasporic bands formed new socio-economic bonds with the French-dominated communities of the lower Red River, where conversion to Catholicism and market relations provided opportunities for survivors and their descendants. In 1795 the Apalachee chief Denis sold a black woman and her two teenage daughters to a Natchitoches planter, Denis having acquired this enslaved family from "a *sauvage* named Cachonalée of the Choctaw nation, from whence came the two little negroes."[8] By the turn of the century the incorporation of the "scattered survivors" into the Louisiana economy had proceeded such that one observer remarked how they "spend more time at work than in hunting."[9] With greater pressures placed on tribal lands from Anglo-Americans, in 1804 the new Apalachee chief, Louis Tensa, requested permission from Spanish authorities in Texas to move his people from the Rapides district to the Nacogdoches area.[10]

Adapting their farming, hunting, and ranching techniques to the wooded river valleys of east Texas, emigrant bands of Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Cherokees competed and conflicted with the resident indigenous nations.[11]These emigrant bands passed through the plantation zone on their way to the appealing ranching and hunting grounds of the Angelina, Neches, Sabine, and Trinity rivers. Unlike some of their kinsmen who remained within their southeastern homelands, these emigrant bands did not develop a plantation economy. This second Native diaspora pushed

[7] "D'Abbadie's Journal," July 18, 1764, in Carl A. Brasseaux, ed. and trans., *A Comparative View of French Louisiana, 1699 and 1762: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques-Blaise d'Abbadie* (Lafayette, 1981), 123.

[8] Denis to Louis Monet, sale of slaves, March 4, 1795, NPCR, Volume 26-A, Document, 2601; Joseph to Bertrand Mailloche, sale of habitation, March 10, 1795, NPCR, Volume 26-A, Document 2603.

[9] Pitot, *Observations on the Colony of Louisiana*, 139.

[10] Jose Joaquin Ugarte to Juan Bautista de Elguezabal, April 3, 1804, BA.

[11] Lawrence Kinnaird and Lucia B. Kinnaird, "Choctaws West of the Mississippi, 1766-1800," *SWHQ* 83:4 (April 1980): 349-370; Ernest William Winkler, "The Cherokee Indians in Texas," *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 7:2 (October 1903): 95-165.

into Caddo territory, sparking a series of diplomatic crises. Angered by Choctaw depredations, in 1792 an Ais man named Taruca and his relatives murdered a Choctaw, whose own relatives pursued and killed Taruca before they continued harvesting deer skins for trade in Louisiana.[12] In 1795 several Caddo chiefs wrote a letter to Louis de Blanc, St. Denis' grand-son and commandant at Natchitoches, whom they addressed as "our brother." They complained of the murders and horse thefts perpetrated by Choctaws. Citing their long-standing ties to the Natchitoches French, the Caddo leaders "asked for the head" of the Choctaw bandit Outabé.[13] Ignoring Spanish efforts to broker a peace, Choctaws continued to raid and hunt on Caddo territory throughout the 1790s and early 1800s, while Caddos mobilized their confederacy to combat the intruders.[14] These incidents placed Spanish authorities in a bind between supporting their Caddo allies, whose loyalty United States Indian agents assailed with trade goods, and their desire to have Choctaws and other southeastern bands provide a buffer against penetration by the U.S. and its citizens.[15] By 1809, diminishing Caddo strength in the face of disease, land loss, and Osage and Choctaw raids allowed emigrant Alabama, Coushatta, Choctaw and Cherokee bands to establish villages along the river valleys of eastern Texas.[16]

[12] Cristobal Hilario de Cordoba to Louis de Blanc, June 27, 1792, BA; Cordoba to Munoz, June 20, 1794, BA.

[13] Caddo chiefs to Louis Charles de Blanc, April 28, 1795, Louisiana Papers (LP), Box 3, Folder 279, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[14] For Caddo-Choctaw warfare, see Jose Maria Guadriana to the Baron de Carondelet, March 2, 1797, LP, Box 3, Folder 329. The Caddo chief Dehahuit and several Choctaw captains negotiated a truce at Natchitoches in 1797, but the conflict resumed over the succeeding years, see Felix Trudeau to Manuel Gayoso de Lemos, October 16, 1797, LP, Box 5, Folder 514; Moral to Elguezabal, January 28, 1800, BA; Marques de Casa Calvo to Trudeau, March 6, 1800, LP, Box 5, Folder 529; Jose Ignacio de Elguezabal to Francisco Viana, July 23, 1807, BA.

[15] For tribes seeking residence inTexas, see Felipe Neri, Baron de Bastrop to Nemesio Salcedo, September 29, 1805, NA; Antonio Cordero to Nemesio Salcedo, September 4, 1807, BA.

[16] Samuel Davenport, "Indians of East Texas," [no date], 1809, Robert Bruce Blake Papers, Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin.

While Native emigration and dislocation characterized one aspect of the region's changing demographics, the influx of black fugitives during the early nineteenth century added another dynamic to shifting labour relations within the pastoral-plantation borderland. As we have seen, *marronage* became endemic in the 1780s, but the majority of maroon bands operated within the bayous and forests of the lower Mississippi rather than moving into Spanish-Caddo territory.[17] Longer distance slave escapes accelerated during the turn of the century, as a confluence of local and global factors prompted larger numbers of black slaves to abandon western Louisiana plantations for succour in Texas. But the Texas-Louisiana border was not a fixed line separating the racialized, exploitative plantation order of lower Louisiana from a more tolerant and inclusive Spanish province, as some have argued.[18] Rather, shifting alliance politics among indigenous and Hispanic communities offered fugitives the possibility of forging new social and labour relations, characterized by greater autonomy rather than the *de jure* absence of slavery. The collapsing population and military power of the Caddo confederacy, a bulwark of the Louisiana plantation regime since the Natchez War, removed a substantial obstacle to black slaves seeking asylum beyond the Louisiana border. Furthermore, the relative peace among Apaches, Comanches, and Spaniards precipitated the relative boom of ranching operations on the plains between the lower Rio Grande and San Antonio. Moving into the pastoral economy allowed escaping slaves to access greater personal and economic independence even as increased labour demands on colonial ranches led many masters to seek greater access to, and control over, unfree labourers.

[17] Gilbert C. Din, "Cimarrones and the San Malo Band in Spanish Louisiana," *Louisiana History* 21:3 (Summer 1980): 237-262.

[18] For such interpretations, see Lance R. Blyth "Fugitives from Servitude: American Deserters and Runaway Slaves in Spanish Nacogdoches, 1803-1808," *East Texas Historical Journal* 38:2 (October 2000): 8; Peter J. Kastor, "'Motives of Peculiar Urgency': Local Diplomacy in Louisiana, 1803-1821" *WMQ* 58:4 (October 2001): 834; Sean M. Kelley, "'Mexico in His Head': Slavery and the Texas-Mexico Border, 1810-1860," *Journal of Social History* 37:3 (Spring 2004): 709-723.

In 1803 a French traveler described Nacogdoches colonists as engaged exclusively in raising "horses, mules, and livestock," and the town itself as the "entrepot of contraband between Natchitoches and San Antonio & Mexico."[19] Intended to contrast the economic stagnation of northern New Spain with the booming cotton economy of Louisiana's western districts, this depiction of Nacogdoches elided the resurgence of local ranching operations during the early nineteenth century. Comanche trading parties visited San Antonio and Nacogdoches several times a year, bringing horses, mules, cattle, and bison robes to trade for weapons, tobacco, textiles, tools, and other goods.[20] Although fugitives took advantage of the pastoral zone's socio-economic fluidity, the Comanche peace likewise allowed colonists to increase production and their investment in slave labour – hence both fugitive and enslaved blacks entered Texas during this period. Between 1793 and 1810 slave sales conducted at San Antonio increased substantially in comparison with the 1770s and 1780s, when the province was ravaged by Apache and Comanche raids.[21] The expansion of the plantation complex into Texas marked the borderland's deepening connections with the politics of the Atlantic world, including geo-political contests suffused by black resistance to racial slavery.

Borders and Borderland Slaving in the Age of New Nations, 1800-1810

The economic stability afforded by the Comanche-Spanish peace transformed Texas into a redoubt for black fugitives *and* aspiring planters just as the Atlantic plantation complex entered a period of protracted political crisis. The massive slave uprising which enveloped St Domingue in 1791 shook the institutions of Atlantic slavery to their very core, particularly after the first

[19] [Paillette], "Notes sur un voyage fait par Paillette en 1803 aux Natchitoches et Texas," MSS 125.413, WRC.

[20] For Comanche trading parties at San Antonio, see for example Elguezabal, Monthly Report, January 1, June 1, August 1, and September 1, 1804, BA.

[21] See slave sales at San Antonio, January 12, May 8, July 8, 1807; January 22 and 23, July 7, November 3, December 15, 1808; February 28, May 4, 1809, BA.

black republic secured its independence in 1804. Combining fears of indigenous uprisings and Jacobin infiltration that attended the United States' 1803 purchase of Louisiana, this crisis continued to reverberate in the borderlands over the decade following the 1791 and 1795 insurrectionary panics at Pointe Coupée.[22]

The Spanish villages of east Texas had long been the objective of slaves fleeing the harsh labour regimes of monoculture plantations, particularly after cotton and sugar replaced indigo and tobacco as the principal cash crops during the early nineteenth century. Between 1793 and 1803 several fugitives were reportedly in Texas after having fled from the western plantation districts of Attacapas, Natchitoches, and Opelousas.[23] Yet Nacogdoches and San Antonio were hardly free territory. The 1804 census recorded a substantial enslaved community at Nacogdoches.[24] Instead of a pathway into legal freedom, the network of rivers and trails connecting borderland villages offered fugitive slaves access to the relative autonomy of the pastoral economy.

Beginning in the fall of 1804 substantial groups of Natchitoches slaves launched a series of escape attempts that exposed fractures within the borderland plantation regime. Unlike the "typical" runaway – usually a young, single adult man who had recently been sold – the Natchitoches maroons fled in larger groups that included women and children, indicating family units whose objective was permanent escape from the plantation complex. Tensions had been mounting over the summer, with Natchitoches planters complaining of rumours that the king of

[22] For the geopolitics of the Louisiana Purchase, see Peter J. Kastor, *The Nation's Crucible: The Louisiana Purchase and the Creation of America* (New Haven, 2004); Eliga H. Gould, *Among the Powers of the Earth: The American Revolution and the Making of a New World Empire* (Cambridge, 2012).

[23] Louis de Blanc to Manuel Munoz, April 26, 1793, BA; Fernandez to Munoz, January 15, 1796, BA; Casa Calvo to Elguezabal, [no date], 1800, BA; Jose Joaquin Ugarte to Elguezabal, September 3, 1803, BA.

[24] In 1804 there were nineteen black or mulatto slaves in San Antonio and sixty black or mulatto slaves in Nacogdoches. See Census of San Antonio de Bexar, [no date], 1804, BA; Census of Nacogdoches, January 1, 1804, BA.

Spain was "granting refuge & protection to all foreign slaves, who would chose to take retreat in his dominions."[25] With thirty slaves involved in the escape attempts, their panicked Franco-American masters, many from families with generational connections to the Indian trade, interpreted the flights as the beginning of a much larger plot that would culminate in a general slave insurrection.[26] Within a week, a group of slave hunters composed of planters, militia, and several free blacks arrived at Nacogdoches in pursuit of four fugitives (two men, a woman, and an infant) who took eleven horses and several muskets in their bid for freedom.[27] Another group of nine slaves also escaped, but slave patrols soon apprehended six of them.[28]

Increased maronnage among slaves in western Louisiana reflected both local tensions and imperial geo-politics. For Louisiana slavers, Natives, Spaniards, and Jacobins figured prominently in their fears of slave resistance. In 1804, planters and officials became distressed by rumours that Spanish agents were attempting to "excite certain Indian Tribes West of the Mississippi to wage war against the United States."[29] Furthermore, planters suspected foreign agents of assisting the fugitives, including a "white man, a Spaniard, or rather what is called a *Washananga*," whose actions so enraged Natchitoches masters that a U.S. Army officer believed they might march on Nacogdoches "and lay it in waste."[30] The escapes soon threatened to cause a diplomatic crisis between Spain and the United States. The Marques de Casa Calvo, the

[25] Petition to Edward Turner by Inhabitants of the District of Natchitoches, July 29, 1804, in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States* (*TPUS*), *Volume 9: The Territory of Orleans, 1803-1812* (28 vols. Washington, D.C., 1940), 273.

[26] Edward D. Turner to Claiborne, October 16, 1804, in Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Official Letter Books of W.C.C. Claiborne, 1801-1816* (6 vols. Jackson, 1917), II: 386-388.

[27] Ugarte to Elguezabal, October 25, 1804, BA.

[28] Casa Calvo to Nemesio Salcedo, November 10, 1804, BA.

[29] Claiborne to Butler, November 1, 1804, *Letter Books*, II: 384.

[30] Turner to Claiborne, October 17, 1804, *Letter Books*, II: 386.

Spanish consul at New Orleans, informed Territorial Governor William C. C. Claiborne that Spain would respect foreign property, but insisted that Louisiana planters bore the brunt of responsibility for the slaves' antagonism given their masters' excessive cruelty and the dissemination of information that "may have given rise to the movement that has been observed among their slaves."[31] Under pressure from Claiborne and fearing of a potential uprising, Casa Calvo asked the Commandant-General of the Interior Provinces to suspend the policy of granting asylum to foreign slaves.[32] Apparently the insurrectionary panic spread back towards Pointe Coupée, where local planters identified "A Sprit of Revolt and Mutyny" in the days preceding their discovery of a "Plan for our Destruction."[33] For planters, the politics of fear descended over the borderland.

Despite increasing planter vigilance and international efforts to control the border, slaves continued to escape from Louisiana into the woodlands of east Texas. An extended family led by three brothers arrived at Nacogdoches in 1805, followed by another surge of escapes over the course of 1807.[34] Given the local and regional contexts of slave rebellion, these escapes contributed to a developing sense of planter paranoia, with many Louisiana masters conjuring the bugbear of a simultaneous Indian war and servile insurrection masterminded by revolutionary foreign agents. In 1804 Casa Calvo tried to reassure Claiborne amid rumours that some Texas

[31] Casa Calvo to Claiborne, November 6, 1804, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 323.

[32] Casa Calvo to Nemesio Salcedo, November 10, 1804, BA.

[33] Petition to Governor Claiborne by Inhabitants of Pointe Coupée, Nov 9, 1804, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 326.

[34] Nemesio Salcedo to Claiborne, September18, 1805, NA; Viana to Cordero, July 29, 1807, BA; Viana to Cordero, August 12, 1807, BA; Petition of Natchitoches citizens for the return of their escaped slaves, September 5, 1807, BA; Viana to Cordero, September 10, 1807, BA.

traders were "alienat[ing] the loyalty of certain Indian tribes, by inciting them even to disturb the quiet and tranquility of Louisiana."[35]

Panic gripped Louisiana officials the next year, when authorities discovered an alleged plot to unite poor whites, free blacks, and slaves in a coordinated uprising across the colony. The plot centered on the activities of a French deserter named "Grand Jean," who passed through Haiti and Baltimore before his eventual arrest in New Orleans.[36] According to the testimony of a New Orleans freedman, some of the city's free black and mulatto population were involved in an extensive plot, to be triggered by a Spanish-Indian invasion: "these people expect the Marquis [de Casa Calvo] to arrive shortly with three or four thousand troops, and that he is to bring one or two nations of Indians, or that they are to follow him. They offer to set all the Black People free who will join them."[37] When Haiti finally secured independence in 1804 – the world's first black republic -- Franco- and Anglo-American masters' paranoia deepened.

Despised by many Louisiana planters for their perceived leniency towards slaves and support of free blacks, Spanish officials themselves remained gravely concerned with the revolutionary ideologies that threatened their own slave colonies. News of slave uprisings from across the Spanish empire filtered back into the borderland. After colonial authorities thwarted a suspected plot among Cartagena slaves to storm the governor's palace, Commandant-General Nava warned the governor of Texas to be vigilant.[38] In 1807 Nemesio Salcedo warned the

[35] Calvo to Claiborne, November 7, 1804, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 325.

[36] Paquette, "Revolutionary St. Domingue in the Making of Territorial Louisiana," 216.

[37] Statement of Stephen, a Free Negro, to Governor Claiborne, January 23, 1806, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 575-576.

[38] Nava to governor of Texas, May 6, 1801, BA.

governor of Texas about "emissaries of Desalines" who arrived on the continent with "the objective of organizing a slave revolt in the American colonies."[39]

Despite omnipresent fears of slave insurrection, the large planters who dominated Louisiana's territorial government demanded a continuous supply of black slaves to increase production. Having taken control of the colony from France, Claiborne informed U.S. President Thomas Jefferson that "the general opinion seems to be that the Territory cannot prosper without a great increase of Negros." In order to circumvent the importation of Haitian slaves bearing revolutionary ideas, planters focused on re-establishing "an uninterrupted Trade to Africa." Despite their efforts to parse slaves based on origins another American official commented that many of the enslaved were "the wretches of St Domingo Martinique & Jamaica instead of the harmless African."[40]

While slave networks clearly spread news of revolutionary developments in the Caribbean, the fugitives fleeing borderland plantations probably did not aim at the "general insurrection" that their masters believed imminent. In fact, slaves with experience or knowledge of the tortures, deportations, and mass executions that followed the 1795 conspiracy may have fled precisely because they feared another reign of terror. Records produced by another surge of Texas maronnage between 1807 and 1810 reveal fugitives used the proximity of the pastoral economy and knowledge of Spanish legal culture to escape cruelty, overwork, or the threat of sale. In January 1808 the commandant at Nacogdoches reported the presence of seven fugitives, including a married couple and three others from Natchitoches, and two others who escaped

[39] Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, March 24, 1807, BA. Jean-Jacques Dessalines was Emperor of Haiti between 1804 and 1806. See Phillipe R. Girard, "Jean-Jacques Dessalines and the Atlantic System: A Reappraisal" *WMQ* 69:3 (July 2012): 549-582.

[40] Claiborne to Jefferson, April 15, 1804, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 222; John Watkins to John Graham, September 6, 1805, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 503. Three slavers arrived from Africa during the 1803 French interregnum. See Gilbert Leonard to Claiborne, January 25, 1804, *TPUS*, Volume 9, 172.

from an American master at Opelousas. Among the Natchitoches escapees, two had been owned by Francois Rouquier, one of the 1804 petitioners, and at least one, Narciso, informed the Spanish officer that he fled in order to avoid being sold to an American.[41] Another slave couple and their young son arrived in the spring, having fled from separate Opelousas plantations.[42] At Salcedo de Trinidad, a military outpost established on the lower Trinity between Nacogdoches and San Antonio, the commanding officer listed ten fugitives. Among them were a man and his three sons and a woman and two men, who explained that "they were born slaves" but after learning of events on the "big houses of the black islands" they fled from Opelousas to escape "the harshness of American laws." Another slave, Lorenzo Maret, fled to Trinidad from the Nacogdoches ranch of Bernard Dortolant, a militia captain and the town's largest slaveholder. Maret justified his flight due to "his master being very cruel with him," having recently been severely beaten by Dortolant's son.[43] Taking advantage of Spanish slave laws, Maret showed the authorities his scars and successfully sued for his freedom on the basis of the "irregular punishments" inflicted by the Dortolants.[44]

By accessing favourable elements of Spanish slave codes, including the right to enjoy the sanctity of Catholic marriage, some borderland maroons forged new labour relations with Texas colonists. Tellingly, while the authorities debated their status, the fugitives at Nacogdoches and Trinidad found employment as servants in Spanish households, where the ranching and domestic

[41] Jose Maria Guadiana, Report, January 21, 1808, BA. Among the seven fugitives, Guadiana listed Juan Luis and his wife Maria, of Natchitoches; two slaves named Luis and another named Narciso, also from Natchitoches; and two unnamed slaves from Opelousas.

[42] Viana to Cordero, May 1, 1808, BA.

[43] Pedro Lopez Prieto, Report, January 21, 1808, BA.

[44] Guadiana, Proceedings in the case of the negro Lorenzo Maret, February 13, 1808, BA; Cordero, Liberty granted the negro Lorenzo Maret, April 2, 1808, BA.

labour regimes differed sharply from the rigors of monoculture.[45] No doubt news of these successful escapes, and the opportunities available to slaves wishing to sue for or purchase their freedom, filtered back to borderland slave communities. Along with Maret's suit, two other Nacogdoches freedpeople purchased their children from Dortolant.[46]

Spanish policy was not uniformly favourable towards fugitive slaves. Instead, Spanish officers pursued an ad hoc policy dictated by their ability to appease Louisiana authorities, avoid a diplomatic crisis with the United States, and feed and shelter maroons. In the spring of 1808 Commandant-General Salcedo ordered the transfer of the Nacogdoches fugitives to Trinidad in order safeguard them after rumours reached him that "some of the friendly Indians would return them to their masters."[47] But the mounting number of escapes, and the concomitant pressure from Louisiana planters and their territorial government, soon forced the deportation of many fugitives back to Louisiana. In October a party of Natchitoches slave hunters arrived at Nacogdoches looking for a group of thirty maroons, and the Spanish commandant agreed to send his own men in pursuit. Within a month, Spanish troops caught sixteen men, seven women, and four children, confiscating their arms and horses before transferring them to San Antonio. Over the succeeding months, Texas authorities returned this group to their masters at Natchitoches.[48]

While Texas officials vacillated over the fugitive issue, the efforts of an Afro-Apache man to secure his liberty contributed to the resolution of Spanish policy. Born to an enslaved Apache mother and a free black father, the child had been christened Evangeliste when, at eight

[45] Guadiana, Report, January 21, 1808, BA; Prieto, Report, January 21, 1808, BA.

[46] Viana, proceedings in the case of Jose Ramon, December 17, 1806, BA; Jose de la Vega to Maria Juana, sale of slave, February 9, 1808, BA.

[47] Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, May 31, 1808, BA.

[48] For the flight and capture of the maroons, see Guadiana to Cordero, October 19, 1808, BA; Prieto to Manuel Salcedo, November 22, 1808, BA. For their return to Louisiana, see Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, December 12, 1808, BA; Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, January 29, 1809, BA; Cordero to Nemesio Salcedo, March 3, 1809, BA.

years old, he was sold to the Prudhomme family in 1786.[49] Among the francophone Natchitoches clans who embraced the second slavery, the Prudhommes possessed significant capital in land, slaves, and cotton. Sometime between 1795 and 1797 Evangeliste escaped the Prudhomme plantation and fled to Texas, eventually making his way to San Antonio. Evangeliste's mixed ancestry and the timing of his flight suggest he was among the Afro-Indian slaves who failed to win their freedom from Louisiana officials and took matters into his own hands. However, in 1809 his former master, Emmanuel Prudhomme, wrote Governor Antonio Cordero to inquire about Evangeliste's presence. Describing Evangeliste as a "*Grif*," Prudhomme cited the return of the Nacogdoches fugitives as precedent for Evangeliste's immediate extradition, which he offered to pay for.[50]

The ensuing legal contest over Envageliste's status revealed much about tensions over the source and control of labour in the pastoral-plantation borderland. During his twelve years in Texas, Evangeliste adopted the Hispanicized name of his old master, and lived as a free black man called "Manuel Pridomo." He worked for Juan Manuel Sambrano, an officer and parish subdeacon, and seems to have had consistent contact with San Antonio's mission Indian community. Although illiterate, with the aid of Sambrano and another priest Envageliste/Manuel described himself as "the natural son of an Indian woman of the Lipan nation named Teresa."[51] Taken from her rancheria by "the Indians of the North," Teresa passed through "various nations" and into bondage at Pointe Coupée, where she bore three sons.[52] To establish his identity as a

[49] Rachel Cloutier to Emmanuel Prudhomme, sale of slave, May 6, 1786, BA. Evangeliste was eight years old and sold for 500 piastres.

[50] John C. Carr to Manuel Salcedo, February 1, 1809, BA; Prudhomme to Cordero, February 15, 1809, BA.

[51] Fray Bernardino Vallejo, affidavit on behalf of Manuel Prudhomme, March 26, 1809, BA.

[52] Declaration of Manuel Pridomo, April 4, 1809, BA (quote); Declaration of Juan Manuel Sambrano, April 5, 1809, BA.

mixed-race Afro-Indian, and therefore legally precluded from enslavement under Spanish law, Manuel called three witnesses who knew him or his mother. An elderly Frenchmen testified that Teresa had been "ransomed from the infidel Indians" and that he knew "Indians could not be sold." Another man, a free mulatto from Natchitoches, described Manuel as the son of an "Indian woman of the Apache nation and a free black father."[53] Thus, despite San Antonio's own deep connections to Apache enslavement, Manuel's community rallied around him to prevent his return to plantation slavery in Louisiana.

In the aftermath of Manuel's case, officials at Chihuahua City and San Antonio began to reverse course and halt the return of maroons to Louisiana. Manuel's Apache ancestry may have contributed to doubts about the ethnic origins of other slaves, and like Manuel, the fugitives in Texas provided valuable labour in their new communities. Furthermore, even as they repatriated slaves to Louisiana, Spanish officials insisted on amnesty from excessive punishment for the fugitives as a condition for their return – a commitment they probably doubted Louisiana masters would honour. Beyond legal and humanitarian questions, Texas officials knew that *maronnage* would continue regardless, and it was preferable to incorporate the fugitives rather than allow them to join the smugglers and bandits who inhabited the Neutral Ground.[54] Given these considerations, in August 1809 Commandant General Salcedo ordered the suspension of fugitive repatriations, writing that the Interior Provinces would resume "the reception and protection […] of the black slaves of Louisiana, and those of other foreign colonies, who arrive with the just goal of acquiring their liberty in conformity with the rights of men." Orders soon reached the

[53] Vicente Micheli, Francisco Barrero, and Manuel Barrero, interrogation of Lorenzo Rebiquy; Micheli et al, interrogation of Bautista Remitote, April 4, 1809, BA.

[54] J. V. Haggard, "The Neutral Ground between Louisiana and Texas, 1806–1821," *LHQ* 28 (October 1945): 1001-1128.

Nacogdoches commandant to "suspend the returns."[55] Unsurprisingly, fugitives continued to enter Texas, with some making it as far south as the Rio Grande.[56] In 1811 Spanish troops apprehended two African-American slaves on the banks of the Trinity River after an Englishman allegedly murdered their master in a bungled attempt to steal and sell them at New Orleans. The same year, two slaves escaped from Doctor John Sibley, the U.S. Indian agent at Natchitoches, and were reportedly at large in Texas.[57] Seizing opportunities in a plantation zone at the edge of indigenous territory, slaves fled towards Texas. Whether motivated by revolutionary ideals or local grievances, these fugitive collectives demonstrated the limits of the plantation zone.

Collapse of the Comanche-Spanish Alliance 1800-1810

With indigenous and black populations in flux, colonial agents on both sides of the border recognized the significance of maintaining amicable relations with the free associations that dominated the interior. Comanche trade facilitated Texas' economic resurgence, all of which would be undone if bands returned to raiding the province for animals. Meanwhile, Spanish and U.S. soldiers stationed along the Red and Sabine rivers viewed Comanches and their allies as a decisive force in any future conflict. Although indigenous and colonial peoples preserved their alliance between 1800 and 1810, eruptions of inter-communal violence and competition over animals and land hint at its precariousness. In 1801, a party of San Antonians destabilized the alliance when they killed two Comanches, including the son of a Yamparica chief, traveling on the Guadalupe River. Matters worsened when three more Comanches were found dead near

[55] Nemesio Salcedo to Bernardo Bonavia, August 7, 1809, BA (first quote); Manuel Salcedo to Guadiana, August 27, 1809, BA (second quote). The elder Salcedo questioned the legality of returning asylum-seeking slaves as early as 1806. See Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, October 28, 1806, BA.

[56] Jose Jesus Rodriguez to Manuel Salcedo, June 27, 1809, BA.

[57] Juan Ignacio de Arrambide, interrogation of the negress Sara, December 21, 1811, BA; Claiborne to Manuel Salcedo, November 28, 1811, BA.

mission San Jose de Aguayo.[58] Led by Sojais, Yzazat, and Soquina, senior Kotsoteka leaders visited San Antonio and argued against allowing the Yamparica band's vendetta to escalate into a general war against Texas. Although the scope of conflict remained limited, significant fissures began to develop between the established leadership, who controlled access to Spanish trade, and younger men who must have taken a dim view of an ally that distributed paltry gifts and periodically murdered their kinsmen.[59]

Inter-indigenous disagreements also disrupted the Comanche-Spanish alliance. Lipan-Comanche tensions flared during these years, particularly after Lipan warriors ambushed members of Yzazat's band along the Rio Grande and killed twenty-five people. Most ominously for the Spanish, rumours entered Comanche rancherias that colonial troops from Coahuila participated in the massacre.[60] With Yzazat and other Kotsoteka captains now considering war, western Comanche leaders intervened lest the cycle of vengeance spread to western Comancheria and New Mexico. Their voices proved decisive. Warriors from Yzazat's band re-focused their efforts on pursuing Lipans south of the Rio Grande.[61] The next year a general war again threatened the province after San Antonio soldiers pursued a party of Taovaya horse thieves and killed nine of them. Although disgusted with the troops' excessive violence, the Kotsoteka leaders Chihuahua and Yzazat visited the capital and foreswore listening to their Wichita allies' calls for revenge. Their trade with Spaniards remained important, while Apache

[58] Miguel Musquiz to Elguezabal, November 8, 1801, BA; Nava to Felix Berenguer de Marquina, March 16, 1802, in Documents Related to Texas, 1797-1810 (DRT). Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

[59] For reports of mounting divisions among Comanches over the efficacy of their Spanish alliance, see Musquiz to Elguezabal, November 8, 1801, BA; Felix Maria Calleja to Marquina, March 26, 1802, DRT; Nemesio Salcedo to Francisco Xavier de Truxillos, January 4, 1803, DRT.

[60] Calleja to Marquina, March 26, 1802, DRT; Nava to Elguezabal, March 29, 1802, BA.

[61] Elguezabal to Nava, August 4, 1802, BA; Elguezabal to Nava, August 18, 1802, BA; Elguezabal to Nava, September 1, 1802, BA.

herds proved sufficient enticements for ambitious Comanche men.[62] Endangered by these developments, Canoso's Lipan band left the Rio Grande valley in 1806 and established a new rancheria on the Nueces. Visiting San Antonio for periodic trade fairs, the lower Lipans' return to Texas brought renewed risks of encountering the larger Comanche parties who also frequented the town and surrounding areas.[63]

Sustained proximity within the buffalo and livestock pasturage of the Southern Plains facilitated a new era in Apache-Comanche-Wichita relations. Beginning in 1806 indigenous diplomats began to refashion their alliance networks, gradually pushing their Spanish counterparts to the political margins. With the encouragement of Texas Governor Antonio Cordero, the eastern Kotsotekas held a grand council and selected Sargento as their principal chieftain, who now styled himself Cordero to symbolize his new kinship with the Spanish leader.[64] Next, in the spring of 1807 prominent Comanche, Lipan, and Tawakoni leaders gathered at San Antonio to quell the violence that threatened their respective communities. Sargento-Cordero, Canoso, another Lipan chief named Morrongo, and the Tawakoni leader Daguarisca agreed to "suspend the war between them." Attempting to solve a long-standing source of conflict, Comanches and Lipans settled on the "Lomeria de San Saba" as the boundary between their territories in the hopes this would prevent conflicts when both nations were in the area hunting buffalo.[65]

As they worked towards an accommodation with their Apache rivals, the associational nature of Comanche bands prompted them to simultaneously pursue more outlets for their

[62] Arrambide to Elguezabal, February 13, 1802, BA; Nava to Marquina, March 16, 1802, DRT.

[63] For Lipan movements in Texas and renewed hostilities with Comanches, see Nemesio Salcedo to Elguezabal, July 16, 1804, BA; Cordero to Nemesio Salcedo, June 16, 1806, BA.

[64] Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, June 3, 1806, BA.

[65] Cordero to Nemesio Salcedo, March 31, 1807, BA; Nemesio Salcedo to Cordero, May 4, 1807, BA.

pastoral economy. Presented with an alternative source of trade goods, some Comanche leaders readily discarded the Spanish alliance. Invited by the Kadohadacho chieftain Dehahuit, in the fall of 1807 four Yamparica captains and theirs followers, along with various Wichita and Caddo delegations, arrived in Natchitoches to treat with Doctor Sibley. Lavished with gifts by their host, over several days the Comanche and Tawakoni diplomats discussed their grievances with New Spain. Producing a flag given to him by Governor Cordero, the leading Yamparica cast it at Sibley's feet in a symbolic rejection of his estranged allies. Eager to fill the commercial vacuum, Sibley wrapped the chief in the flag of the United States and promised that more gifts would be available the next time Comanches visited the post.[66] Although pleased with Sibley's largesse in tobacco and textiles, the visiting Comanches were less impressed by the lack of guns, along with the drunkenness and horse thefts they observed. Furthermore, by 1807 the majority of Natchitoches' population were enslaved blacks, and this would have been Comanches first exposure to a plantation-based slave society. While one can only speculate on their impressions of Natchitoches chattel slavery, Comanches apparently developed an aversion to the town. Several Yamparicas contracted a virus during the visit and died on their return home – an American observer noted that Comanches held the Kichais "in peculiar detestation, on account of their supposed powers of *blowing* [witchcraft]; and charge them with having 'blown' the waters that intersect their route to Natchitoches, which has rendered their visits to that post so destructive to their people."[67] Although the 1807 councils at San Antonio and Natchitoches seemed to secure Spanish and U.S. interests along the contested Texas-Louisiana border, these diplomatic achievements masked signs of indigenous estrangement.

[66] John Sibley, *Report from Natchitoches in 1807*, Annie Heloise Abel, ed. (New York, 1922), 54-55.

[67] David G. Burnet, "David G. Burnet's Letters Describing the Comanche Indians," Ernest Wallace, ed. *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 30 (1954): 127.

Having abandoned the Rio Grande Valley, lower Lipan bands hoped to gain resources and security by returning to their old camps in Texas. This movement coincided with worsening relations between Tonkawas and Spaniards, who reaffirmed their nominal alliance in 1805. But cut off from the southern buffalo herds, the Tonkawa bands of the central Colorado River consistently pilfered Spanish stock, both for food and to maintain the critical mass of horses necessary to defend against Comanche and Wichita harassment.[68] The hollow Tonkawa-Spanish peace collapsed in 1808, when San Antonio troops aggressively entered the rancheria of Cuernitos ("Little Horns") and forced the Tonkawas to surrender several men suspected of horse theft, who they dragged off in chains.[69] Disillusioned with Spanish arrogance, the numerically inferior Tonkawas reprised El Mocho's coalition-building strategy when they sent diplomats to "other Indians, with the objective of moving them to war." Warned of these plans by a friendly Kichai chief, Spaniards prepared their own offensive and called on indigenous allies for support.[70] Even this proved difficult, as Tawakoni warriors resented the presence of Lipans who also joined the expedition against the Tonkawas.[71] Hoping to avoid hostilities, Spanish and Tonkawa leaders met at the military outpost of San Marcos, where captains Arocha and El Colorado gave assurances they would return stolen horses and blamed Cuernitos for the raids. Following these negotiations, the Spaniards took the Tonkawa party hostage and brought them to San Antonio where they were made to pledge their loyalty before the governor. Eventually releasing most of their prisoners, Spanish authorities remained troubled by the Tonkawas' appeal to mission fugitives and other outcasts. Thus they retained an "incorrigible" man named

[68] Smith, *From Dominance to Disappearance*, 74.

[69] Juan Jose de los Santos, Diary, August 13-29, 1808, BA.

[70] Bonavia to Manuel Salcedo, August 17, 1809, BA.

[71] Varela to Bonavia, September 6, 1809, BA.

Pafalache, who spoke Spanish and was "a Christian from Concepción Mission, but unruly and should not be allowed to live in the Tonkawa Nation."[72] Thereafter Tonkawas became divided between a more militant band led by Cuernitos, who regularly joined Canoso's Lipans in raiding La Bahia for cattle, and other bands who sought an alliance with the Spanish against the Comanches.[73]

Compounding Spanish-Tonkawa tensions were the loosening bonds of New Spain's military-commercial pact with eastern Comanches. In 1810 the Bourbon policies developed during the 1770s seemed to secure the Interior Provinces. From Santa Fe to San Antonio, the alliance with the favoured Comanches held firm, and even the "Apache problem" achieved a measure of resolution with the success of the estabiliminetos along the Rio Grande. On the ground, the reality proved quite different. As ever, Comanche bands pursued their own vision of Plains hegemony and continued to expand the resource bases of their political economy. The period between 1810 and 1830 marked the high point of Comanche power, and while historian Pekka Hämäläinen has emphasized the imperial dimensions of Comancheria other scholars remain sceptical that inter-band coordination extended beyond a "multiunit federation of piratical economies."[74] Indeed, Comanches' surging influence during the early nineteenth century stemmed from the politically egalitarian and geographically diffuse nature of their kin-based pastoralism. Operating from a core region of control, Comanches appeared increasingly imperialistic on their borders, especially the southern front with New Spain, even as internal

[72] Varela to Manuel Salcedo, September 6, 1809, BA; Manuel Salcedo to Varela, September 11, 1809, BA.

[73] Jose de Goseascochea to Manuel Salcedo, November 20, 1810, BA; Jose Felix Perez, Diary, May 16-June 2, 1812, BA.

[74] See Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 181-291. For critiques of the empire thesis and alternative explanations for Comanche expansion, see Thomas W. Kavanagh, "Review of *Comanche Empire*," *Ethnohistory* 56:3 (Summer 2009): 534; Betty, *Comanche Society*, passim.; Joaquin Rivaya-Martinez, "A Different Look at Native American Depopulation: Comanche Raiding, Captive Taking, and Population Decline," *Ethnohistory* 61:3 (Summer 2014): 395-397.

divisions multiplied. Far from contradictory, the associational nature of Comanche society empowered an inter-band confederacy of staggering wealth, influence, and complexity.

Significant fissures developed among the broad, clan-based divisions of Comancheria due to internal differences over how to mobilize the resources, increasingly controlled by the warrior-trader class, that increased overall band-level production. The Kotsotekas divided into western and eastern branches during the early nineteenth century, with the latter group emerging as the most powerful indigenous cohort in Texas.[75] Kotsoteka leaders never expressed approval of Spaniards' willingness to make local truces with Apaches, a policy that culminated in the establicimientos, since this behaviour undermined a central tenet of the alliance: war against Apacheria. Having stabilized their trading relationship with Texas under the leadership of Sargento-Cordero, hundreds of eastern Kotsoteka from several bands traveled westward to attack Apache rancherias. In the summer of 1810 Sargento-Cordero's warriors arrived at the lower Pecos River, where they joined forces with western Kotsotekas under the influential captain Quegüe and five hundred troops and militia commanded by the New Mexican governor. Together, the allies entered the "Sierra del Sacramento […] to persecute the Farones and Mescaleros who lived in those territories."[76] Although aimed at "hostile" Apaches, these campaigns invariably complicated Apache and Spanish attempts to reach a détente. While passing through Chihuahua the next year on their way back to Texas, Sargento-Cordero informed the commandant general that nine hundred Comanches were still campaigning along the Rio Grande. Exemplifying the predicaments created by Spanish entanglements with Apache and Comanche alliances, during their stay members of Sargento-Cordero's cohort killed a "peace

[75] Thomas W. Kavanagh, *The Comanches: A History 1706-1875* (Lincoln, 1996), 190.

[76] Jose Manrrique, Report, June 16, 1810, BA.

Apache."[77] Passing through San Antonio on their return from their campaign, Sargento-Cordero's war party traded nineteen mules and "two captives they took from the Mescaleros."[78] As they had since 1785, Comanche war leaders continued to exchange Apache captives at Spanish villages, their enemy's bodies serving as both a metaphysical representation of alliance and a source of labour for their new masters.

Far from centralizing forces, warfare and trading heightened the diffuse, egalitarian nature of Comanche pursuits. Although Quegüe introduced Sargento-Cordero as the "Principal Chief of the Eastern Comancheria" at the 1810 Pecos meeting, the latter's departure revealed the limits of his authority within the muddled politics of the eastern clans. Interested in greater proximity to both Anglo-American traders and the Rio Grande livestock herds, some Yamparica bands traveled downstream along the Red and Colorado valleys during the 1800s. Over the succeeding decades they became known as Tenewas – "those who moved downstream." During the spring and summer of 1810 smaller, proto-Tenewa raiding parties struck mule drives making their way from La Bahia to Monterrey, while also attacking ranches along the Rio Grande. They were clearly focused on seizing horses, probably for trade with Americans, as they killed at least two *vaqueros* but did not take any captives. Sending pursuit parties from Laredo and San Antonio, Spanish soldiers managed to recover some of the animals and drive off the raiders, but not before Mescaleros and Lipans used the outbreak of Yamparica raids to wedge themselves between Spaniards and Comanches. Allied Mescaleros assisted Spanish forces in Coahuila, while Canoso's men captured two Comanches and then insisted in joining a Spanish party

[77] Nemesio Salcedo to Simon de Herrera, December 18, 1811, BA.

[78] Arrambide to Bonavia, October 20, 1810, BA.

searching for other raiders.[79] Taken prisoner during the retreat across the San Saba hill country, one Comanche captive revealed the changing political geography of Comancheria during his interrogation at San Antonio. Evincing the nature of Comanches' long-distance alliance, information, and raiding networks, the captive identified himself as a Yamparica and claimed to have only heard of Sargento-Cordero, since his own rancheria was located above the Taovaya villages eleven days travel from San Antonio. He and his cohort had set out in the hopes of stealing Spanish or Tonkawa horses.[80]

Intra-Comanche divisions intensified during this period. Seeking to stabilize relations, Spanish officers reached Sargento-Cordero at his rancheria, where he returned two horses and blamed the thefts on "foolish young men." Beyond providing a glimpse into tensions between the senior leadership and younger war leaders, the Kotsoteka chief hinted at a rapprochement between some Comanches and their erstwhile Lipan enemies. According to Sargento-Cordero, these warriors "traded with the Lipans everything they robbed," despite his admonitions and those of Chihuahua.[81] In the new environment, some junior war leaders determined that the advantages of an Apache alliance outweighed old scores. At a follow up conference attended by twenty-eight Comanche captains, Kotsoteka leaders announced that "the Lipans have declared war against [the Spanish], and entered the Comanche villages" in order to gain their support during their upcoming campaign. The scope of nascent inter-band alliances did not end there. Sargento-Cordero explained that the raiders did not come from his or allied rancherias, but were affiliated with minor Yamparica captains named El Sordo ("the Deaf One") and El Manco ("the

[79] For Spanish counter-measures, see Jose Ramon Diaz, Diary, March 18-27, 1810, AGM, PI, Volume 201, Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin; Jose Ramon Diaz, Diary, May 17-June 7, 1810, AGM, PI, Volume 201; Vicente Lozano, Diary, May 20, 1810, AGM, PI, Volume 201. For Apache involvement, see Jose Maria de Arze, Diary, July 21-August 15, 1810, BA; Juan Ignacio de Arrambide to Bonavia, October 19, 1810, BA.

[80] Arrambide, Interrogation of Comanche prisoner, August 2, 1810, BA.

[81] Arrambide to Bonavia, October 19, 1810, BA.

One Handed" or "One Armed") who joined forces with Wichitas and Skidi Pawnees to "trade stolen women" and horses.[82]

By distancing themselves from Kotsoteka seniors who favoured accommodation with Texas, El Sordo and his inter-ethnic kinsmen represented a new, potentially disruptive force within borderland politics. Presaging the source of later conflicts, El Sordo first entered the records in 1803, when Spaniards arrested him and twenty seven followers for horse theft.[83] Although other Comanche leaders soon secured the prisoners' release, El Sordo continued to organize raids on Spanish herds. During a visit to San Antonio, El Sordo met the governor and expressed with "a refined malice" his frustration over the lack of guns and the prohibition against trading with Anglo-Americans.[84] At some point before 1810 he split from his rancheria. Abandoning his Comanche wives, El Sordo traveled to a Tawakoni village to live with his Caddoan wives and relatives, accompanied by followers "from his own Nation."[85] El Sordo's decision to reject some of his Comanche kin indicates that inter-band politics, rather than a purely economic motive, determined his band's alignment with Anglo horse traders. The actions of El Sordo and his followers also illustrate the continuation of joint Comanche-Wichita lineages first established during the eighteenth century. In 1797, Sojais, one of the architects of the 1785 alliance, killed another leader's son and then fled to live among the Taovayas.[86] Whether El Sordo was or had been an associate of Sojais, long-standing Comanche-Wichita co-lineages facilitated inter-band partnerships.

---

[82] Arrambide to Bonavia, October 20, 1810, BA.

[83] Elizabeth A. H. John, "Nurturing the Peace: Spanish and Comanche Cooperation in the Early Nineteenth Century," *New Mexico Historical Review* 59:4 (October 1984): 352.

[84] Salcedo, Bonavia, and Herrera, Proceedings of Council of War, October [no date], 1810, BA.

[85] Simon de Herrera, Proceedings concerning the arrest of El Sordo and his followers, December 15, 1811, BA.

[86] Betty, *Comanche Society*, 35.

In the autumn of 1810 indigenous raiders hit San Marcos in a coordinated assault that netted nearly three hundred horses and mules. In the aftermath, an allied Tonkawa informed Spanish officers that the attackers were "Comanches, Tawakonis, and Taovayas, and that he knew very well that the captain of these people was a Comanche Indian."[87] With such a serious breach of the alliance, senior Comanches moved to repair the damage. The raiders apparently came from the rancherias of Chihuahua, El Sordo, and Pisinampe, another captain with connections to Anglo-American horse traders. Sargento-Cordero and a senior Yamparica chief named Oso Ballo ("Bald Bear"; Paruaquita) arrived at San Antonio in 1811 and vowed to punish Comanches who broke the peace. But the two chieftains also took steps to align *their* interests through kinship. As a sign of intra-Comanche relations paramountcy within the context of broader alliances, Oso Ballo married one of Sargento-Cordero's daughters.[88]

Under pressure from Oso Ballo and other captains, in December 1811 El Sordo entered the colonial capital to make amends, initiating a series of events that destroyed eastern Comanches' alliance with Texas. Arriving with two women, probably his Tawakoni wives, another man, and a child, El Sordo entered a community rife with suspicion – both of Comanches and each other. The governor and other officers suspected El Sordo visited in order to scout the location and movements of the presidial herd, rather than make sincere commitments to cease raiding. When a colonist claimed that one of his horses was among El Sordo's mounts, the officers arrested him and placed the entire party in jail. Subsequent Spanish actions hint at their increasing sense of isolation and the perceived threat of even a relatively small militant band. A council of soldiers and colonists, "experienced in Indian warfare," decided to deport El Sordo and his family from the province in order "to avoid the damages that he could do with a

[87] Herrera to Bonavia, October 19, 1810, BA.

[88] Kavanagh, *Comanches*, 157.

small rancheria, such as seducing the Northern Nations who trade with us."[89] Fearing El Sordo and his kinsmen's ability to mobilize allied Wichita and Comanche bands, as well as the possibility their relatives would attempt a rescue, Spanish officers sent their prisoners to Bahia. In March of 1812 Texas officers dispatched the deportees, now including the "Tonkawa Indian known as Pafalache," on mule-back to Coahuila – after arriving at Monclova nearly a month later, they disappeared from the records. If they survived the arduous journey, it ended in de facto enslavement.[90]

It would be difficult to imagine a worse course than the San Antonio junta's decision to arrange a long-distance deportation. El Sordo came to negotiate with a small party that included women and a child, established symbols of peace within the realm of inter-cultural mediation. Their summary deportation represented an unacceptable breach of borderland diplomatic protocol. Other Comanches must have interpreted Spanish actions in light of prior deportations, whose main target were supposed to be their common enemy: Apaches. Direct observation of Native and black slaves' condition at San Antonio and Natchitoches likely also informed Comanches' expectations of the fate that awaited El Sordo and his companions. Whatever their perceptions of Spanish treachery, many Comanche bands, some previously inclined to peace, now refocused on revenge.

The Comanche decision to go to war against Texas demonstrated the reach of inter-band coordination and the significance of their auxiliary alliances. In the spring of 1812, unaware that El Sordo had already been deported, Oso Ballo called a council of war along the upper Colorado River attended by over two hundred Yamparicas, Kotsotekas, Taovayas, and Tawakonis. Joining

[89] Simon de Herrera, Proceedings concerning the arrest of El Sordo and his followers, December 15, 1811, BA.

[90] For the deportation of El Sordo, his companions, and Pafalache, see Nemesio Salcedo to Herrera, January 12, 1812, BA; Andres Matteo to Herrera, March 13, 1812, BA; Cordero to Herrera, April 10, 1812, BA.

indigenous forces were several Tejano traders and disgruntled ranch hands who fled their masters because of debt or cruel treatment. Jose Menchaca, a native of Bexar and a thirty-year veteran of the northern frontier, was also present to offer the warriors "gifts, guns, powder, and bullets in order to march on the capital." With some Wichita guides, Menchaca then travelled to Natchitoches in order to obtain these items. In addition to the support of their Tejano allies, other Comanches were busy acquiring ammunition and firearms from the Pawnee. Together, the assembly made plans to enter San Antonio under the guise of negotiating, seize the gunpowder storehouse, liberate El Sordo and his family, and then assassinate the governor. Comanches did not close ranks along ethnic lines, as other captains vowed to support the Spanish.[91] Nevertheless, on April 8 a strike force of several hundred warriors led by Sargento-Cordero, Oso Ballo, Pisinampe, and Yzazat appeared on the outskirts of San Antonio to demand El Sordo's release. Governor Salcedo led 600 soldiers to meet the Comanches, who dispersed without giving battle.[92]

Even without further violence, the Comanche-Texas alliance was dead. The presence of Sargento-Cordero and Yzazat, key figures within alliance politics during the preceding decade, among the militants demonstrated the depth of Comanche hostility. This reversal suggests that Comanche leaders previously inclined to a "pro-Spanish" policy could not have continued that course and expected to retain their followers.[93] No Comanche leaders entered San Antonio to trade for the remainder of the decade. Instead, they launched a long and brutal war.

The Indigenous War Machine 1811-1821

[91] Nemesio Salcedo to Manuel Salcedo, January 7, 1811, BA; Manuel Salcedo, Proceedings concerning Oso Ballo's conspiracy, March 5, 1812, BA; Nemesio Salcedo to Manuel Salcedo, April 27, 1812, BA.

[92] Cristobal Dominguez to Manuel Salcedo, April 15, 1812, BA.

[93] For the individual and collective dynamics of Comanche revenge culture, see Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 10.

The crisis sparked by the "El Sordo affair" transpired alongside the outbreak of the Mexican War of Independence (1811-1821). The social revolution and civil war that began with Father Miguel Hidalgo's "Cry of Dolores" and soon spread to the Interior Provinces, where insurgent forces enjoyed early successes.[94] In January 1811 a retired officer led a group of mutinous militiamen into the governor's residence and arrested the royalist leadership. The rebels declared themselves in support of Hidalgo's movement and allied themselves with their colleagues in Coahuila. Recognizing the military power of equestrian indigenous bands, both rebel and imperial agents frantically sought them as allies. From Monclova the leader of Coahuila's insurgent forces wrote to Jose Menchaca, imploring him "to communicate [to the Comanches] that one of our objectives is to liberate them from the contempt and baseness with which they are treated by the Europeans, their eternal enemies, and thus they should support our cause as their own."[95] Counter-coups restored royalist control over Coahuila and Texas in March, with imperial officers likewise hoping that Natives would prove loyal to their cause.[96]

The deportation of El Sordo definitively altered the balance of power between republican and royalist contenders. Royalist officers reported that "the mobile forces of the Hidalgo insurrection are mustering the Comanche, Tawakoni, Tonkawa, Taovaya, and Lipan nations to

[94] For the Mexican War of Independence in Texas, especially American involvement, see Harris Gaylord Warren, *The Sword was their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution* (Baton Rouge, 1943); Vicente Ribes Iborra, *Ambiciones Estadounidenses Sobre la Provincia Novohispana de Texas* (Mexico City, 1982); David E. Narrett, "José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara: 'Caudillo' of the Mexican Republic in Texas," *SWHQ* 106:2 (October 2002): 194-228; Ed Bradley, *"We Never Retreat": Filibustering Expeditions into Spanish Texas, 1812-1822* (College Station, 2015).

[95] Pedro de Aranda to Jose Menchaca, February 26, 1811, BA. Comanche bands continued to debate the merits of preserving their Spanish alliance throughout the war. In 1816 a former captive reported that at the rancheria where she lived the "warriors" favoured permitting Anglo-American and Spanish insurgents to live among them, in opposition to the "old Indians." See Arredondo to Perez, September 17, 1816, BA.

[96] Ignacio Elizondo to San Antonio Junta, March 17, 1811, BA.

commit various robberies and damages against us."[97] While commanding the royal troops who were laying siege to rebel-controlled Bahia during the winter of 1812-1813, Governor Salcedo ordered the San Antonio horse herd withdrawn inside the presidio, where a token force was left to guard nearly 7,000 animals. Enraged by Salcedo's treatment of El Sordo and further refusal to meet his demands for tribute, Sargento-Cordero and an estimated two thousand indigenous raiders descended on the horses and "took them all away."[98] Not surprisingly, Comanches were nowhere to be seen when Bernardo Gutierrez de Lara led Spanish, Anglo-American, and Native troops – the "Republican Army of the North" – proceeded from Bahia towards San Antonio in March 1813, where they defeated the royalist army at the Battle of Rosillo. Following General Joaquin de Arredondo's bloody re-conquest of Texas in August 1813, many rebels sought succour at Natchitoches or among the rancherias of allied Natives.[99] Although Arredondo and his successors managed to keep Texas under nominal royalist control for the remainder of the 1810s, indigenous and insurgent warfare marked this period as the nadir of Spanish imperial power in the region.

Beyond their organizational capabilities, a common experience with slaving allowed free associations to construct new alliances between 1814 and 1816. Over the course of 1814-1815 Spanish officials in Texas and Coahuila tried to revive treaties with the Lipan bands led by El Cojo ("The Lame One"), Pacheco, and Chambalia, who visited the provincial capitals and offered to return horses and captives. Yet Spanish officers could not back up their own guarantees of assistance against the Lipans' enemies, and these bands soon explored

[97] San Antonio Junta to Nemesio Salcedo, May 8, 1811, BA; Salcedo to commandant at Nacogdoches, August 3, 1812, NA.

[98] Menchaca, "The Unpublished Second Part of the Menchaca Manuscript," 121-122.

[99] Natchitoches became a bastion of rebel activity following the defeat of las Casas. See Herrera to Felix Trudeau, October 3, 1811, BA.

alternatives.[100] In a sudden reversal, after a century of violent competition over hunting grounds, Lipans and Comanches found common cause. Colonial officials misconstrued the nature of Apache-Comanche conflict, assuming that their enmity was "as old as the nations themselves" and, given Spanish machinations, would remain so.[101] The disintegration of indigenous-Spanish relationships occurred at a moment when Apache-Comanche conflict ebbed after several generations. With inter-tribal warfare peaking between 1780 and 1800, the scores of women and children taken by both sides during these years were likely reaching maturity, and complete cultural assimilation, during the first decades of the nineteenth century. The critical role played by Native women in brokering truces with Spaniards during the eighteenth century suggests that former captives, especially women, played a similar role in bringing together Apaches and Comanches as well. This was an unintended, but critically important consequence of decades of captive-taking by the two communities: abductions created new diplomatic possibilities by making people who were of both nations, and hence positioned to bring the two together.[102]

The history of slaving between Apaches and Comanches is illuminated by Lipan legends. Several tales hinge on the ways war, medicine power, and captive women played key roles in fostering enmity, as well as cooperation, between these rival pastoralists. One story records how a Comanche girl was taken captive by the Lipans and assimilated into a family, who treated her well. She eventually married another Comanche captive, "a boy who had been captured years before and grown up the Lipan." When war threatens to break out between the Lipans and the

[100] Benito Arminan to Joaquin de Arredondo, July 3, 1814, BA; Arminan to Arredondo, July 11, BA; Arredondo to Arminan, July 21, 1814, BA.

[101] Merino, "Report from a Desk in Chihuahua," 157.

[102] For the gendered diplomacy of the borderlands, a process dominated by Native concepts of kinship, see Barr, *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman*. In terms of Apache captives taken, the largest Comanche raids took place in 1779 and 1790, see Cabello to Croix, February 12, 1779, BA; Croix, "General Report of 1781," 74-75; Pacheco to Revilla, March 6, 1790, NA.

Comanches, the young couple volunteer to return to their natal people and broker a truce. Appearing before her father after years of captivity among the Lipan, the Comanche woman explained how her captors "never treated me roughly nor made a slave of me. But you, my own people, when you take captives, you make them slaves, you work them to death. But the Lipan treated me well." Thanks to her intervention, the two tribes reached a peace agreement. Lipans clearly recognized important differences between their engines of capture and those of Comanches.[103] Another tale records how several Comanche captains returned from a raid on "Old Mexico" and approached a Lipan-Mescalero encampment during the journey. One of the Comanches suggested that they "have peace with those people and have a big dance with them, for we have obtained many possessions." The others disagreed, and were killed during a disastrous attempt to steal the Apaches' horses. At once a lesson about Comanche greed and Apache resilience, the story also reveals the ways in which collective warfare against New Spain/Mexico and trade could bring the two peoples together.[104]

With Apache and Comanche bands sharing many of the socio-political structures integral to free associations, in 1816 new, inter-indigenous military alliances emerged on the southern Plains. A formidable cohort of Lipan warriors led by El Cojo, often allied with Tonkawa bands, renewed their raids on Rio Grande and Gulf Coast cattle ranches.[105] Reports also indicated that the Lipan and Comanches arranged their own military pact, often joined by Taovayas and Tawakonis who were probably kinsmen of El Sordo. In exchange for permission to hunt buffalo along the San Saba valley, now part of southern Comancheria, El Cojo's men joined Comanche

[103] Morris Edward Opler, ed., *Myths and Legends of the Lipan Apache Indians* (New York, 1940), 237-246.

[104] Opler, *Myths and Legends of the Lipan*, 247-250. See also Sherry Robinson, *Apache Voices: Their Stories of Survival as told to Eve Ball* (Albuquerque, 2000), 131-144.

[105] Mariano Varelo to Francisco Adam, December 19, 1815, BA.

war parties. Given their prior residence among Rio Grande ranching communities, Lipans provided valuable information on colonial geography when they joined Comanches "on campaign with the intention of attacking the towns of the north."[106] Reflecting the growth of mixed lineages, a number of Comanche men followed Apachean matrilocal customs and took up residence among the kinsmen of their Lipan wives.[107] By the summer of 1817, Lipan and Comanche warriors, "now in friendship and union," were forming large raiding parties, upwards of several hundred participants, to seize control of the pastoral economy. Pinning down under-provisioned troops within San Antonio, indigenous forces whittled down the Spanish herds until they dominated movement in an equestrian world.[108] Among several successful campaigns, a combined Lipan-Comanche force of over one thousand men swept onto the coastal plains and sacked Refugio, taking over ten thousand animals. Within two years, indigenous warriors turned coastal ranches into steady suppliers of livestock conveniently located near the Louisiana border. Lipans and Comanches also turned south, creating raiding trails that intersected the Rio Grande valley and soon stretched hundreds of kilometers into Mexico.[109]

Embarking on prolonged campaigns deep into hostile territory with one another, Apache and Comanche men evidently shared aspects of their war culture, including aesthetic practices. An officer at Rio Grande presidio received word that a party of Lipans "with braids like the Comanches," were approaching the valley, and on another occasion Lipans raiding in Coahuila

---

[106] Juan de Castaneda to Manuel Pardo, April 29, 1817, BA (quote); Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 7; Padilla, "Report on the Barbarous Indians," 56.

[107] Jean-Louis Berlandier, *The Indians of Texas in 1830,* John C. Ewers and Patricia Reading Leclercq, ed. and trans. (Washington D.C., 1969), 63.

[108] Antonio Martinez to Viceroy Juan Ruiz de Apodaca, June 7, 1817, NA; Martinez to Apodaca, August 6, 1817, NA.

[109] Hämäläinen, *Comanche Empire*, 186; Martinez to Apodaca, May 12, 1819, NA; Smith, *Dominance to Disappearance*, 110.

were "disguised as Comanches and allied with them."[110] Adopting alternative hair styles and dress allowed indigenous raiders to confuse colonial authorities as to the identity of their foes. In early 1819 a besieged Governor Antonio Martinez informed his superior that "many strange Indians are appearing dressed in capes and hats."[111]

Having buried their long-standing conflict, Apaches and Comanches quickly forged new partnerships with Tejano and Anglo-American traders in order to balance their diminished access to Spanish goods. Scattered by the royalist victory at Medina, in 1815 small parties of insurgents regrouped among the Comanches. The next year the Natchitoches commandant warned the governor of Texas that Spanish rebels "had gone to the Comanches," and together they planned to wage "a campaign against [San Antonio de] Bexar."[112] Rebel-aligned traders spent long periods among friendly rancherias, supplying their hosts with weapons smuggled from Natchitoches and Nacogdoches. Taken prisoner, the Irish-born horse smuggler and rebel agent Raymond Kirk told his interrogators that "Mariano Santos (alias el embustero ["the liar"]) of Nacogdoches" led a party of Spanish and Anglo-American traders to Sargento-Cordero's rancheria with seventeen mule-loads of guns and ammunition. Sargento-Cordero's band evidently used their control of the Louisiana-Texas corridor to summon Anglo-American traders, from whom they acquired the guns no longer available from war-torn New Spain. Soon,

[110] [Unknown] to Matias Ximenez, January 28, 1816, BA; Arredondo to Calleja, April 30, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I.

[111] Martinez to Arredondo, February 1, 1819, in *The Letters of Antonio Martinez: Last Spanish Governor of Texas, 1817-1822* (*LAM*), Virginia H. Taylor, ed. and trans. (Austin, 1957), 204.

[112] Arminan to Mariano Varela, August 5, 1815, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I; Felix Trudeau to Ignacio Perez, February 29, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I.

members of the band were traveling directly to Natchitoches to acquire more weapons.[113] Indigenous and rebel war leaders also used these trade fairs to coordinate their assaults, with mobile war parties drawing royalist forces towards the interior so amphibious landings by republican forces could be attempted along the Gulf Coast.[114]

With colonial villages beset by violence, there can be no doubt that during the 1810s indigenous bands became the most appealing borderland residences in terms of security and resources. Numerous Tejanos associated with the insurgency, including some of the most prominent colonists, fled San Antonio to cohabit with their long-standing Native trading partners. Francisco Ruiz and Clemente Delgado were both accused of sponsoring or guiding indigenous raiding parties, while other men assembled Tejano war parties that dispersed into the woodlands from where they "came back and forth to raid these communities […] killing cows and stealing all the animals they were able to carry to the United States."[115] Isolated, conditions became dire inside San Antonio. Upon his arrival at the capital in 1817, Governor Antonio Martinez discovered that "the troops had been living entirely on field roots for several days." Besides the onset of malnutrition the soldiers also lacked shoes, clothes, iron, ammunition, and horses. As a result, desertions became frequent. Returning from Natchitoches, three soldiers abandoned their commander near the Brazos and "joined some traders who are fugitives." Another incident involved the escape of the imprisoned rebel Pedro Procela, "alias El Chino,"

[113] Varela and Bastrop, Interrogation and Declaration of Raymond Kirk, February 12, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I; Thomas James, *Three Years Among the Indians and Mexicans*, Walter B. Douglas, ed. (St. Louis, 1916), 136-139.

[114] Varela to Arredondo, February 24, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I. For further suggestions that rebel forces planned to coordinate a general campaign with Comanches and Lipans, see Arsene Lacarriere-Latour, "General Observations on the War of the Mexican Patriots of Texas and their Allies," 1817, AGM, PI, Volume 244, Part I.

[115] Arredondo to Varela, June 28, 1816, BA; Ignacio Perez to Arredondo, August 14, 1816, BA; Martinez to Arredondo, July 6, 1817, *LAM*, 17; Martinez to Arredondo, October 23, 1819, *LAM*, 274.

who absconded "to the interior" with six accomplices and over a dozen horses.[116] Larger inter-ethnic raiding parties continued to pillage San Antonio and the surrounding ranches, with Comanches, Lipans, and Tawakonis accompanied by "wicked Spaniards."[117] By 1821, one informant claimed the trade in "Double barrelled Guns, good Lances and a great quantity of ammunition" amounted to U.S.$ 90,000 over the preceding year alone, and that the traders "go to plunder and murder the Spaniards jointly with the Indians."[118] Built upon generations of interaction, disparate indigenous and Tejano factions merged to destroy Spanish Texas.

Indigenous Power and Engines of Capture

While military and commercial networks connected Native rancherias with insurgents, smugglers, and bandits, livestock and captive-taking constituted the pillar of these surging indigenous economies. At times, raiding parties assumed significant dimensions in both their personnel and the scale of plunder. Moving across Texas, Comanche-Lipan cohorts repeatedly attacked villages in northern Coahuila over 1815-1816, killing fifty people, taking thirty-two captive, and making off with over eight hundred head of livestock during a single campaign.[119] Overall, raiders tended to seize a few captives in the process of taking animals, often boys or young male herders who could not escape when their flocks were attacked. In a report typical of his tenure, Governor Martinez described an 1818 attack on San Antonio by "a large band of Comanches and several Spaniards" in which "a soldier guarding the stock and a child on a ranch near [mission] La Espada were killed. Two boys were carried away from the ranch." No doubt,

[116] Martinez to Arredondo, May 30, 1817, *LAM*, 1; Martinez to Arredondo, July 23, 1817, *LAM*, 25; Martinez to Arredondo, September 30, 1817, *LAM*, 65.

[117] Martinez to Apodaca, June 26, 1818, NA (quote); Martinez to Arredondo, April 1, 1819, *LAM*, 217-218.

[118] Gregorio Peres to Martinez, March 15, 1821, NA.

[119] Arredondo to Calleja, February 24, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I.

these youths fulfilled similar roles under the supervision of their new Comanche masters.[120] Women also represented a significant portion of the captive population. Ruiz, who lived among Comanches between 1813 and 1821, noted that they captured "hundreds of prisoners of both sexes." Comanche polygyny facilitated the insertion of these women into families as labourers essential to the pastoral-raiding economy. They tanned hides, established camp, collected firewood, and drew water, among myriad other tasks. The depth of incorporation covered several layers, from drudge menials who might be sacrificed at their master's death to men who gained "rights and privileges after they join in a battle with the tribe, and particularly if they distinguish themselves in the campaign." In turn, captives, among both "the Indians of the Plains" and Euro-Americans, transformed their captors' societies by diffusing genes, technologies, and languages.[121] Along with the numerous Apache and Wichita peoples living among Comanches, several escaped Spanish captives reported Indian masters who "spoke in Spanish."[122]

Although incorporation represented one avenue of social integration, indigenous slaving networks, escapes, and ransoming also shuttled captives across great distances in a series of disorienting spatial and cultural transactions. Organizing lengthy campaigns deep into Spanish territory, indigenous warriors established temporary war camps to consolidate their spoils before making the long journey home. During 1816 one ex-captive spent several months at such a depot, held by Comanches along the "Rio de Barrancas" near the Vallecillo silver mines between

[120] For the seizure of herders, see Jose Antonio Bustillos to Varela, July 26, 1816, BA; Juan de Castaneda to Manuel Pardo, April 29, 1817, BA; Martinez to Arredondo, October 21, 1817, *LAM*, 71; Martinez to Arredondo, March 25, 1818, *LAM*, 110; Martinez to Arredondo, June 26, 1818, *LAM*, 150 (quote); Ynirino Yreta to Martinez, May 11, 1819, NA.

[121] Ruiz estimated 900 captives among the Comanches during the 1810s and 20s, including many who escaped. See Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 9; 15 (quotes). See also Burnet, "Letters Describing the Comanche Indians," 128-131.

[122] Varela to Arredondo, March 31, 1816, BA.

Laredo and Monterrey.[123] Another prisoner, an old man released by his captors as useless, reported that a combined Comanche-Lipan force gathered "about fifty" captives whom they drove towards their rancheria while the majority of the raiders remained encamped near Laredo.[124] Some of these captives endured journeys that covered hundreds of kilometers and multiple colonial and indigenous communities. Captured by eastern Comanches near Rio Grande presidio along with two other women and five children, Maria Baca spent nearly a year among her captors before a Spanish trader acquired her and brought her to Santa Fe for ransom.[125] The frequency of escapes and ransoms during the 1810s suggests that indigenous societies acquired more captives than they could reasonably control or accommodate within their pastoral political economy.

Raiding warfare, and the cycles of revenge it unleashed, exposed individuals and communities to higher levels of violence and abduction. With their aggregations of men, animals, and weaponry, indigenous war parties inflicted a number of severe defeats on their Spanish adversaries. Established to secure the frontier along the lower Rio Grande, the garrison town of Palafox and its residents experienced a series of raids over the 1810s. In the spring of 1816, fifty Comanches, "resentful of the blows they suffered" during an autumn raid, pinned down the troops guarding the presidial herd and killed twenty-seven men.[126] Monthly raids on San Antonio and Bahia severely taxed those garrisons, with dozens of soldiers killed in action.[127]

---

[123] Varela to Arredondo, March 31, 1816, BA.

[124] Matinez to Arredondo, April 26, 1820, *LAM*, 317.

[125] Arredondo to Perez, September 17, 1816, BA.

[126] Domingo de Ugartechea to Arredondo, May 8, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I; Arredondo to Calleja, May 13, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I. After raiders burned the town in 1818, it was abandoned until 1824.

[127] For military casualties and dire conditions at San Antonio and La Bahia, see Yreta to Martinez, May 11, 1819, NA; Martinez to Apodaca, May 12, 1819, NA; Arredondo to Martinez, March 22, 1821, NA.

Civilian casualties also soared. Governor Martinez recorded the deaths of sixty-four inhabitants between 1813 and 1820, numbers that far surpassed the intermittent killings which marred the peace of 1785-1810.[128] For their part, Spaniards continued to deploy their own long-standing mechanisms of violence, including raiding and deportations. During a series of short campaigns in March and April of 1816, Spaniards mobilized two hundred soldiers from the Rio Grande villages to attack Lipan rancherias. An advance force fell upon the rancheria of captains "Moreno and El Carabinero," both of whom were killed along with a number of warriors, while the soldiers managed to capture one man and eighteen women and children. The captors killed two women as they attempted to escape, and then deposited most of the remaining prisoners at a nearby ranch.[129] A month later another Spanish war party sallied from Palafox and attacked two rancherias, killing four men and two women, and taking thirty-three captives.[130] It is unclear whether Spanish officials deported these large groups of Apache captives or dispersed them among local households, but the governor noted the lack of facilities to hold prisoners and small-scale deportations continued.[131] In 1817 officers at Bahia captured a Lipan and his blind father and sent them to Monterrey. Four months later the commandant sent a Tonkawa to Rio Grande presidio, followed by another convoy of prisoners composed of Spanish rebels and an "apostate Indian" in May 1818.[132]

---

[128] Antonio Martinez, "Men and Women Killed by Indians, Between 1813 and 1820," Catholic Archives of Texas (CAT), San Antonio.

[129] Juan Jose Elguezabal, Diary, March 7-April 17, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I.

[130] Arredondo to Calleja, April 30, 1816, AGM, PI, Volume 239, Part I.

[131] For the lack of adequate carceral facilities at San Antonio and Bahia, see Martinez to Arredondo, May 28, 1818, *LAM*, 130.

[132] Martinez to Arredondo, July 12, 1817, *LAM*, 18; Martinez to Arredondo, October 5, 1817, *LAM*, 65-66; Martinez to Arredondo, May 28, 1818, *LAM*, 130.

Beyond captives, successful raids were also an important source of horses and weaponry for depleted Spanish and allied indigenous forces. During an attack on an Anglo-Comanche-Tawakoni encampment south of San Antonio, Spanish soldiers, colonists, and allied Tonkawas killed five, captured two, seized twenty-six horses, and a number of guns and lances. Among the other spoils were five pairs of Tawakoni ears and a banner that Martinez ordered placed in the town's church.[133]

By 1821, when Augustin de Iturbide's army took Mexico City and ended the Mexican War of Independence, famine, fever, and flood had combined with a decade of warfare to plunge Tejanos (Hispanic Texans) into destitution.[134] The chaos helped African-American slaves to rediscover Texas as a region of refuge, while others came as bondspeople brought by Anglo-American insurgents. In 1818 three black male slaves escaped a rebel encampment on Galveston Island and fled into the interior of Texas, and Spanish forces continued to capture fleeing slaves over the succeeding years.[135] Almost completely destroyed and depopulated by the rampaging royalist army in 1813, Nacogdoches continued to serve as a gateway for fugitives and bandits. One Anglo-American visitor described the village as "very desolate looking place" with a population of about a hundred "Spaniards, French, Americans, and free negroes."[136]

As the war drew to a close, the independent Mexican regime consolidated its administrative control over the Interior Provinces and dispatched peace commissioners to

[133] Martinez to Apodaca, May 29, 1818, NA; Martinez to Arredondo, June 2, 1818, *LAM*, 137.

[134] Outside the town's meager stockade, indigenous forces burned the surrounding fields to deny Spaniards' pasturage and food, Martinez to Arredondo, October 4, 1819, *LAM*, 269. In 1819 bovine malignant catarrhal fever ravaged the presidial horse herd, and during the early morning of July 5, 1819 the sudden rise of the San Antonio River caused it to burst its banks, killing "a good many people" and destroying much of the town, see Martinez to Arredondo, February 5, 1819, *LAM*, 207; Martinez to Arredondo, July 8, 1819, *LAM*, 242-243 (quote). A general picture of provincial ruin and the onset of famine is Martinez to Arredondo, January 20, 1820, *LAM*, 294-295.

[135] Martinez to Arredondo, May 27, 1818, *LAM*, 131-132; Martinez to Arredondo, October 6, 1818, *LAM*, 182; Martinez to Apodaca, December 10, 1819, NA.

[136] W. F. Dewes to [unknown], [no date], 1820, Robert Bruce Blake Papers, CAH.

establish treaties with Apaches, Comanches, and Wichitas. Mexican officials hoped that the venerable Kadohadacho chieftain, Dehahuit, would serve as an ambassador to the hostile indigenous nations. Dehahuit managed to facilitate a truce between San Antonio and Tawakoni bands led by two captains who pledged to terminate their alliance with Comanches and Lipans, encourage other Wichita bands to seek terms, and arrest all unofficial or foreign traders who entered their villages. Mexican officials also demanded the return of all captives, but the Tawakoni claimed to have none in their possession after they sold a Spanish boy to the Comanches.[137] Despite this early success, Mexican aspirations that the Kadohadacho could organize a pan-Indian peace proved premature. Dehahuit and his retinue of Caddo and French diplomats visited Monterrey to negotiate with the new commandant general, but the Kadohadacho leader later informed Mexican officials that his people were scattered "in the country of the Osages" on a hunting expedition and that he would be unable to visit Mexico City.[138]

Sensing an opportunity, an ambitious metis man named Richard Fields attempted to fill the diplomatic vacuum. Of mixed Cherokee and Scottish descent, Fields travelled to San Antonio and convinced Governor Jose Felix Trespalacios that Cherokee warriors could bring the Apaches and Comanches to terms in exchange for land tenure in east Texas. In their 1822 treaty with Mexico, the Texas Cherokees pledged to farm along the Sabine River and defend the frontier from indigenous and foreign attackers. In return they would be considered naturalized "American Spaniards" with the full rights of Mexican citizenship.[139]

---

[137] Treaty between Texas and the Tawakoni, April 23, 1821, AGM, PI, Volume 251.

[138] Dehahuit to Martinez, January 22, 1822, AGM, Relaciones Exteriores; Dehahuit to Iturbide, March 4, 1822, AGM, Relaciones Exteriores.

[139] Agreement between Captain Richard Fields of the Cherokee Nation and the Governor of Texas, November 8, 1822, NA.

Bolstered by their new Cherokee allies, Mexican officials continued to negotiate with Comanche and Apache bands. The fate of various captives played a central role during these discussions. Breaking their alliance with the Comanches after a series of violent disagreements, the Lipan leaders Cuelgas de Castro and Poca Ropa visited Monterrey for initial peace talks and then proceeded to Mexico City, bringing with them soldiers, interpreters, and two Spanish captives.[140] At the capital they negotiated a ten-point treaty that allied Lipans and Mexicans against the Comanches, and guaranteed Lipan hunting rights along the coastal plains. In addition to their military pact, the Lipan captains offered their captives to the Mexican president and promised to release the thirty-four Mexicans they held, along with another fourteen prisoners they acquired from other bands.[141] Once again, captive exchanges proved integral to making allies.

While the Lipan alliance proved durable, Mexicans failed to reach a stable agreement with eastern Comanches. Negotiations started off well, as the former rebel Francisco Ruiz, now a government Indian agent, attended a massive council of five thousand Comanches. Speaking in favour of peace, in July 1822 Pisinampe led a Comanche delegation into San Antonio and formalized a truce after officials promised to pay for returned captives and allow those who wished to remain to do so. Traveling to Mexico City, a party of Comanche diplomats concluded a treaty that included trade concessions, promises of assistance against mutual enemies, and the commissioning of several Comanche leaders as officers in the Mexican Army.[142]

---

[140] Gaspar Lopez, Report on the Interior Provinces of the East, April 26, 1822, AGM, Relaciones Exteriores; Matias Ximenez to Anastacio Bustamente, May 13, 1822, AGM, Relaciones Exteriores.

[141] Anastacio Bustamente, Articles of Peace with the principal chiefs of the Lipan Tribe, Cuelgas de Castro and Poca Ropa, Aug 17, 1822, NA.

[142] Kavanagh, *Comanches*, 196-197.

This rapprochement proved fleeting. Disappointed with officials' frugality during a June 1825 visit to San Antonio, several hundred Comanches proceeded to loot the town and slaughter cattle with impunity.[143] The same year Comanches resumed their raids on the Rio Grande towns, seizing livestock and captives, with rumours again surfacing that some Lipan warriors joined them as guides. In their correspondence, borderland officials continued to decry the effectiveness of indigenous warfare, particularly the transformation of captives into full members of free associations. One Mexican border agent noted how captive-taking deprived "religion and the State of the prisoners that the Indians take from us" and that the "caste that results from the mixing of our women with the Indians, or vice versa" constituted the greatest threat to Euro-American society.[144]

Galvanized during the Mexican War of Independence, indigenous engines of capture allowed Apaches, Comanches, Wichitas and their auxiliaries to replenish personnel, secure goods, and obtain information. Although a decade of warfare took its toll, these bands emerged militarily ascendant from the internecine conflicts of the 1810s.

Conclusion

By the beginning of the Mexican period (1821-1836), Texas and other borderland provinces had been radically transformed by slaving. Taking advantage of porous borders, fugitive slaves, aspiring planters, and Native emigrants entered Texas, pressed along by the convulsions of the Anglo-American plantation zone. Discerning the shifting economic landscape, Plains-oriented indigenous confederacies restructured their alliances in ways that did not conform to imperial expectations, and in fact contributed to the collapse of Spanish control over

[143] Mateo Ahumada to Juan Jose Llanos, August 8, 1825, BA.

[144] Jose Manuel Ceballos to the Bardon de Bastrop, September 14, 1825, NA; Bastrop to Ceballos, December 13, 1825, NA; Bastrop to Ceballos, December 26, 1825, NA (quotation).

Texas. Further empowering these advances, hundreds of Natives and Euro-Americans joined these coalitions as allies, captives, or commercial partners. With Comanche and allied bands firmly dominating the Plains political economy, northern Mexico languished in poverty while the plantation regime which once appeared poised to consume new lands stalled along the Mississippi. In response, Mexican authorities mobilized Anglo-American and Native colonists, like the Cherokees, to occupy its northeastern borderland as a food-producing military cohort, a policy that presaged new conflicts over land and labour.

Chapter 5: The Long War for the Texas Borderlands, 1825-1840

As the cruel embrace of borderland slaving enmeshed more participants, it began to unravel. Writing from a stockade along the Red River border between Texas and Arkansas Territory, in 1827 one United States Indian agent described the region as "the whirlpool that is sucking within its bosom the restless and dissatisfied of all nations and languages; parties of broken up tribes are continually pouring in, and it is become a receptacle for detached parties from all parts." Displaced by "the Long War of 1812" or travelling west to pre-empt the forced removals that would become U.S. policy within a decade, emigrant bands of Cherokees, Creeks, Delawares, Kickapoos, Seminoles, Shawnees, and other refugees arrived in Texas during the early 1820s.[1] Yet as years passed and Mexico City's inaction over granting the Cherokee land titles dragged on, the emigrant indigenous bands became embroiled in the intrigues of borderland politics. In 1825 a Cherokee man told a Mexican official that emigrant indigenous leaders met with an "Englishman and a Spaniard" who smoked a war calumet and told the assembly that "the Americans had whipped them here but not in Canady and not to be afraid for they could not whip them [in Texas]." Nor were the emigrant nations the only newcomers drawn to Mexico's northeastern borderland. Assembling from across the southern United States during the early 1820s, Anglo-American planters led by Stephen Fuller Austin pressed the frontier of slave-based cotton agriculture westward – an objective that demanded they transport all available capital, "particularly their Slaves."[2]

---

[1] For the larger context of the United States' expansion at the expense of northern and southeastern indigenous nations between 1760 and 1830, see Francois Furstenberg, "The Significance of the Trans-Appalachian Frontier in Atlantic History," *The American Historical Review* 113:3 (June 2008): 647–667; Alan Taylor, *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies* (New York, 2010); Gould, *Among the Powers of the Earth*; John P. Bowes, *Land Too Good for Indians: Northern Indian Removal* (Norman, 2016).

[2] George Gray to James Barbour, June 13, 1827, *TPUS, Volume 20: The Territory of Arkansas, 1825-1829*, 480; "Statement of a Cherokee Indian" [no date], 1825, Nacogdoches Archive (NA), Newberry Library, Chicago; Stephen F. Austin, Memorial to Legislature of Coahuila and Texas, in Eugene C. Barker, ed., *The Austin Papers*:

The expanding power of indigenous and Anglo-American slavers challenged Mexican politicians as they attempted to incorporate New Spain's northern provinces – what some viceroys had called "the land of war" – into the fledgling republic. From independence in 1821, Mexico City exerted littler control over the Texas borderland, where indigenous bands, traders, and brigands organized raids, smuggled animals, and stole people. In this multipolar setting slaving and warfare generated conflicts along class lines, rather than the "cultural and ethnic differences" scholars from the nineteenth century onwards have ascribed to borderland warfare in Texas.[3] Committed to raiding and trading, Plains-oriented bands and their allies confronted invading plantation communities, themselves beset with the tensions of racialized exploitation. The ensuing contest over land and labour amplified the violent interconnections between pastoral and plantation economies. As new waves of refugees and invaders adapted their resistance and slaving practices to borderland conditions, the cruel embrace that characterized earlier interactions began to collapse.

In this multipolar borderland, numerous factions contended for control of local resources and markets. Their own weaknesses weighed heavily as they dealt with each other. Emerging as militarily dominant from the warfare of the 1810s, a confederacy of Comanche and Wichita bands drew new partners into their commercial and kinship networks. The expansion of their pastoral economy confronted the colonial designs of the Mexican and Anglo-American states that emerged from their imperial antecedents. Like the liberal officers who directed New Spain's

---

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1919 (*AP*) (3 vols. Washington, D.C., 1924), I, Part 1: 996-1000.

[3] A harsh critic of the "ranger tradition" that dominates Texas history, historian Gary Clayton Anderson describes borderland warfare as a clash of races and cultures. See Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820-1875* (Norman, 2005), 125; Ben Kiernan, *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur* (New Haven, 2007), 334-349. For a critical appraisal of Texas historiography, see Stephen Stagner, "Epics, Science, and the Lost Frontier: Texas Historical Writing, 1836-1936," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 12:2 (April 1981): 165-181.

Indian policy and feared U.S. aggression, the first generation of Mexican frontier officials viewed Texas as a key strategic front. Mexico's early national governments all attempted to invigorate the region's population and economic potential. During the early 1820s authorities called on outsiders, inviting thousands of Anglo-American and Native colonists to help occupy and defend Texas. Seeking new lands for their plantation regime, Anglo-American planters terminated the region's long-standing role as a safety valve for maroons by transporting and pursuing slaves into Texas. Although the Mexican Congress legislated against chattel slavery between 1824 and 1829, lobbying and defiance by Anglo-American planters and their allies in the state government blunted these emancipatory efforts. Driven across the Mississippi by westering masters or transported by clandestine Atlantic slavers, African and African-American slaves laboured along the precarious frontier where cotton monoculture met Comanche power. At the confluence of pastoral and plantation economies powered by slaving, they encountered new challenges and opportunities. Over the coming decade, new alliances would emerge that challenged the racialized, exploitative society constructed by Anglo-American slavers.

Foregrounding these groups demonstrates the significance of the larger and longer struggles among various indigenous and colonial peoples that transformed the southwestern borderlands during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. From the early 1820s onward bands of Native emigrants, métis traders, and brigands competed with Anglo planters for control of east Texas, even as all of these factions wrestled with Comanche expansion and their own internal divisions. Led by influential Cherokee leaders, a republic of Native villages developed in east Texas that seemed to secure a new homeland for tribes driven from the United States. However, between 1830 and 1835 a militant faction of recently arrived planters from the U.S. became ascendant within Anglo politics. They possessed a very different vision of the

borderland's future. Not surprisingly, Anglo-American efforts to bring about Texas' independence have interested several generations of U.S. historians. Scholars have more recently underscored the obvious importance of chattel slavery in bringing about the "Texas Revolution" of 1835-1836. This confrontation between Mexico and its former colonists formed part of a much larger "panic of 1836" that raised possibilities of a Mexican-Native-African-American coalition overthrowing the racialized plantation regime, a conflict that became the "Long war for Texas."

Natives, Newcomers, and the Geography of Slavery, 1825-1829

By the mid-1820s Comanche trade, Mexican colonization policy, U.S. Indian Removal Policy, and fluid borders brought new groups into the Texas borderlands. In 1828 a Mexican general described the peoples of east Texas as a mixture of "incoherent elements" that included "tribes of savages […], fugitive criminals, honorable farmers, vagabonds and ne'er-do-wells."[4] Among these factions, aspiring Anglo-American *empresarios* (private colonization agents) like Stephen F. Austin worked indefatigably to recruit Southern planters and bring the slave-powered cotton economy into Texas. Within a decade, Anglos and black slaves established cotton plantations along the lower Brazos and Colorado rivers. Although wracked by storms, mosquitos, and cholera, the new towns of Brazoria, Columbia, Harrisburg, Matagorda, and San Felipe served as essential hubs for connecting this emerging plantation zone to the bustling nexus of credit and capital centered at New Orleans.[5] Although generally ignored in a historiography

[4] Manuel de Mier y Teran to Guadalupe Victoria, June 30, 1828, in Jack Jackson and John Wheat, ed. and trans., *Texas by Teran: The Diary kept by General Manuel de Mier y Teran on his 1828 Inspection of Texas* (Austin, 2000), 100.

[5] For the historiography of the plantation economy in Anglo-American Texas, see Lester G. Bugbee, "Slavery in Early Texas," *Political Science Quarterly* 13:3 (September 1898): 389-412; Eugene C. Barker, "The Influence of Slavery in the Colonization of Texas," *SWHQ* 28:1 (July 1924): 1-33; Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas* (Baton Rouge, 1989); Sean M. Kelley, *Los Brazos de Dios: A Plantation Society in the Texas Borderlands, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge, 2010); Andrew J. Torget, *Seeds of Empire: Cotton,*

focused on Anglo-American colonization, groups of emigrant Natives, traders, bandits, and slaves contested the boundaries of the plantation regime being built in Texas. As individuals or protean groups –flashing together in moments of cooperation – this diverse collection of peoples added to the competing forces creating a new geography of slavery.

Black slavery defined class relationships among whites in the Southern U.S., and they brought these structures to the Texas borderlands. There, the means of racialized exploitation altered class dynamics among all participants. The farmers and ranchers who aspired to mastery but lacked sufficient capital and political connections accessed the cotton economy by occupying the river valleys in search of prime cotton-producing soil. These people possessed few, if any, slaves and modest herds. They overcame these shortcomings by aggressively infiltrating the disputed U.S.-Mexico border. The Anglo-American newcomers soon put pressure on the local environment by clearing forests and adding to competition over hunting grounds. Most of these squatters established farms that mixed subsistence agriculture and animal husbandry, which they gradually supplemented with small cotton yields. Others sought opportunities in the pastoral economy of the Plains, traveling directly to Comanche camps to acquire livestock and buffalo hides. Although pastoral and plantation economies continued to exchange personnel, animals, and goods, structural tensions over the mobilization of labour and land began to fracture the slaving zone.

The land tenure system, kin-based production, and social dynamism of indigenous pastoralism directly challenged the extractive, racist, and chattel principles of the plantation economy. As the directors of the pastoral zone, indigenous bands and their auxiliaries (traders,

---

Slavery, and the Transformation of the Texas Borderlands, 1800-1850 (Chapel Hill, 2015). For works that explore the global flows of cotton, credit, and slaves emanating from the nineteenth century Southern United States, see Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge, 2013); Edward E. Baptist, *The Half has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York, 2014); Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A New History of Global Capitalism* (New York, 2015), 3-135.

slavers, bandits) became the targets of rival slavers – the planter class who dominated the U.S. In a letter to a frontier officer Austin criticized the Plains political economy for animating a "plundering war" against northern Mexico that was "of individual interest to the Indians." In order to combat this "species of Land Piracy" Austin proposed the introduction of more Anglo-Americans through the empresario program, a monopoly company to regulate Plains trade, and equipping mounted "Rifle Companies" who could more effectively control the plantation borderland.[6] Mexican officials shared Austin's qualms about the qualities of migrants from the U.S. Members of the state legislature at Saltillo distrusted the itinerant hunters and ranchers who criss-crossed the Red River, but praised "the people from Mississippi [who] are slave holders and generally wealthy." In their efforts to build the Texas economy, and develop their own share of the cotton economy, the Tejano elites at San Antonio and La Bahia supported Austin's arguments for sustained immigration. Although they welcomed "capitalists" they remained concerned by an uncontrolled border that created an "open door" for "wicked adventurers and others who constitute the dregs of society."[7]

Social cleavages among Anglo-Americans presaged the formation of a class of borderland planters who combined the slaving practices of the pastoral and plantation economies they straddled. Mounted and well-armed, this frontier cohort drove Natives off of their land, stole their livestock, and plundered their villages. Stationed outside Shreveport, Louisiana, a U.S. Indian Agent requested more troops in order to prevent the attacks perpetrated by "the lower class of Whites, residing in the province of Texas, on the [Caddo] Indians belonging to this

[6] Stephen Austin to Anastacio Bustamente, May 10, 1822, *AP*, I, Part 1: 508-510. For changes in the land around Nacogdoches, see Teran, Diary, June 3, 1828, *Texas by Teran*, 74-78.

[7] Bastrop to Luciano Garcia, December 2, 1823, NA; "Petition Addressed by the Illustrious Ayunamiento of the City of Bexar to the Honorable Legislature of the State: To Make Known the Ills which Afflict the Towns of Texas and the Grievances they have Suffered Since their Union with Coahuila," December 19, 1832, in David J. Weber and Conchita Hassell Winn, eds. and trans., *Troubles in Texas, 1832: A Tejano Viewpoint from San Antonio with a Translation and Facscimile* (Dallas, 1983), 19.

Agency." Beginning with the violent acquisition of land and animals, these men also began to acquire black slaves to transform indigenous hunting grounds into corn and cotton fields. Pursuing these slaving and colonization methods challenged Anglo-American raiders with securing their ill-gotten gains from Native retaliation even as they established their regime of racialized social control.[8]

The 1824 criminal code Austin wrote for his colony reflected the security preoccupations of Anglo planters in their new borderland environment. Published at San Felipe, the regulations targeted the "pilfering depredations of strolling parties of Indians and Robbers" as well as the "transit of men of bad character." Of the code's twenty-six articles, ten dealt directly with controlling Natives and slaves, particularly their movements within or around the colony. These laws authorized Anglo militias to arrest Natives of "suspicious character," and stipulated punishments of up to twenty-five lashes for violations ranging from being "rude" to colonists to theft.[9] Intimidation and force soon became the norm in Anglo dealings with the local Karankawa and Tonkawa bands. In one 1823 incident Austin and his men stormed into the village of friendly Tonkawas led by Carita ("Little Face") to demand the punishment of some suspected horse thieves. Enraged, Austin ordered Carita to "inflict with his own hands in my presence a severe lashing on the marauders." Austin clearly understood the shameful implications of subjecting indigenous men to corporal punishment – he later ordered Tonkawa horse thieves "whipp[ed] severely and shaving the head." Following another incident, in May 1824 Anglos imposed a treaty that forced Carita's band to move their camps further north, where they could obtain

[8] Gray to Barbour, November 30, 1825, *TPUS*, Volume 20: 154.

[9] Stephen F. Austin, "Criminal Regulations," January 22, 1824, in David B. Gracy II, ed., *Establishing Austin's Colony: With the Laws, Orders, and Contracts of Colonization* (Austin, 1970), 84-89.

horses and deerskins for trade. It also installed them as a military buffer between the plantation zone and eastern Comancheria, hardly an enviable position.[10]

Modeled on the slave codes that governed Southern society in the U.S., Austin's regulations preserved its progenitors' emphasis on controlling the movement of enslaved people within the plantation zone. In order to prevent slaves from fleeing or bandits from "inducing them to runaway," the code mandated written passes and outlawed commerce between whites and slaves. In 1826 Austin conducted a census that revealed how rapidly the plantation complex had transformed southeastern Texas. Of the 1,800 colonists, 443 were enslaved people toiling in the production of corn, cotton, and the first attempts at sugar monoculture. Yet concerns over the sanctity of slave property under Mexican law remained uppermost in the minds of potential migrants. When the state legislators of Coahuila y Tejas drafted a new constitution in 1827 they included a clause that undermined the future of chattel slavery by decreeing that "no one shall be born a slave in the state, and after six months the introduction of slaves under any pretext shall not be permitted." Despite the constitutional obstacles, *de facto* slaving continued as Austin worked with Tejano leaders to facilitate the introduction of black slaves under a system of indentured servitude modeled on Mexican peonage.

Others simply took advantage of the unguarded border to continue illegal slave importations from Louisiana and Arkansas Territory. The Mexican commandant at Nacogdoches reported that "there are no inhabitants on this frontier who are not owners of negroes," and that U.S. prohibitions against international slave trading made it risky for these masters to bring their slaves back across the Sabine. Under these circumstances the officer warned that Anglos were

[10] Austin to Garcia, August 28, 1823, *AP*, I:1: 688-689; Austin to Garcia, October 20, 1823, *AP*, I:1: 701-702 (quote 1); James Cummins to Austin, May 3, 1824, *AP*, I:1: 783; Austin to Amos Rawls, June 22, 1824, AP, I:1: 840 (quote 2); Jose Maria Sanchez, "A Trip to Texas in 1828," Carlos E. Castaneda, ed., *SWHQ* 29:4 (April 1926): 269. For Comanche-Tonkawa hostilities, see John Holland Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, John Holmes Jenkins III, ed., (Austin, 1958), 8.

likely to defend their plantation regime by force, as slavery's "abolition would be the ruin of [the] inhabitants." As Anglos contested emancipatory legislation and continued to introduce slaves, the borderland lost its status as a maroon haven that it had held under New Spain. For fugitives fleeing slavery in Louisiana and Arkansas Territory, sanctuary was no longer in Texas. The line of freedom was now the Rio Grande.[11]

Conversely, the porous borders that enabled the plantation complex to envelop Texas and curtail black autonomy also created opportunities for those operating on the margins of the cotton economy. Taking advantage of Mexico's limited military presence along the Red and Sabine rivers, stock thieves, slave stealers, and other bandits preyed on vulnerable ranches and plantations. Descending from the squatter settlement of Pecan Point or cutting trails through the pine woods, bandits simultaneously stole from and supplied those with more vested interests in the plantation economy. The gang associated with Nicholas "Old Nick" Trammell apparently targeted plantations from Natchitoches to Natchez by kidnapping or "persuading away" slaves with assurances of freedom in Texas. These men also traded in livestock, which they either stole from San Antonio or acquired by fencing stolen slaves.[12] These actions brought the gangs into direct conflict with wealthy planters on both sides of the border, who mobilized local sheriffs to crack down on brigandage. Having fled Alabama, one slave smuggler hired another man to assassinate the Nacogdoches *alcalde* (magistrate) because he was "raising the militia and a-

[11] Austin Colony Census, 1826, Center for American History (CAH), University of Texas, Austin; "Constitution of the State of Coahuila and Texas," in H. P. N. Gammel, ed., *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*, 10 vols. (Austin, 1898), I: 424; Richard Ellis to Austin, January 3, 1828, *AP*, II: 2-3 (quote 1, emphasis in original); Jose de las Piedras to Ahumada, November 7, 1829, NA; Piedras to Ahumada, November 9, 1829, NA (quote 2).

[12] For two men expelled from Nacogdoches on charges of "negro stealing," see James Gaines, arraignment of William L. Smith and Joseph Rankin, May 19, 1824, NA. For Trammell and his associates (Andre Valentin, Robert Collier, Wyatt Anderson, and others) role in stealing slaves and livestock , see James Dill to Francis Adams, October 19, 1824, NA; Deposition of William Pryor, August 16, 1825, NA; Interrogation of James Collier, January 19, 1826, NA; Declaration of Daniel O'Quin, April 3, 1826, NA; Leonard Dubois to Andre Valentin, sale of slaves, September 22, 1825, NA; Juan Martin de Veramendi to Austin, February 15, 1825, *AP*, Volume I, Part 2: 1044-1045.

striving to Enforce the law, by which the rogues were disturb[ing] their Trade of Stolen negroes and property." When Mexican troops marched to arrest Trammell's gang for "molesting the inhabitants and stealing their cattle," Trammell and other "bad men" fled north towards Pecan Point. Meanwhile, the Red River served as conduit for the "Lawless Fellows" who moved stolen slaves and horses between Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Reporting on the apprehension of bandits who kidnapped an enslaved woman from Opelousas and spirited her to northern Texas, in 1828 a U.S. official admitted that "such villainy is common on this Frontier."[13]

Anglo-Americans were hardly the only group of colonists who entered Texas with or without the consent of Mexican officials. From the early 1820s Mexico also accepted the entry of Natives emigrating from the United States, most of who belonged to nations that lost territory as Anglo-Americans expanded across the Appalachian Mountains. Whether pressured by war, encroachment, or federal removal policies, the exodus of Cherokees, Choctaws, Creeks, Delawares, Kickapoos, Seminoles, Shawnees, and others gathered in multi-ethnic towns as they sought to create new lives at the eastern edge of the Great Plains. This diverse Native diaspora soon challenged the territorial claims of Caddos, Comanches, Osages, and other Siouan peoples living along the Arkansas, Missouri, and Red watersheds.[14] As competition with the Osages over

[13] For Collier's criminal career and death, see Declaration of Daniel O'Quin, April 3, 1826, NA; Petition by Citizens of Monroe County, Mississippi, October 2, 1826, NA; Henry Johnson [on behalf of Green Collier] to Baron de Bastrop, May 9, 1825, *AP*, Volume 1, Part 2: 1090; Robert Collier, Inventory of Estate, September 20, 1826, NA. For Trammell's escape and slave stealing along the Red River border, see Norris to Political Chief, October 31, 1826, NA; Gray to Barbour, November 30, 1825, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 155; Gray to Peter B. Porter, August 30, 1828, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 743; David Brearley to Robert Crittenden, December 24, 1828, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 821.

[14] For diplomacy and rivalries in this borderland, see Stephen Aron, *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State* (Bloomington, 2006); Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia, 2006). For tribal histories see Ernest William Winkler, "The Cherokee Indians in Texas," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 7: 2 (October 1903): 95-165; Diana Everett, *The Texas Cherokees: A People Between Two Fires* (Norman, 1990); Arrell Gibson, *The Kickapoos: Lords of the Middle Border* (Norman, 1963); Kristin Hoganson, "Struggles for Place and Space: Kickapoo Traces from the Midwest to Mexico," in Clarissa Confer, Andrae Marak, and Laura Tuennerman, eds., *Transnational Indians in the North American West* (College Station, 2015); Sheri-Marie Shuck Hall, "Borderlands and Identities in Imperial Texas: The Alabamas and Coushattas in the Anti-Comanche Union, 1820-1840," *The International History Review*

hunting rights became violent, one band of Cherokees led by the renowned warrior Tahchee (or William Dutch), vowed "never again to join the main body of the [Cherokee] Nation," and planned to move "beyond Red River, within the Spanish provinces." Establishing a village with Delawares and Kickapoos, Tahchee's enclave became increasingly influential among the displaced tribes living on both sides of the international border. Another band of Cherokees, led by the venerable war leader Duwali (or Bowles, the Bowl) also entered Texas in 1821. Seeking a formal alliance with Mexico, the Anglo-Cherokee diplomat Richard Fields negotiated a provisional treaty in 1822. Carving out a space for themselves on the upper Sabine, Neches, and Angelina rivers forty kilometers north of Nacogdoches, about five hundred Cherokee colonists "engaged in the cultivation of their lands, in cattle raising, and in weaving their cotton dresses." Three hundred Delawares and four hundred Shawnees built a network of villages north of the Cherokees and eight hundred Kickapoos settled west of the Sabine. Hunting, farming, and ranching along these alluvial valleys, this republic of villages increased from an initial population of about two thousand to an estimated five to seven thousand people by 1835.[15]

Providing Mexico with another group to secure and develop its northern borderland, these villages were also centers of debate and increasing factionalism among the emigrants. More established leaders sought stable relations with Mexico, while younger, often métis, leaders became interested in land speculation or trading opportunities with nomadic bands. Of

---

25 (September 2003): 563-591; H. Allen Anderson, "The Delaware and Shawnee Indians and the Republic of Texas, 1820–1845," *SWHQ* 94 (October 1990): 231-260; Sami Lakomaki, *Gathering Together: The Shawnee People through Diaspora and Nationhood 1600-1870* (New Haven, 2014), 165-192.

[15] For Cherokee-Osage conflict see Matthew Arbuckle to Edward G. W. Butler, November 4, 1826, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 302; Edward W. DuVal to William Clark, December 6, 1826, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 320; Clark to Barbour, January 6,1827, *TPUS*, 358. For the 1822 treaty and Cherokee petitions for land titles, see Agreement between Captain Richard Fields of the Cherokee Nation and Antonio Crespo, November 8, 1822, NA; Richard Fields to Rafael Gonzalez, April 22, 1825, NA. For the locations, populations, and activities of the emigrant Natives, see Sanchez, "Texas in 1828," 286; Juan N. Almonte "Statistical Report on Texas [1835]," Carlos E. Castaneda, ed. and trans., *SWHQ* 28:3 (January 1925): 222.

mixed Scots-Cherokee heritage, Fields repeatedly pledged military assistance against Comanche and Wichita raiders, insisting that "we consider ourselves sons of the Mexicans." Responding to the devastation of Comanche and Wichita raids, Fields refused to see "our fathers killed or driven into captivity." In the fall of 1826 Fields offered to lead a campaign against the Tawakoni village on the upper Brazos, the staging ground for raids against Cherokee, Tejano, and Anglo-American communities.

Still, other Native emigrants gravitated towards the pastoral economy. Parties of several extended families visited the Plains for seasonal buffalo hunting expeditions and trade fairs, while Native individuals sought work and other opportunities at the trading posts scattered along the Red and Arkansas River valleys. With their métis partners, the activities of these men blurred the lines between competing alliances. Members of these trader cohorts, such as Tennessean John "Cherokee" Williams, were of dubious loyalty to Mexico and often suspected of "raising a disturbance in our country." The economic successes of emigrant Native communities also challenged the designs of Anglo-American squatters and land speculators, making them suspect in the eyes of their white neighbours.[16] The uncertainty created by local rumours and Mexican land policy intensified Native emigrants' efforts to formally secure their claims to a new homeland in Texas. Disappointed with Mexican officials' failure to grant them the deeds they had promised him, Fields cultivated other means to this end. These actions soon embroiled the emigrant villages in the machinations of disgruntled Anglo-American empresarios in an uprising that became known as the "Fredonian Rebellion."

[16] For Fields efforts to mobilize an Anglo-Cherokee force against the Comanches, Tawakonis, and Wacos, see Fields to Norris, [August-September], 1826, NA (quote); Fields to Austin, [September], 1826, NA. For Mexican and Anglo suspicions regarding the intentions of Natives and traders, see Rafael Manchola to Ahumada, March 30, 1826, NA; Fields to the Governor of Texas, August 12, 1826, NA (quote); Norris to Political Chief of Texas, August 22, 1826, NA (quote).

Unlike Austin, the Edwards brothers' plans for turning cheap land into substantial wealth did not meet their expectations. In 1825 Haden Edwards received a land grant to colonize eight hundred families west of Nacogdoches. Supported by land speculators from Louisiana, Edwards began harassing established residents regarding the validity of their own land claims. When Edwards' failed to rig the alcalde election in favour of his son-in-law, his rivals among the older colonists feared he would "return with a crowd of vagabonds to avenge himself." Rumours swirled during the spring of 1826 that the Edwards faction planned "the formation of an independent government," and would "establish such laws as they think proper, especially respecting slaves." Reports also surfaced that some Cherokees, Delawares, and Shawnees, supported "by a combination of Englishmen," would join "those who contemplate a revolution." Disillusioned with Mexican promises, Fields reversed course and led a faction of Texas Cherokees in a desperate gambit to secure their lands by taking sides with the Edwards brothers.[17]

Disgruntled Cherokee diplomats and Anglo-American land speculators made awkward allies, with each side motivated by their own weaknesses. In an impassioned speech to his Cherokee supporters, Fields described the contemptuous treatment he had received from Mexico City officials when he tried to obtain land titles for "an orphan tribe of red people who looked on me as their protector." Isolated and insulted, Fields declared that "If I am whipped, then I shall submit to my fate; if not, I will keep my lands, with the assistance of my red warriors." With only forty armed men in their ranks, the Edwards brothers needed troops and feared the consequences of refusing Fields overtures. So they decided to "yield to the Indians the territory

[17] For Mexican suspicious of Edwards and his followers, see Ahumada to Gonzales, March 29, 1825, NA; Jose Antonio Sepulveda to Political Chief of Texas, March 23, 1826, NA (quote 1). For rumours of Edwards' intentions to revolt, see Norris to Political Chief of Texas, April 4, 1826, NA (quote 2); Norris to political chief, October 17, 1826, NA (quote 3); Norris to political chief of Texas, May 2, 1826, NA (quote 4).

which they claimed." Riding into Nacogdoches, on December 21, 1826 the Edwards and Fields factions proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Fredonia in a document that divided east Texas between "Red and White men." Four days later the Fredonians issued another proclamation. It attempted to galvanize local slaveholders by raising the specter of Mexico's emancipationist policies. Mexican troops supported by Austin's militia and local Caddos soon prompted the Edwards faction to flee across the Sabine, leaving behind "cattle, horses, hogs, and negroes." The Republic of Fredonia had lasted less than a month. Fields never obtained the support of Duwali and the Cherokee Council, who disavowed the uprising and affirmed their loyalty to Mexico by having Fields assassinated.[18]

Although it failed miserably, the Fredonian unrest of 1826-1827 exemplified the multifaceted and increasingly deadly contests dividing Mexicans, Anglos, and Natives over the future of slavery within the borderland's political economy. Reports of village rivalries, renegade war leaders, and an alliance of emigrant indigenous nations beholden to neither Mexico nor the U. S. created what one Indian agent called "a scene of anarchy and plunder such as has not happened in Indian commotions for many years." Although land titles were still not forthcoming from Mexico City, the Cherokees and their allies maintained *de facto* control over their east Texas territories, with defined boundaries and interconnected towns. Threatened by an expanding Native population's control of coveted cotton-growing soils, Austin told state officials that "it is illusory to think [the emigrant Natives] can be contained, or made into useful citizens."

[18] Peter Ellis Bean, Report on "Speech of Richard Fields in the Assembly of Nacogdoches," [no date], 1826, NA (quote 1); Benjamin Edwards to Gray, May 27, 1827, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 483 (quote 2); Benjamin Edwards, Herman Mayo, Richard Fields, and John Dunn Hunter, Fredonian Declaration of Independence, December 21, 1826, NA (quote 3); Benjamin Edwards and Mayo, Proclamation, December 25, 1826, in Charles Adams Gulick Jr. and Katherine Elliott, eds., *Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar* (*PML*) (6 vols. Austin, 1921-1927), I: 66-68. For the defeat of the Fredonians and Fields' murder, see John A. Williams to Ahumada, Feb 12, 1827, NA (quote 4); Bustamente to Commandant General of Eastern PI, March 30, 1827, NA; Francisco Ruiz to Ahumada, May 14, 1827, NA.

Informed by greed and racism, planters and speculators wanted indigenous lands and black labour.

In this uncertain diplomatic landscape traders and raiders of all nations exploited the interstices of pastoral and plantation economies. On the Red River border Pecan Point became a staging ground for launching raiding expeditions into Texas or Comancheria. Brigands led by a "Doctor Dayton" and a "half breed Shawney" styled themselves the "Advance of the Republican Army," but their grandest design was to "Plunder the Caravan which conveys silver from Santa Fe to the City of Mexico."[19] Mexican and Anglo officials also struggled to control independent traders in east Texas. Sensing an opportunity outside the cotton economy, young men left Austin's colony to search for a missing man but the empresario suspected "their true object is to kill Indians and get horses." At Nacogdoches, the Mexican commandant defended his reliance on a trader raised among the Shawnee and Kickapoo. He informed his superior that if the trader's rivals succeeded in dislodging him, "he is sure to be followed by the Indians; [and] change their friendship into enmity."[20]

Amid this turmoil, Mexican politicians began to re-evaluate their colonization policy. In 1828 they dispatched General Manuel Mier y Teran to inspect the Texas borderland and offer policy recommendations. In east Texas Teran observed a borderland society of indigenous, Anglo, French, and Spanish peoples alongside blacks "and their different mixtures," all together "notable for the diversity of their origins and the present similarity of their customs." Teran also detected the separatist leanings of many Anglos, whom he feared would soon sever Texas from

[19] Gray to Barbour, June 13, 1827, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 481 (quote 1); Austin to Musquiz and Lorenzo de Zavala, July 23, 1829, *AP*, II: 238 (quote 2). For Pecan Point, see Jose Maria Mora to Musquiz, April 29, 1828, NA (quote 3); Antonio Elosua to Musquiz, May 13, 1828, NA; George Izard to Henry Clay, October 16, 1827 *TPUS*, Volume 20, 543.

[20] Austin to Ahumada, March 27, 1826, NA (quote 1); Piedras to Ahumada, June 8, 1829, NA (quote 2).

the federal republic. In response he urged an end to immigration from the U.S. and proposed a renewed attempt to bring Mexican colonists to Texas.[21]

Wary and weary of the unchecked Anglo-American immigration described by Teran, in April 1830 the centralist government in Mexico City terminated the colonization program. It was a devastating blow to the planters, slavers, and land speculators who now dominated Anglo-Texas. Yet the deepening crisis between Anglos and Mexico was only one part of the multipolar conflict that plunged the borderland into nearly two decades of war. Beyond Mexican congressional debates and town meetings, powerful indigenous confederacies constituted a far more real challenge to this alien society of masters and slaves.

Indigenous Alliances and the War for Texas, 1830-1835

Pursuing their own visions of hegemony, alliances among bands of eastern Comanches, Caddos, Wichitas (Kichais, Taovayas, Tawakonis, and Wacos), and others challenged the plantation complex invading their lands. Empowered by the successes of the 1810s and 1820s, these bands emerged from those decades as even more interconnected units of a pastoral raiding, trading, and stockraising economy. With their military mobility and ability to incorporate outsiders, these bands had become well-equipped to target the production and personnel of scattered ranches and cotton plantations. Volatile master-slave relations within these communities only added another element for Caddos, Comanches, and Wichitas to exploit. Austin himself described the challenges of controlling a large slave population at the borders of indigenous territory. Admitting that his colony was "not well prepared to resist an attack" by a

[21] Teran, Diary, June 3, 1828, *Texas by Teran*, 80.

Comanche-Tawakoni force, Austin explained that Anglo men had abandoned their militia posts as they waited for "the decision of [Mexico's] Congress in regard to their slaves."[22]

Mexican frontier officials largely continued the Bourbon policy of favouring a "bad peace" over a "good war" with independent Native peoples. This meant the acknowledgement of local truces, gift-giving, and an effort to make Natives dependent on material goods in combination with tactical violence. Following Teran's mission, in 1829-1830 Mexico City sent hundreds of additional troops to Texas in order to secure the northern states from the Comanche-Wichita confederacy. In consultation with Anglo and Tejano leaders, Commandant General Anastacio Bustamente initially favoured an offensive policy that would bring the war into Comanche and Wichita territory in central Texas. Viewing them as bases for conducting livestock raids, Austin targeted the Wichitas' Brazos villages for destruction in order to "finally dispose of those Indian settlements in one campaign." Although allied Lipan Apache and Cherokee war leaders made clear their interests in joining these campaigns Bustamente ultimately adopted a defensive posture. Concerned about the financial costs of keeping a large Mexican army in the field, Bustamente also raised concerns that destroying the Wichitas' towns and crops would turn them into a "wandering tribe" even more amenable to joining Comanche raids.[23] With the door open for negotiations, in June 1827 the veteran Tejano Indian agent Francisco Ruiz followed-up Tawakoni and Waco peace feelers by inviting them to Nacogdoches to broker a truce. The Waco war leader Menchaca and other elders expressed their desire for a "true peace" and indicated that their Comanche allies were likewise disposed to visit San

[22] Austin to Political Chief, September 11, 1826, NA.

[23] For Anglo and Tejano advocates of offensive warfare against the Tawakoni and Waco villages, see Rafael Manchola to Ahumada, March 30, 1826, NA; James J. Ross to Austin, April 4, 1826, NA; Austin to Ahumada, April 30, 1826, NA (quote 1). For the adoption of a more defensive policy, see Bustamente to Ahumada, April 7, 1827, NA (quote 2); Felipe de la Garza to Ahumada, June 20, 1829, NA.

Antonio and conclude a treaty. A diplomatic party visited San Antonio in July and explained that other leaders would make peace with Mexico when they returned from a campaign in Osage territory. Over the next two years various Penateka leaders visited San Antonio and the Rio Grande towns to parley, and in 1830 the Comanche diplomat Guonique, who had travelled to Mexico City in 1822, returned to the federal capital to reinforce the fragile truce.[24]

Committed to a political economy built on ranching, trading, and raiding, cohorts of younger war leaders and their partners thwarted these agreements, which struck directly at their commercial and social aspirations. Within a year of the Nacogdoches truce tensions between members of the Comanche-Wichita confederacy and a loose alliance of Anglo-Americans, emigrant Natives, and Mexicans sparked a prolonged war in central Texas. Militants among the Comanche-Wichita confederacy frequently struck at the Anglo and Native villages in east Texas. In response Cherokee, Shawnee, Delaware, Creek, and other emigrant leaders met with Teran and expressed their "love for the Mexicans and of their desire to form one people with them to exterminate the Tawakonis and Wacos." After Wacos took the majority of their horses, in April 1829 and June 1830 Cherokee infantry campaigned along the Brazos, destroying two Wichita towns, killing eighty people, with "many of the women and children made prisoners" and hundreds of animals retaken.[25]

In the wake of these victories Comanches increasingly joined their Tawakoni allies in counter-raids against enemy villages. As more Comanche leaders disavowed the truce of 1827 by

[24] Francisco Ruiz to Austin, May 27, 1827, *AP*, I, Part 2: 1647; Ruiz to Austin, June 2, 1827, *AP*, I, Part 2: 1653 (quote 1); Peter Ellis Bean to Austin, June 3, 1827, *AP*, I, Part 2: 1656; Smith, *Dominance to Disappearance*, 137.

[25] Austin to Musquiz, February 12, 1828, *AP*, II: 15-16; Sanchez, "Texas in 1828," 288 (quote 1); Martin Allen to Austin, July 5, 1829, *AP*, II: 225-226; John Wesley Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas: Reliable Accounts of Battles, Wars, Adventures, Forays, Murders, Massacres; Together with Biographical Sketches of Many of the Most Noted Indian Fighters and Frontiersmen of Texas* (Austin, 1889), 174-179; James T. DeShields, *Border Wars of Texas; Being an Authentic and Popular Account, in Chronological Order, of the Long and Bitter Conflict Waged between Savage Indian Tribes and the Pioneer Settlers of Texas* (Tioga, 1912), 66-76.

condoning raids, in the summer of 1831 Teran informed garrison commandants from Laredo to Santa Rosa to prepare the soldiers and Mexican citizens of the Rio Grande valley for hostilities. During the early 1830s Mexican forces launched a series of campaigns that further enveloped the communities of southern and central Texas in renewed warfare. In a direct challenge to Comanche-Wichita territoriality, the Mexican Army constructed Fort Tenoxtitlan on the upper Brazos and placed Francisco Ruiz in command. Schooled in borderland warfare during the insurgency of 1811-1821, Ruiz assisted allied Natives in harrying the Wichitas. When Cherokee, Delaware, and Shawnee war leaders pledged to continue the war, Ruiz insisted they turn over all the branded animals they took but offered to pay them a bounty of six pesos for every Tawakoni scalp they brought to Tenoxtitlan.[26]

The intensity of warfare increased during the early 1830s, with engagements producing dozens of casualties as colonial forces sought a decisive victory. During the early morning hours of November 13, 1831 a force of 170 Mexican, Tejano, Caddo, and Kickapoo troops under Captain Manuel Lafuente surprised a large Tawakoni hunting camp while the inhabitants slept. The attackers opened with a "dense volley," but as they poured gunfire into the defenseless encampment cries of "Comanches, friends friends Spaniards!" rang out from the din – a band of Comanches, supposedly at peace with Mexico, were among the villagers. In his campaign journal Lafuente described the presence of the Comanches as a "fatal reunion" that prevented a complete slaughter, "because more of [the Tawakonis] would have been killed, and because the families of many of them would have been captured." Nevertheless, dozens of Tawakonis were killed, including Menchaca, and the Comanche leader Barbaquista and his son died in their efforts to prevent a massacre. Lafuente's force captured two hundred horses, but they gave many

[26] Teran to Antonio Elosua, August 23, 1831, Bexar Archive (BA), CAH; Elosua to Nicasio Sanchez, August 17, 1830, BA; Ruiz to Elosua, August 6, 1830, BA.

of the animals to Barbaquista's grieving kinsmen. Continuing their offensive, a week later Lafuente and his men engaged a group of thirty Tawakonis in a running battle along a canyon. They killed nine warriors, taking their guns and leaving the bodies "hanging on two liveoaks."[27] With eastern Comanche bands draw into the conflict, by 1832 the San Antonio *ayunamiento* (town council) complained to the state government in Saltillo of a "new uprising of the Comanches" that threatened to destroy Texas. The killing of Menchaca and Barbaquista surely diminished the influence of Comanche and Wichita leaders who still favoured reconciliation with Mexico, and raids resumed on San Antonia, Goliad, and the Rio Grande towns further south.[28]

Like those of the 1810s, the Comanche-Wichita campaigns of 1828-1835 involved mobile warfare that weakened colonial communities by inserting stolen people and animals into the pastoral economy. In 1828 Ruiz estimated that nearly nine hundred captives lived among Comanche bands, mainly Mexican women, adolescents and "Indians of the Plains." If they survived the initial violence and drudgery of incorporation Ruiz explained that some captives "are allowed rights and privileges […] particularly if they distinguish themselves in the campaign." Indeed, various sources attest to the prevalence of Native, Mexican, and other Euro-American men and women who became fully-assimilated members of Comanche society between the 1820s and 1840s. Repeating the long-standing conviction among Hispanic officials concerning the transformation of captives into dedicated members of Comanche society, Ruiz argued that "the customs and habits of the captives are as wicked, or sometimes even worse, than

[27] Manuel Lafuente to Elosua, November 24, 1831, BA; Lafuente, Diary of the events […] in the expedition against the Tawakoni, [November 30], 1831, BA (quotes); Austin to Manuel Carillo, January 24, 1831, *AP*, II: 590.

[28] "Petition by the Ayunamiento of Bexar," *Troubles in Texas*, 15. For an account of the Shawnee-Comanche battle at Bandera Pass, see *Telegraph and Texas Register* (Houston), Wednesday, August 14, 1839, 3.

those of the other barbarians." As a cohort, this generation of captives made significant contributions to the skills, knowledge, and vitality of indigenous societies.[29]

The expansion of Anglo-American plantations up the Colorado and Brazos valleys, the primary buffalo hunting grounds of the southern Comancheria, brought indigenous warfare into the plantation zone.[30] During his time riding with U.S. Army dragoons along the Arkansas-Texas border, artist George Catlin noted that people of mixed black and indigenous ancestry could be found "amongst the Camanchees, even, and the Caddoes." Catlin explained that some black men escaped from "the slave-holding States to the heart of the country," where they joined indigenous bands and sometimes became "extraordinary and important personages."[31] The following decade would bear out Catlin's observations. Determined to protect the homeland that they had carved out during the preceding century, Comanche warriors drew in an increasingly diverse array of prisoners as Anglo and African-American captives joined Hispanic and indigenous peoples their ranks. Captured people played crucial roles in indigenous societies beset by population losses due to disease, warfare, and the immense pressures imposed by colonialism.

---

[29] For Comanche captives, see Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 9 (quotes); Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas,* 215; William Fairfax Gray, January 17, 1836, in Paul D. Lack, ed., *The Diary of William Fairfax Gray: From Virginia to Texas, 1835-1837* (Dallas, 1997), 68; Benjamin Dolbeare, *A Narrative of the Captivity and Suffering of Dolly Webster Among the Camanche Indians in Texas; With an Account of the Massacre of John Webster and his party, as related by Mrs. Webster (New Haven, 1986 [1843]), 25;* Berlandier, *The Indians of Texas in 1830*, 74-75; Rivaya-Martinez, "The Captivity of Macario Leal," 396-397; Josiah Gregg, *Commerce of the Prairies*, Max L. Moorhead, ed. (Norman, 1954), 249-250; James Hobbs, *Wild Life in the Far West* (Hartford, 1875), 17-31; John Galvin, ed., *Through the Country of the Comanche Indians in the Fall of Year 1845: The Journal of a U.S. Army Expedition led by Lieutenant James W. Abert* (San Francisco, 1970), 47; 64; Thomas W. Kavanagh, ed., *Comanche Ethnography: Field Notes of E. Adamson Hoebel, Waldo R. Wedel, Gustav G. Carlson, and Robert H. Lowie* (Lincoln, 2008), 67; 79; 123-124.

[30] For Comanche attacks on plantations in eastern and northern Texas, see Green DeWitt to Musquiz, December 28, 1830 [29?], NA; Izard to Barbour, September 21, 1828, *TPUS*, Volume 20, 748.

[31] George Catlin, "Letter No. 58" [1834] in Peter Mathiessen, ed., *North American Indians* (New York, 1989), 461. For an African-American who became an advisor to the Texas Cherokees, see Andrew Forest Muir, ed., *Texas in 1837: An Anonymous, Contemporary Narrative* (Austin, 1958), 47.

The largest Comanche-Wichita offensives took place in central Texas, where ranching and cotton operations began to encroach on their territory. As they pressed northwestward up the Brazos and Colorado rivers, Anglo planters established a string of militarized plantation communities that met stiffening Comanche and Wichita resistance. Having incorporated the buffalo-range of central Texas into their territory during the second-half of the eighteenth century, Comanches clearly regarded the region as a core component of their pastoral economy, which they shared with their Wichita allies. In 1834 Taovaya warriors intercepted a buffalo-hunting expedition from Bastrop, a town at the western edge of the plantation zone, killing one man and taking two captives – a young Anglo boy and an older black slave. According to Catlin, who accompanied a U.S. Army mission to the Taovaya village, the chief denied having the boy until a black man, "who was living with the Pawnees [Wichitas]," stepped forward and revealed that the captive was being held in a nearby cornfield. Only then did the U.S. cavalrymen offer to exchange the boy for three Wichita and Kiowa girls they had ransomed from the Osage. Although the identity of the black man remains unclear – was he the slave captured alongside the boy? – another account of this incident suggests that this man may have stayed among the Wichitas for nearly a year before deciding to abscond.[32] Whatever the case, black slaves continued to experience the perils and possibilities that indigenous warfare introduced to their lives on borderland plantations. In another assault on a frontier plantation Comanche raiders apparently killed an enslaved woman and took her young child prisoner. In 1835, a Comanche expedition destroyed another plantation and carried off a white and a black girl. The same year Comanches attacked a fortified cluster of plantations in central Texas, and among the war party was "a negro man who had run away from his master and joined them." The ex-slave died in the

[32] Catlin, "Letter No. 43," *North American Indians,* 337-338 (quotes); Andrew Davis, "Folk Life in Early Texas: The Autobiography of Andrew Davis," R. L. Jones, ed., *SWHQ* 43:2 (October 1939): 163-164. For another account of this incident, see DeShields, *Border Wars of Texas,* 111-118.

ensuing firefight, and Anglo women revealed their profound apprehensions over such alliances when they "cut off the head of the negro man who had been killed and stuck it on a pole where it remained for several months." One Anglo-Texan chronicler memorialized the warfare of 1835-1837 as the "Bloody Days of Bastrop."[33] The vulnerability of frontier plantations during the mid-1830s did little to stem Anglo invasions, but offered additional personnel for indigenous war leaders busily organizing the defense of Native borders.

Comanches and Wichitas expanded the scope and effectiveness of their campaigns through the recruitment of additional Native allies – Kiowas, later Arapahoes and Cheyennes – as well as Native, métis, and Euro-American traders.[34] Drawn by the commercial dynamism of Comancheria, these traders worked their way up the Red River, establishing outposts beyond the reach of the Mexican or U.S. cavalry officers who viewed them as the driving force in the borderlands' gun and horse trade. In turn, the traders recouped a share of the livestock, captives, and other plunder taken by Comanches and allied raiders, who embarked on increasingly long-distance expeditions deep into Mexico. Together, these indigenous and Euro-métis groups formed influential kin and political linkages. From his trading post on the western Cross Timbers Kentucky-born Holland Coffee led a mixed cadre of twenty-five Americans and dozens of Native traders who distributed captives, weapons, animals, and goods across the Southern Plains. A Waco chief, himself fearful of Coffee's influence among the Taovayas and Tenewa Comanches, told a Nacogdoches mule trader that many warriors "consider that American a sorcerer." Melding commerce and diplomacy, business at Coffee's outpost depended on raids

[33] DeShields, *Border Wars of Texas*, 118, 196; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 217-218 (quotes). For general hostilities between Comanches and Anglos in central Texas, see Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 27-31; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 241-245; John Henry Brown, *Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas* (Austin, 1890), 106-107 (bloody days quote).

[34] For new members of the Comanche-Wichita alliance, see Ruiz, *Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*, 16; John Cameron, "Comanche Indians; Country West of the Rio Grande," October 25, 1836, *PML*, I: 476.

against Mexican and Anglo ranches. The Waco chief reported that Coffee urged Comanches, Choctaws, and Osages "to make peace among them[selves] and to unite in war against the Mexicans." After Tawakoni men returned from a raid against Bastrop, Coffee allegedly told them "all [was] well and to proceed in the business, he would protect them and give them market for their plunder."[35]

Mexican and U.S. officials rightly feared the potential blowback of their war and removal policies, as the border between Mexico and Indian Territory allowed emigrant nations to contact Plains Indians. Embittered by the violence and dispossession of Anglo-American colonization, a new generation of Native diplomats warned Comanche and Wichita leaders about the avarice of whites, "telling how they had been despoiled […] and that it would be same in their case." Avowed foes of the United States since the 1760s, U.S. officials especially feared the Kickapoos due to their militant council among Comanches. Taken together, the infusion of new individuals and groups – runaway slaves, Anglo and Hispanic captives, métis and Native traders – into Comanche networks heralded formations that challenged Anglo-American slavers.[36]

The Panic of 1836

As Anglo-Texans continued to organize the continent's westernmost plantation society, their revolt against Mexican sovereignty unfolded within a larger historical context riven by panics over speculative economic bubbles, Native hostilities, and slave insurrections. In his

[35] For Coffee's outpost, see Henry Rueg to Political Chief of Bexar, May 18, 1835, NA; James Bowie to Rueg, August 3, 1835, NA; DeShields, *Border Wars of Texas*, 158. Coffee himself was also increasing his investments in the plantation economy, see census for Colorado County, in Gifford E. White, ed., *The 1840 Census of the Republic of Texas* (Austin, 1966), 31. For Tejano traders involved with the Cherokees and Comanches, see Juan Mora, Proceedings against Jose Justo Liendo and [Juan] Lorenzo Boden, February 10, 1835, NA. See also Ralph A. Smith, "Mexican and Anglo-Saxon Traffic in Scalps, Slaves, and Livestock, 1835-1841," *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 36 (October 1960): 98-115; David La Vere, *Contrary Neighbors: Southern Plains and Removed Indians in Indian Territory* (Norman, 2000), 91-136.

[36] For the militant influence of removed Natives, see Noah Smithwick, *Evolution of a State, or Recollections of Old Texas Days* (Austin, 1900), 189; Teran to Foreign Minister, June 9, 1828, *Texas by Teran*, 93-94.

withering 1836 critique of the "Slave Power" in Texas, the abolitionist Benjamin Lundy argued that the so-called Texas Revolution began as a "settled design" among American slaveholders, land speculators, and slave traders to "wrest the large and valuable territory of Texas from the Mexican Republic, in order to re-establish the SYSTEM OF SLAVERY [and] to open a vast and profitable SLAVE-MARKET." Prior to publishing *The War in Texas*, between 1833 and1834 Lundy worked with the free black community at Matamoros to bring additional free black colonists from Louisiana and Haiti to the Rio Grande delta. Most Anglo-Americans shared different ideas about the borderland's future – one that did not include enclaves of free black farmers and merchants living on their southern border. Not surprisingly, the insurgents used stridently racist language to justify their struggle, which often masked their deeper interests in raiding for plunder or speculating in land. Rallying men for a "descent on Matamoras," mercenary leaders advertised their objectives as "the carrying of the war into Africa." In August 1835 Austin bluntly told his cousin that "*Texas must be a slave country*," and noted that "a population of fanatical abolitionists in Texas would have a very pernicious and dangerous influence" on the growing slave population of Louisiana, which reached nearly 110,000 by 1830.[37]

Anglo militants resorted to armed conflict with Mexico in October 1835, but suffered severe setbacks when two Anglo-Texan detachments were destroyed at San Antonio ("the Alamo") and Goliad in March 1836. A month later, the land speculator and disgraced ex-governor of Tennessee, Sam Houston, led the remaining Texan force against President Santa Anna's army and routed them at the battle of San Jacinto. In 1836 Houston became the first

[37] Benjamin Lundy, *The War in Texas; A Review of the Facts and Circumstances, Showing that this Contest is the Result of a Long Premeditated Crusade Against the Government, Set on Foot by Slaveholders, Land Speculators, & C. with the View of Re-establishing, Extending, and Perpetuating the System of Slavery and the Slave Trade in the Republic of Mexico* (Philadelphia, 1836), 1; John J. Linn, *Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas* (New York, 1883), 300; Austin to Mary Austin Holley, August 21, 1835, *AP*, III: 101-102 (emphasis in original).

president of the Republic of Texas.[38] Although Texas secured independence, a state of war with Mexico persisted for another decade, rapidly infolding other conflicts among Natives, blacks, and whites.

Woven into the nineteenth-century ideology of master race expansion, Anglo-Americans in Texas and the United States expressed fears of indigenous and black power that haunted their visions of an empire for slavery in the trans-Mississippi west and beyond. In May 1836 congressman John Quincy Adams excoriated the Anglo-Texans' cause when he described their revolt as a "war of aggression and of slave-making," that "cover[ed] the Mexican border with land-jobbing, and with slaves, in defiance of Mexican laws." Although a staunch opponent of Southern slavery, Adams also conjured the racialized geopolitical nightmare of an avenging Mexican *caudillo* counter-attacking into the United States "with the torch of liberty in his hand […] proclaiming emancipation to the slave and revenge to the native Indian." Imagining the "war of races" that could envelop North America from Maine to Panama, Adams turned to his colleagues from the South and asked "Where will be your negroes? Where will be that combined and concentrated mass of Indian tribes?"[39]

As described by Adams, the trajectory of events during the 1830s – a decade that began with Nat Turner's 1831 uprising – would have resonated across the southern and western borderlands of the U.S. During the summer of 1835 plantation communities along the lower Mississippi River entered "an excited state" over a rash of slave thefts, gambling, and the belief that the infamous John Murrell gang intended to start a slave rebellion and loot the countryside.

---

[38] For an overview of the "Texas Revolution" see Paul D. Lack, *The Texas Revolutionary Experience: A Political and Social History* (College Station, 1992).

[39] John Quincy Adams, *Speech of John Quincy Adams on the joint resolution for distributing rations to the distressed fugitives from Indian hostilities in the states of Alabama and Georgia; delivered in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 25, 1836* (Washington, D.C., 1836), 5-6.

The leader of a Natchez lynch mob who became a general in the Army of the Republic of Texas recalled how frenzied white Mississippians detected "an extensive combination of Murrelites and abolitionists to excite a servile war." The reactionary White Terror that followed involved vigilance committees, summary trials, torture, and the executions of dozens of black and white suspects. By the end of the year rumours circulated that members of the Murrell gang were infiltrating Texas to assassinate Houston. As Anglos began to suspect Cherokees, Comanches, and other bands of joining a Mexican offensive to reconquer Texas, perceptions of a pan-Indian uprising reached fantastical proportions. In late 1836 reports began circulating between Montreal and London that James Dickson, an English expatriate styling himself "Montezuma the Second," was leading an army of Native and métis warriors with the intention of "forming themselves into a great and independent Nation" somewhere along the Pacific coast. In a letter to a Texan officer Dickson himself claimed to be raising men to "fall upon Santa Fe and California and thus create a powerful diversion in favour of Texas."[40]

Despite the precarious situation created by these real and imagined threats, Anglo-Texans continued to acquire unfree labourers through raids or commerce that further destabilized the region. The number of African and African-American slaves in Texas reached approximately 2,000 by 1835 (out of 24,000 non-Natives), but labour-hungry Anglos seized other opportunities to enslave neighbouring indigenous peoples. Slave-raiding generated continuous violence in

[40] For the Murrell gang and the panic of 1835 in Mississippi, see Henry Millard to D. C. Barret, December 29, 1835, in William C. Binkley, ed., *Official Correspondence of the Texan Revolution* (*OCTR*) (2 vols. New York, 1936), I: 255-256; Felix Huston, "The military strength of the Southern States, and the effects of slavery therein : addressed to the Southern convention," [1850], 15 (quotes); Edwin A. Miles, "The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835," *Journal of Negro History* 34:2 (1949): 73-94; Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Honor and Violence in the Old South* (New York, 1986), 214-248; Christopher Morris, "An Event in Community Organization: The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835," *Journal of Social History* 22:1 (October 1988): 98-113; Joshua Rothman, "The Hazards of the Flush Times: Gambling, Mob Violence, and the Anxieties of America's Market Revolution," *Journal of American History* 95:3 (December 2008): 651-677; Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams*, 46-72. For Dickson's expedition, see George Simpson to J. H. Pelly, October 31, 1836 and James Dickson to David B. Macomb, January 15, 1837, in Grace Lee Nute, ed., "Documents Relating to James Dickson's Expedition," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 10:2 (September 1923): 174; 180-181 (quotes).

Texas and the rending apart of Native families and entire villages. Harried by Anglo war parties, in 1834 coastal-dwelling Karankawa families suffered further losses when Anglos rounded them up and "distributed them amongst their families, as servants."[41]

During the spring and summer of 1835 borderland planters used stock thefts as a pretext for launching their own raids against nearby Native settlements. These raiders were bent more on plundering corn and horses than seeking revenge against the actual perpetrators. A land speculator, slaver, and hardened killer (what Anglo-Texans referred to as an "Indian Fighter"), Edward Burleson became an influential war leader among the militant planters who grappled for control of central Texas. In the attack that began his rise to prominence, Burleson captured a small party of Caddos and after accusing them of murder and theft (wrongly, as it turned out), Burleson and his posse lynched seven Caddo men. The terror soon spread to other communities. A month later Burleson's rangers descended on a recently-abandoned Waco village and seized their corn stores. During their pursuit of the fleeing villagers Burleson's force captured and enslaved a family of six. From his own plantation outside Bastrop, Robert Coleman organized and commanded a cavalry detachment to pillage a Kichai village. After holding off the initial assault, the Kichais fled towards the upper Trinity where Anglo raiders surprised the women and children while the men were hunting. Coleman's rangers dragged their captives back to Bastrop and "sold them to the settlers."[42] The violence in central Texas intensified just as Anglos

[41] Population estimates are in Almonte "Statistical Report on Texas [1835]," 222. For the killing and enslavement of Karankawas, see Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 214; Mary Austin Holley, *Texas: Observation, Historical, Geographical, and Descriptive […]* (Baltimore, 1833), 95-97; T. C. Allan, ed., "Reminiscences of Mrs. Annie Fagan Teal," *SWHQ* 34:4 (April 1931): 321-322.

[42] For the Burleson and Coleman raids, see Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 22-24; Brown, *Indian Wars*, 26; Wilbarger, *Indian Wars of Texas*, 218. Arriving in Texas from Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee, many borderland planters brought antagonisms towards Native peoples inculcated during earlier conflicts, such as Andrew Jackson's bloody campaigns against the Creeks. The Burleson clan, which included Edward and his five brothers, nurtured a special hatred for Duwali's Cherokee band stemming from a dispute in Tennessee. Burleson's fellow ranger later

committed themselves to an armed rebellion against Mexico, which broke out in October 1835. Convinced that Anglo promises of honouring their land claims would prove worthless, the Cherokees began to entertain Mexican offers as Anglo stock thieves and surveyors continued to trespass on their ranches.[43]

Having alienated the numerous indigenous peoples who surrounded them, Anglo-Texan rebels also confronted the possibility that another group with long-simmering grievances might revolt in the name of liberty. One rebel leader summed up Anglo fears when he warned that Santa Anna planned "to gain the friendship of the different tribes of Indians; and, if possible to get the slaves to revolt." For black slaves held within the Gulf Coast plantation zone, the conditions for an uprising could hardly have been more propitious. Since 1827 Anglo resistance to Mexico's anti-slavery legislation had become increasingly public, and every slave community would have been aware of a conflict that centered on them. Once again, violence in Texas would be driven by slaving. Furthermore, the strife between Anglos and Mexican authorities that destabilized local government allowed for an unprecedented introduction of African slaves that increased the population of adult black males – the group most likely to launch an armed insurrection. Taking advantage of the unguarded Gulf coastline, Anglo slavers, including prominent rebels such as James Fannin and James Bowie, invested heavily in "Negroe Speculation" by smuggling African slaves from Spanish Cuba into the Brazos plantation zone. Running Mexican blockades at night, slave-bearing schooners disembarked hundreds of captives,

---

remarked that "the entire family seemed to consider that they owed a debt of vengeance to all Indians." See Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 13.

[43] For the failures of Anglo-Texan diplomacy see Bean to Military Commander at Bexar, August 18, 1835, NA; Pierre Menard to Council, November 26, 1835, *OCTR*, I: 123; Henry Smith to John Forbes, Sam Houston, and John Cameron, December 30, 1835, *OCTR*, I: 258; James Gaines to J. W. Robinson, January 9, 1836, *OCTR*, I: 283-284; Domingo de Ugartechea to Martin Perfecto de Cos, August 8, 1835, in John H. Jenkins, ed., *The Papers of the Texas Revolution, 1835-1836* (*PTR*) (10 vols. Austin, 1973), I: 321. For Cherokee complaints of Anglo depredations against their cattle, see Henry Rueg to the Alcalde of Nacogdoches, February 16, 1835, NA; Radford Berry to James Carter, March 6, 1835, NA.

who were quickly purchased by local planters or driven in coffles towards the larger slave markets in Louisiana. Born on a lower Brazos planation in 1853, former slave Nancy Antwine remembered that her mother "came from Africa, in a boat, an' here's how come she got here." Historian Sean M. Kelley has estimated that by 1836 nearly 1,000 Africans had been inserted into the Brazos slave regime, the area with the largest concentration of black slaves.[44]

Determined to break out of the plantation complex, this diverse slave population made common cause with the Mexican Army as it advanced on Texas, launching a series of localized uprisings beginning in the fall of 1835. Word of an imminent slave insurrection began almost as soon as the conflict started. Brazos planters especially feared that along with Santa Anna's northward march, Mexican forces would attempt a naval landing along the coast to cut off Anglo settlements, free the slaves, and deploy them against their former masters. In August Anglos learned that the captain of a Mexican schooner patrolling the Gulf "intended to take all the negro slaves in the country that he could get in his possession, and offer them their liberty after one year's service," because "there were no slaves legally indentured in Texas." Apprehensions over slave action amplified by Mexican support strongly influenced Anglo-Texan military plans. Concerned about the defenseless coastline "with so much of the Slave population among us," one Brazoria planter asked Austin whether it would "be prudent for any more men to leave the lower Country in the present state of things[?]" Other planters proposed launching a pre-emptive

[44] Ben Milam to Francis W. Johnson, July 5, 1835, *AP*, III: 81-82 (quote). For slaves' knowledge of Mexican laws, see Teran to Victoria, June 30, 1828, *Texas by Teran*, 101. For slave smuggling and trading from Africa via Cuba, see Edward Hanrick to Samuel H. Williams, [no date, 1833], Samuel May Williams Papers, Rosenberg Library, Galveston (quote); Dilue Harris, "Reminiscences of Mrs. Dilue Harris, Part I," *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* (October 1900): 97-99; James Fannin to F. S. Belton, August 27, 1835, in "Notes and Fragments," *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 7:4 (April 1904): 320; Fannin to James F. Perry, sale of "five African negroes," September 24, 1835, Gilder Lerhman Collection, New York City; Fannin to President of the Consultation, November 6, 1835, *OCTR*, I: 57-58; W. S. Fisher to Henry Smith, March 2, 1836, *OCTR*, I: 477; James Kilpatrick, "Early Life in the Southwest – The Bowies," *DeBow's Review* 13 (1852): 380-381; Nancy Antwine interview, in George Rawick, ed., *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography*, Supplement, Series 2, Volume 2: Texas Narratives, Part 1 (Westport, 1979), 60-62 (quote); Kelley, *Brazos de los Dios*, 48-50; Ernest Obadele-Starks, *Freebooters and Smugglers: The Foreign Slave Trade in the United States after 1808* (Fayetteville, 2007), 75-108.

attack on Mexico in order to prevent enemy incursions near the largest plantation settlements. According to the Matagorda Committee of Safety, such an offensive would have additional benefits as "we shall be enabled to gather the present crop, and our slave population will be less likely to become refractory."[45]

By late September, 1835, a large cadre of Brazos slaves prepared to launch their own uprising. Although few accounts survive, the insurrection involved hundreds of slaves – making it one of the largest, if least documented, North American slave revolts during the nineteenth century. On October 17 B. J. White hastily informed Austin that "the negroes on the Brazos made an attempt to rise," which forced Anglo-Texan units to leave the front and begin a campaign of bloody suppression – "near 100 had been taken up, many whipped nearly to death [and] some hung." In a postscript describing the inverted social order that was the stuff of slaveholder nightmares, White claimed that the slaves planned to "divide all the cotton farms, and they intended to ship the cotton to New Orleans and make the white men serve them in turn." In actuality, the slave insurrectionists burned plantations, gathered animals, tools, and weapons, and dispersed into the woods or joined the advancing Mexican forces. Others probably fled northward, into Indian Territory. At the same time, independent Karankawa bands began attacking Anglo towns.[46]

Collective slave actions subsided for a few months, but the fall of the Alamo in March 1836 presented new opportunities when Santa Anna's forces marched on the exposed plantations

[45] A. J. Yates, I. N. Moreland, and A. C. Allen to J. Brown, August 29, 1835, *PTR*, I: 376-378 (quote); Josiah H Bell to Austin, October 6, 1835, *PTR*, II: 57; Matagorda Committee of Safety Resolutions, September 30, 1835, *AP*, III: 143-144; Thomas J. Pilgrim to SFA, October 6, 1835, *AP*, III: 162; *Texas Republican*, September 26, 1835, 2 (quote).

[46] For the October 1835 uprising, see B. J. White to Austin, October 17, 1835, *AP*, III: 190; Harriet A. Ames, "The History of Harriet A. Ames during the Early Days of Texas," typescript, CAH. For Karankawa raids during this period, see James Kerr to San Felipe Committee of Safety, October 28, 1835, *OCTR*, I: 25; Ira Ingram to RR Royall, October 31, 1835, *OCTR*, I: 33-34; J.W.E. Wallace to Rusk, [July 10] 1836, *OCTR*, II: 849.

of the lower Brazos-Colorado corridor. In the wake of the previous slave uprising and the massacre of the Alamo defenders, panic swept eastward as Anglos fled towards the Louisiana border in an event remembered by white Texans as the "Runaway Scrape." For blacks, this retreat added to the possibilities generated by the war, forming part of a larger pattern of confrontation or flight that saw hundreds escape bondage in 1835-1836. Advancing on abandoned plantations, one Mexican general described how "slaves kept coming in succession" towards his army, since "none of them wanted to stay beyond the Colorado, so great was their fear of falling once again into the hands of their owners." Retreating slaveholders managed to secure hundreds of slaves on Galveston Island, where they were put to work on fortifications, but others renewed the armed struggle. In March one fleeing planter predicted another "rising of the negroes," and vigilance committees ordered armed patrols to assemble. Most planters chose patrimony over patria, and simply fled. One refugee recalled being "mortified at seeing so many distinguished and able men" fleeing the fighting "with their aids white and Black too numerous to mention." Smaller-scale revolts occurred in the Trinity valley of east Texas, where Coushattas (a Creek tribe) joined slave rebels before being violently suppressed by Anglo-Texan forces.[47]

As these conflicts disrupted the Texans' war effort, Comanche and Wichita bands renewed their livestock and captive raids on weakened Anglo and Tejano villages. Targeting the Rio Grande valley, in April 1836 Comanches intercepted a party of British and German immigrants who were fleeing the fighting, killing most of the men and taking seven prisoners.

[47] For renewed slave unrest on the Brazos and Trinity, see Thomas Jefferson Rusk to James Morgan, April 16, 1836, *OCTR*, II: 640; Henry Austin to Perry, March 5, 1836, *AP*, III: 318 (quote); Brazoria Meeting, [1836], *PTR*, V: 98-99; James Morgan to [Sam P. Carson], March 24, 1836, Executive Record Book, David G. Burnet Papers, CAH. For planters flight and slave escapes during the Runaway Scrape, see Jose Enrique de la Pena, *With Santa Anna in Texas: A Personal Narrative of the Revolution*, Carmen Perry and James E. Crisp, ed. and trans. (College Station, 1997), 170; 179; Gregg J. Dimmick and John R. Wheat, ed. and trans., *General Vicente Filisola's Analysis of Jose Urrea's Military Diary: A Forgotten 1838 Publication by an Eyewitness to the Texas Revolution* (Austin, 2007), 88; Thomas J. Alsbury to Mirabeau Lamar, October 14, 1838, *PML*, III: 245; C. Richard King, ed., *Victorian Lady on the Texas Frontier: The Journal of Ann Raney Coleman* (Norman, 1971), 84-94; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, November 9, 1836, 4; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, November 19, 1836, 1.

Although three of the captives were eventually ransomed, one of the infant boys grew into an adult Comanche.[48] The next month an army of eight hundred Caddo, Kichai, and Waco warriors targeted an Anglo compound known as Fort Parker, which had been used by Burleson and Coleman's rangers during their summer 1835 raids. Using white flags to gain entry, the war party killed several men and took five women and children captive, whom they divided among the participating bands. While indigenous men certainly sought revenge for Anglo massacres, the quartermaster-general of the Texas Army reported that the Parker colonists further incensed neighbouring Natives by using counterfeit money, trading them faulty goods, and even selling poisoned food. The attack on Fort Parker inaugurated another series of Comanche and Wichita expeditions against central Texas during the spring of 1836, which struck directly at cotton production and threatened to cause a "Second Runaway Scrape," that would see the country "Broken Up." As Anglo planters returned to the upper Brazos and Colorado valleys "to make a late crop," indigenous hit-and-run tactics forced many borderland planters to huddle in the relative safety of Bastrop, only leaving town in "armed squads […] still tugging away at their late crops." Ravaged by two sieges within six months, San Antonio and its outlying ranches were also vulnerable to Comanche raids. In March 1836 the influential Comanche war leader Casimiro led hundreds of men in sacking San Antonio, but not before he offered a Tejano acquaintance a chance to enjoy the fruits of the Comanche expansion, telling him that "I have 20 horses 2

[48] For Comanche offensives along the Rio Grande, see E. House, *A Narrative of the Captivity of Mrs. Horn, and her Two Children, with Mrs. Harris, by the Camanche Indians* […] (St. Louis, 1839) in Carl Coke Rister, *Comanche Bondage: Beale's Settlement and Sarah Ann Horn's Narrative* (Lincoln, 1989),120-124; Brown, *Indian Wars,* 27-37; Ralph A. Smith, "Indians in American-Mexican Relations Before the War of 1846," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 43:1 (February 1963): 34-64; David M. Vigness, "Indian Raids on the Lower Rio Grande, 1836-1837," *SWHQ* 59:1 (July 1955): 14-23; Brian DeLay, "Independent Indians and the U.S.-Mexican War," *American Historical Review* 112:1 (February 2007): 35-68.

Mexican prisoners to wait on me and 4 wives. If you will come and live with me and my band I will divide equally with you each of these articles."[49]

The slave uprisings and indigenous offensives of 1835-1836 – part of a larger set of panics and conflicts that wracked North American borderlands during those years – played decisive roles in shaping the Mexican-Anglo war. Austin acknowledged this in a shrill letter to a Missouri senator, arguing that despite Santa Anna's defeat at San Jacinto a "war of extermination" would continue that pitted "civilization and the Anglo-American race" against "a population of Mexicans, Indians, and renegades, all mixed together." Refusing to acknowledge Texas independence, Mexican leaders sustained the war against the "pirates and adventurers of Texas" even as their republic descended into civil war between federalists and centralists. Within this maelstrom of conflict, black and Native resistance continued to shape the long war for Texas.[50]

Borderland Warfare, 1837-1840

The conglomeration of Anglo-Mexican-Native-Black conflicts that continued after 1836 created new inter-ethnic alliances as the dispossessed sought new means to contain the plantation complex. Supported by frontier officers stationed in northern Mexico, a loose alliance of Caddos,

[49] For increased Comanche and Wichita attacks on Brazos and Colorado plantations during 1835-1836, see Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 33-34; 45-49 (quotes); *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Tuesday, December 27, 1836, 3; Garrison Greenwood to President of Consultation, March 7, 1836, *OCTR*, I: 485; Smithwick, *Evolution of a State*, 153. For the attack on Fort Parker, see James Parker, *Narrative of the Perilous Adventures, Miraculous Escapes and Sufferings of Rev. James W. Parker […] to which is appended A Narrative of the Capture and Subsequent Sufferings of Mrs. Rachel Plummer (his daughter), During a Captivity of Twenty One Months among the Cumanche Indians […]. (Louisville, 1844).* 9-16; Almanzon Huston to Burnet, June 29, 1836, *OCTR*, II: 830-831; A. J. Sowell, *Early Settlers and Indian Fighters of Southwest Texas* (Austin, 1900), 47-48. For the raid on San Antonio, see Menchaca, "The Unpublished Second Part of the Menchaca Manuscript," 137.

[50] Austin to L. F. Linn, May 4, 1836, *AP*, III: 344-348 (quote); Extract from orders of General Filisola, in "Report of the Secretary of State […] Relative to the Encroachments of the Indians of the United States upon the Territories of Mexico, Senate of the United States of America, *Senate Executive Documents*, 32nd Cong., 2nd Sess., (Washington, D.C., 1852), 17 (quote). For persisting Anglo-American fears that Mexican forces would attempt a coastal assault in conjunction with a slave revolt, see Sam Houston to the House and Senate, January 10, 1843, in E. W. Winkler, ed., *Journals of the Congress of the Republic of Texas*, Second Congress, Secret Journal, November-December 1837 (Austin, 1911), 271. For the Centralist-Federalist civil war in northern Mexico, see Weber, *Mexican Frontier*, 242-272.

Cherokees, Shawnees, Kickapoos, Tejanos, free blacks, and fugitive slaves struggled to preserve their autonomy in east Texas. In western and central Texas, Comanches, Wichitas, and Anglos continued hostilities that subsumed the tensions of chattel slavery within borderland warfare.

Alliances between Mexico and the emigrant Natives of east Texas originated in their earlier conflicts with Fredonians and the Comanche-Wichita confederacy. These connections intensified after 1836, as both sides faced the prospect of single-handedly confronting the more numerous, and increasingly belligerent, Anglo-Texans. Given their hostility towards non-whites, Anglos rightly feared that their many enemies would unite against them. During the Anglo revolt of 1835-1836, a constant stream of rumours emanated from Nacogdoches, where whites especially fear the consummation of a Cherokee-Mexican alliance that would leave them exposed to Native attacks.[51]

These rumours persisted long after Santa Anna's defeat, and some Cherokees were certainly interested in a prospective military pact with Mexico. From New Orleans one informant reported that Cherokee and Mexican diplomats gathered in the Crescent City to discuss the coordination of future military efforts, with a centralist general promising Native leaders "Land & Cattle should they assist & succeed in exterminating the Population of Texas." By far the busiest center of diplomatic activity was Matamoros, a Rio Grande town garrisoned by centralist forces that became the principal base for supplying Tejano and indigenous guerillas. Needing individuals experienced in indigenous diplomacy, Mexican officers relied on Tejanos to organize an insurgency against the Republic of Texas before it could consolidate its territorial gains or arrange for annexation by the United States. Over the course of numerous conferences and

[51] For Anglo fears of a Cherokee attack during the Runaway Scrape, see Deposition of M. B. Menard, April 11, 1836, Andrew Jackson Houston Collection (AJHC), Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Austin, TX; Big Mush to Nacogdoches Committee of Safety, April 13, 1836, AJHC; Henry Raguet to Houston, April 17, 1836, AJHC.

calumet ceremonies at Matamoros, indigenous leaders obtained the offers of legal title to Texas lands that they had been seeking for almost twenty years. Conferring with a Mexican agent, one group of prospective Caddo allies "asked if the river Colorado was for them." Descending from his Red River stronghold, in 1837 Coffee reported that Duwali recruited Tahchee's Arkansas Cherokee band by telling his kinsmen that Mexico would "give them the country if they conquered it," and that "a portion was to be given to each tribe according to the strength they brought." Although the Arkansas Cherokee ultimately rejected Duwali's proposal, other members of the Indian Territory diaspora remained intrigued.[52]

In order to create this pan-Indian buffer state, Mexican generals laid out a new strategy for recovering Texas. Rather than campaigns waged by Mexican soldiers, then needed to repel federalist rivals and French invaders, centralist generals Vicente Filisola and Valentin Canalizo worked with Tejano and Native leaders to craft a guerilla strategy. Canalizo encouraged allied Natives to eschew sporadic raids and instead concentrate on opening an extended front, stretching from San Antonio to Matamoros, which would cut Anglos' supply of horses and give close support to Tejano loyalists in west Texas. This policy of harassing Anglo ranches and plantations would continue until Mexican regulars became available for a general offensive.[53] However, as these plans gained momentum Comanches launched their own campaigns against northeastern Mexico. In July 1837 a Comanche army of a thousand warriors came within a few

[52] For Native-Mexican diplomacy, see Thomas Toby to Burnet, July 23, 1836, *OCTR*, II: 888-889 (quote); Diary of Pedro Julian Miracle [June-August 1838], *Senate Executive Documents*, 14-17 (quote); Statement of Elias Vansickle, January 23, 1839, *Senate Executive Documents*, 25-26; Coffee to Felix Huston, December 17, 1838, *Senate Executive Documents*, 37 (quote); Robert Irion to Memucan Hunt, September 20, 1837, in George Pierce Garrison, ed., *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas* (3 vols. Washington, D.C., 1908), I: 259-262. For Anglo suspicions of a Cherokee-Mexican alliance, see R. M. Williamson to the People of Texas [at San Felipe], June 22, 1835, *PTR*, I: 199-202; Huston to A. S. Johnston, December 13, 1836, *Senate Executive Documents*, 37; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, December 1, 1838, 3.

[53] Vicente Filisola, Privates Instructions for the Captains of Friendly Indians of Texas, *Senate Executive Documents*, 13; Valentin Canalizo to Flores, Instructions to the captains and chiefs of the friendly nations, February 27, 1839, *Senate Executive Documents*, 32 (quote).

kilometers of Matamoros, overrunning ranches and killing a dozen Tejano and Cherokee men who came to assist the locals.[54] Comanche war leaders like Casimiro also maintained their raiding patterns in western and central Texas, where their followers kept San Antonio in a state of virtual siege, harassed slave traders moving black captives between the lower Brazos and Bastrop, and took numerous captives.[55]

Comanche raids in west Texas formed one vector of their increasingly long-distance campaigns below the Rio Grande, where they targeted vulnerable Mexican ranches. In 1837 one Anglo-Texan official reported that Comanches "contemptuously" referred to Mexicans as "their *stockkeepers* and out of which nation they procure slaves." When Duwali and a several Cherokee diplomats traveled to the Comancheria in an attempt to broker a peace on behalf of Houston's government, several Comanche bands rejected his entreaties. One Comanche captain was particularly blunt about how raiding sustained the pastoral political economy, explaining to Duwali that "he could not make peace with the Americans nor the Mexicans. The Americans because they were a-coming in and killing his buffalo and that they would starve him and how can he make peace with such men[?] I can't make peace with the Mexicans because I get from them horses and mules and sell them to Coffee at his trading house for our supplies of ammunition and clothing."[56] By the 1830s, war, raiding, and trading had become the basis of the Comanches' political economy.

---

[54] For Comanches' 1837 Rio Grande campaigns, see *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Tuesday, August 22, 1837, 2; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, September 16, 1837, 2; James Douglas to William Wharton, December 23, 1838, *Senate Executive Documents*,40; Vigness, "Indian Raids on the Lower Rio Grande," 14-23.

[55] J. W. Benedict, "Diary of a Campaign Against the Comanches," *SWHQ* 32:4 (April 1929): 304-306; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 192-193; 347-349; Smithwick, *Evolution of a State*, 162-163; Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 49-52.

[56] Report of Standing Committee on Indian Affairs, October 12, 1837, *Indian Papers of Texas*, I: 24 (emphasis in original); Peter E. Bean to Houston, May 6, 1837, AJHC.

As Comanche bands pursued their own policy, the efforts of Mexicans, Tejanos, and emigrant Natives to renew the struggle against Anglo-Texans gradually coalesced into a united front. By 1838 the Tejano population of roughly 3,000 people was vastly outnumbered by 30,000 Anglos, and 5,000 black slaves.[57] Concentrated at the older colonial towns of San Antonio, Bahia (renamed Goliad), and Nacogdoches, Tejanos faced the discrimination and distrust of their neighbours, with Anglos frequently trespassing, robbing, and appropriating Tejanos' property with near impunity. Anglo bandits and liquor traders also contributed to fears, resentments, and unrest among the Native villagers of east Texas. Working as an informal negotiator on behalf of his friend Houston, the free black Nacogdochian William Goyens observed the deleterious effects of whiskey among the Cherokees and their neighbours. Given the porous Texas-Louisiana-Arkansas border, liquor traffickers poured into Texas unimpeded, with Goyens telling Houston "that the whites need as much watching as the Indians."[58]

By the summer of 1838, Anglo abuses in east Texas galvanized a Nacogdoches notable, Vicente Cordova, to defend himself and his neighbours. What began as a series local disturbances culminated in larger struggle known as the "Cordova Revolt."[59] Like most borderland conflicts, its immediate causes involved a dispute over horses. Communal tensions mounted after Anglo ranchers accused Cordova's brother of assisting Caddo horse thieves, and violence began on August 4, 1838, when Tejanos attacked a party of Anglos en route to the younger Cordova's ranch. Charging Anglos with "taking their people," on August 10 Cordova

[57] Population statistics are from the *Handbook of Texas Online*, "Census and Census Records," accessed February 28, 2018, http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ulc01.

[58] For liquor traders among the Cherokees and other east Texas Natives, see Bowles to Houston, January 14, 1837, AJHC; William Goyens to Houston, January 20, 1837, AJHC (quote); F. H. Rankin to Houston, June 20, 1838, AJHC; George W. Hockley to Houston, July 17, 1838, AJHC.

[59] For an overview of the revolt, see Paul D. Lack, "The Cordova Revolt" in Gerald E. Poyo, ed., *Tejano Journey, 1770-1850* (Austin, 1996), 89-109.

and eighteen others released a statement of grievances, explaining that they were "tired of suffering injustices and the usurpation of their rights." One of the rebels described their motives more bluntly: "they had been dogs long enough." Along with fifteen Tejanos, the signatories included three Anglos, all from families with long-standing ties to the Mexican regime, and a black freedman. Although Anglos viewed their conquest of Texas as a racialized struggle, the revolt continued to unfold more closely along class lines.[60]

Among Anglos, consensus overwhelmingly supported black chattel slavery – in Texas, Native land was required to bring the plantation economy to fruition. By 1838, militant planters and land speculators dominated the Texas Congress, and they refused to ratify the provisional 1836 treaty Houston had signed with the Cherokees. The inauguration of Mirabeau Lamar, a Georgian fire-eater and Indian-hater, as president of the republic in September 1838 further consolidated the militants' control. Lamar, Burleson and their colleagues opened land offices, dispatched surveying parties that violated Native borders, and continued to speculate in lands that they intended to acquire by force. Castigating his rivals during his last months in office, Houston charged that the Cherokees' "blooming peach trees, snug cabins, well cultivated fields and lowing herds excited the speculators," whose greed drove the Cherokees and others to "desperation." Realizing the likelihood of disgruntled Natives joining Cordova's band, Houston scratched out frantic letters to the Cherokee villages, beseeching Duwali not to get involved. Houston also tried to get the U.S. Army to intervene, by telling U.S. officers that "*Low* Frenchmen" (a euphemism for Indian traders) were involved in the disturbances and that "the Mexicans, with their abolition policy, and united with the Indians, will invite the slaves of the

[60] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, September 29, 1838, 2; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, March 27, 1839, 2 (taking people quote); DeShields, *Border Wars of Texas*, 294 (proclamation quote); [Harriet Matilda Jamison Durst], "Early Days in Texas," Ralph W. Steen Library, Durst Family Collection, Stephen F. Austin University, Nacogdoches (dogs quote).

south to revolt!" Disillusioned with Anglo behaviour, Duwali had never severed contact with Mexican officials, and his village served as a conduit for passing information, personnel, and weapons between Matamoros and Nacogdoches. After dispersing among allied indigenous towns on the Brazos and Trinity, rebel forces regrouped over the fall.[61]

Animated by myriad local disputes over land and labour, inter-ethnic cohorts of Tejano rebels, free blacks, fugitive slaves, and Native militants launched a series of collective actions against frontier planters between 1838 and 1839. Operating from log stockades at the western edge of the plantation zone, well-armed parties of surveyors and rangers continued to violate Native borders. In early October 1838, a mixed force of Natives and Tejanos led by the Kickapoo captain Benito ambushed an Anglo force beyond Bastrop and killed several intruders over a day long engagement. The leader of the Anglo party recalled that the attackers knew "we were surveying the land, [and] that the white people would settle there and break up their hunting grounds." As Anglo intrusions increased, the scope of cooperation among emigrant villages expanded, drawing together younger war leaders determined to oppose these depredations by force. Native leaders worked together to fortify villages and sequester women and children further north, where they would be less vulnerable to ranger slave raids. A few days after the attack on the surveyors, a war party that included Caddos, Cherokees, Kickapoos, and Tejanos struck a cluster of plantations north of Nacogdoches, killing six Anglos and taking ten captives, including a young boy who later became "a leader of considerable notoriety among the tribe by whom he had been adopted."

---

[61] Houston to the Texas Senate, 21 May, 1838, in Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker, eds., *The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863* (*WSH*) (8 vols. Austin, 1970), IV: 55-60; Anderson, *Conquest of Texas*, 168-169 ("Low Frenchmen"); Houston to Big Mush, August 10, 1838 and Houston to Bowl, August 11, 1838, *WSH*, II: 269-270; Diary of Pedro Julian Miracle [June-August 1838], *Senate Executive Documents*, 14-17; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, December 1, 1838, 3.

In response General T. J. Rusk led an army of two hundred Texans towards the Kickapoo village, which they attacked on the morning of October 16. Tejanos, free blacks, and militant Cherokee warriors joined the Kickapoo defenders in meeting the assault. Cordova's force, which one ranger called "a motley gang of Mexicans, negroes, Coshattees, Caddoes, & [others]" dispersed over the winter of 1838-1839, but Rusk's army continued to scour the upper Trinity. In December they pursued a band of Caddos who were on their way to receive treaty annuities in Shreveport, Louisiana. Rusk believed the Caddos "laid out" their payments for weapons that they then exchanged with Comanches or used in raids against Texas.[62] Thus, even without formal alliances, various raiding and fugitive bands were interconnected by commercial networks whose nodes lay within the horse and gun trades of the pastoral zone.

Fighting resumed in the spring of 1839 as the allies attempted to hold their position in anticipation of an eventual Mexican invasion. Caddos led by the young warrior Jose Maria struck plantations above the Brazos Falls, and then ambushed and killed fifteen Anglos who rode out in pursuit. More rangers now assembled to patrol the cotton frontier, but the ensuing engagements demonstrated the vulnerability of borderland plantations. Writing on behalf of a Franco-Choctaw slaveholder who refused to join Cordova's band, one Texan informed Lamar that the rebels decided to "deprive him of his property, and succeeded by inducing his slaves to follow them." There also appears to have been increasing coordination between the Caddo-Cherokee-Tejano bands and eastern Comanches threatened by Anglo incursions. An Anglo woman whose first attempt to escape her Comanche captors ended when a group of Caddo, Cherokees, and

[62] For the first engagement, see Jimmy L. Bryan, Jr., "More Disastrous than All: The Surveyors' Fight, 1838," *East Texas Historical Journal* 38:1 (March 2000): 3-14; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 353-354. For the attacks on the Killough plantation (October 5) and the Kickapoo village (October 16), see Statement of Elias Van Sickle, January 23, 1839, *Senate Executive Documents*, 25-26; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 620-622; Rusk to Bowles, October 20, 1838, *PML*, II: 255; Hugh McLeod to Lamar, October 22, 1838, *PML*, II: 265-267; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, November 3, 1838, 3. For the border dispute caused by Rusk's pursuit of the Caddo, see Rusk to A. S. Johnston, February 25, 1839, *Senate Executive Documents*, 22-25.

Kickapoos "restored [her] to the Comanches," later reported that among the emigrant Natives were a "considerable number of negro slaves – men, women, and children – from the United States." On March 28, 1839 a ranger force commanded by Burleson intercepted Cordova's men as they attempted to reach Matamoros and killed thirty rebels. Cordova managed to escape, but among those captured was a "French negro" named Raphael who "claimed to have always been free." Interrogated by Burleson, Raphael defiantly declared that he "always maintained a hostile attitude toward the Texans," and refused to submit. He was summarily lynched. In May ranger forces ambushed and destroyed another Mexican-Native force, bringing the insurrection to an end.[63]

Derived from the most aggressive elements of U.S. Indian policy, during the late 1830s the Republic of Texas based its policies on exclusion and extermination. Although the Cherokee were divided over committing themselves to the Mexican-Tejano alliance, the participation of cadres of Cherokee warriors during the fighting of 1838 provided the necessary pretext for Lamar and his generals to launch a violent removal campaign. Covetous of Cherokee lands, in a speech to the Congress Lamar castigated the emigrant villages as a threatening "*imperium in imperio*" that undermined Texas sovereignty. Working to weaken the Cherokees' alliance network, Lamar's agents intimidated Shawnee and Coushatta leaders into abandoning their claims in Texas, while the treasury secretary of the Republic of Texas obtained a $27,000 loan from a New Orleans bank "to enable the Government to carry out its views relative to the Cherokee Indians." Lamar's government insisted on expelling the Cherokees by treaty or by force, and during tense negotiations over May and June Duwali bought time for allied forces to

[63] *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, January 23, 1839, 3; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 151-156; 361-363; William M. Williams to Lamar, April 1, 1840, *PML*, II: 361-362 (quote); Barnard E. Bee to John Forsyth, December 15, 1840, *Senate Executive Documents*, 51(quote*);* Dolbeare, *Captivity and Suffering of Dolly Webster, 16-17; Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, April 17, 1839, 2 (quote); Burleson to Johnston, May 22, 1839, *Senate Executive Documents*, 30-31.

assemble. The eighty-four year-old chieftain explained to Anglo agents that "his young men believed they could whip the whites," and fearing for the welfare of his wives and children, Duwali felt bound by the militant consensus – "if he fought, the whites would kill him; and if he refused to fight, his own people would kill him." After Duwali refused to sign a removal treaty with Texas, in mid-July five hundred Texas troops commanded by Rusk and Burleson advanced on the emigrant towns. With columns of black smoke rising from the Delaware and Shawnee villages they had just burned, the Texans engaged Cherokee warriors as they covered their people's retreat. During a two-day running battle over a hundred Cherokees were killed, including Duwali, who was executed on the battlefield, then mutilated and scalped. The survivors dispersed in different directions, with many taking refuge in the Cross Timbers before continuing into U.S. Indian Territory, while others fled towards Mexico.[64]

While Tejanos and Cherokees resisted Anglo aggression in east Texas, Comanche-Texan war intensified, sparking a bloody war that would last into the 1850s. For their part, Comanche bands continued their campaigns to keep Anglo surveyors and rangers – the advance forces of the plantation regime – out of the upper Colorado valley that was the gateway into their central Texas domain. In February 1839 a party of Anglo and Lipan Apache rangers surprised a Comanche village and slaughtered over one hundred people during a dawn attack, sparking years of bloody warfare in the region. As they observed the patterns of Anglo invasion, Comanches developed a pointed antagonism towards the borderland planters of the Colorado valley. According to one ranger the Comanches "regarded the whites, like themselves, as divided up into tribes," and reserved a special hatred of the "Coloradians." With a litany of shared grievances, Comanches and Wichitas also received support from Mexicans and Caddos, the latter of whom

[64] Lamar, "Message to Both Houses," December 21, 1838, *PML*, II: 351-354; James H. Starr to Lamar, June 27, 1839, *PML*, III: 31; John H. Reagan, "The Expulsion of the Cherokees from East Texas," *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 1:1 (July 1897): 41-46.

carried calls for vengeance to Comanche councils. While traders like Holland Coffee continued to sponsor the raiders who terrorized northern Mexico, for the right incentives Comanche violence could also be directed the other way. On reports that Matamoros officers offered Comanche men a bounty of five pesos for each Anglo they killed, a Houston newspaper editor cringed at the thought that "Texian scalps can be purchased by Mexican gold."[65]

Given the seething resentments of their enslaved workforce, borderland plantations became especially inviting targets for indigenous raiders. Frequently returning to instances of indigenous and black cooperation, Wilbarger conceded that "very frequently run away negroes would join the Indians and render valuable assistance in fighting and stealing." Robert Coleman, who organized the raid on the Kichai village in 1835 eventually drowned two years later. Still, in 1839 Comanches attacked the hated Texan's plantation, killing his widow and capturing his infant son. Ransomed over a decade later, Thomas Coleman – now an adult Comanche man – had become "so imbued with their ideas and habits that he went back to them, never feeling satisfied among the whites."[66] During the same series of raids Comanches also hit another Colorado valley plantation, carrying off seven black slaves whose recovery became a priority of the Texas government for several years. Passed along indigenous exchange networks, two of the slaves ended up in Indian Territory, where some of the expelled Cherokees protected them from slave catchers. An Anglo woman ransomed in 1840 confirmed planter's fears of slaves assisting

[65] J.H. Moore to A.S. Johnston, March 10, 1839, in Dorman H. Winfrey and James M. Day, eds., *Indian Papers of Texas and the Southwest* (5 vols. Austin, 1966), I:58-59; George Bernard Erath, "Memoirs of George Bernard Erath," Lucy A. Erath, ed., *SWHQ* 26:3 (January 1923): 228; Smithwick, *Evolution of a State*, 189; 213-221; Brown, *Indian Wars*, 25; Irion to Hunt, September 20, 1837, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, I: 260; 26; *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Saturday, December 1, 1838, 3 (scalp quote).

[66] Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 147-150; 266; 412 (quote); Brown, *Indian Wars*, 61; Smithwick, *Evolution of a State*, 220; Jenkins, *Recollections of Early Texas*, 56-60 (quote); *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, January 8, 1840, 2. For Anglo-American captives among the Comanches during the nineteenth century, see Michael L. Tate, "Comanche Captives: People Between Two Worlds," *The Chronicles of Oklahoma* 72:3 (Fall 1994): 228-263.

indigenous raiders, as Comanche war parties were often "led by one or more negroes" who provided ammunition, information, and additional manpower.[67]

Captives – black, white, and Native – continued to play a central role in the deepening Anglo-Comanche conflict. On March 19, 1840 a group of over sixty Penateka Comanches, including women and children, entered San Antonio for a prisoner exchange and parley. The Penatekas offered Matilda Lockhart to the Texan officers and claimed that she was the only white captive their band possessed, a claim the officers rejected before declaring the assembled chiefs to be *their* prisoners. The Comanche diplomats immediately attempted to escape and were gunned down at point-blank range. The Council House Massacre left thirty-five Comanches and eight Texans dead. The correspondence of General Johnston and his subordinates also suggests that they actively conspired to trap and murder the Penateka leaders.[68] During the slaughter Anglos also captured thirty-two Comanches, mostly women and children who accompanied the embassy. Anglo-Texans released one Comanche woman to return to her people and arrange the return of the remaining Anglo captives, rumoured to number fifteen, who would be exchanged for the rest of the Comanche prisoners. However, enraged by news of the massacre the Penatekas decided to burn thirteen Anglo captives, electing only to ransom two white children who had already been adopted into the band. The exchange of a few prisoners was eventually conducted, while the remaining Comanche women escaped from San Antonio during the ensuing months. Many of their children remained behind, however, having been "taken into families as

[67] Nathaniel Amory to Daniel Webster, May 19, 1841, *Senate Executive Documents*, 56; Joseph W. Robertson to James Mayfield, April 7, 1841, AJHC; Robertson to Anson Jones, April 20, 1843, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*, II: 177-178; *Brazos Courier*, Tuesday, April 7, 1840, 2 (quote).

[68] H. W. Karnes to A. S. Johnston, January 10, 1840; A. S. Johnston to W. S. Fisher, January 30, 1840, *Indian Papers of Texas*, I:101-102; 105-106.

domestics." In 1843, hostage Comanche children could still be seen wandering the streets of the town where their parents had been murdered.[69]

The Penatekas response to the Council House Massacre widened the scope of the conflict as they called on other Comanches and indigenous allies for assistance. As word of the massacre spread across the Plains, Comanches organized an inter-tribal council and successfully concluded an alliance with their traditional enemies, the Cheyenne and Arapahos. During the bloody summer of 1840, Native diplomats convened an inter-tribal conference at Bent's Fort, along the upper Arkansas River, that resulted in a lasting peace between the former adversaries. The Cheyennes provided guns and other goods in exchange for horses supplied by the Comanches and Kiowas.[70]

For Anglo-Texans, their butchery of the Penateka delegates at San Antonio appeared to have given them some reprieve by plunging Comanche politics into crisis. From Victoria, Lamar's business partner wrote to him in mid-May and reported that "we all already feel as though we are forever free from Mexicans or Indians." But on August 6 nearly one thousand mounted Comanche and Kiowa warriors appeared on the outskirts of the Gulf Coast town. After killing dozens of Texans and slaves trapped on the outskirts of the town, the indigenous strike force continued southeast towards Linnville, which they sacked and burned.

Predictably, the bloodletting did not end there. In September, ranger captains requested an adjournment of the local courts "in order that the people may turn out *en masse* against the Indians." The veteran raider John Moore once again led the way in combining slaving with revenge. Riding north along the Colorado River in September 1840, his force of ninety Texans

---

[69] For the aftermath of the massacre and prisoner exchanges, see Rena Maverick Green, ed., *Memoirs of Mary A. Maverick* (San Antonio, 1921), 36-37; 47 (quote); William Bollaert, *William Bollaert's Texas: Diaries Kept by William Bollaert in Texas, 1842-44*, W. Eugene Hollon and Ruth Lapham Butler, eds. (Norman, 1956), 229.

[70] George Bird Grinnell, *The Fighting Cheyennes* (Norman, 1956), 63-69.

and twelve Lipans repeated the tactics they employed at San Saba over a year earlier. For two months Moore's force scoured the region before they discovered a vulnerable Penateka camp in western Texas. Taking up an elevated position on the morning of October 24, the attackers charged down on the waking village, where "a murderous fight was opened and continued upon the flying enemy." Wilbarger justified the massacre, which left approximately 130 Comanches dead or dying, as part of "a war of extermination." Once again, plunder and captives motivated ranger expeditions, as Moore's men seized five hundred horses along with thirty-four Comanche women and children, who they "carried into the settlements, and made servants of."[71]

Anglo-Texan engines of capture further destabilized the borderland by drawing on disparate sources of unfree labour that intertwined raiding and slave trading. The Comanche captives "carried into the settlements" by Moore's rangers following the campaigns of 1839-1840 became the focus of diplomatic wrangling after Houston returned to the presidency in 1841. As he attempted to arrange a meeting with Comanche and Wichita leaders, Houston informed the Texas Congress "that we hold many of their people as prisoners" and asked the legislature "to compel those citizens who hold the Indian prisoners to surrender them." In December 1842, Congress passed an act "for collecting and conveying" the enslaved Comanches to the Waco village where they would be exchanged for eleven Anglo captives.[72] Despite these

[71] For the 1840 Comanche raid, see Samuel A. Plummer to Lamar, May 17, 1840, *PML*, III: 392; Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations*, 184-185; Letter to Citizens of Victoria and Texana Respecting Indian Expedition, September, 9 1840, *Indian Papers of Texas*, I: 115; Linn, *Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas*, 337-345; Isidro Vizcaya Canales, *La Invasion de los Indios Barbaros al Noreste de Mexico en los Anos de 1840 y 1841* (Monterrey, 1968); Donaly E. Brice, *The Great Comanche Raid: Boldest Indian Attack on the Texas Republic* (Austin, 1987). For the Colorado massacre and the Comanche captives, see Moore to Branch T. Archer in *Telegraph and Texas Register*, Wednesday, November 18, , 1840, 2; Smithwick, *Evolution of a State*, 250 (quote); Wilbarger, *Indian Depredations in Texas*, 186.

[72] Houston to the House and Senate, December 23, 1842, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 7th Congress, Regular Session (Austin, 1843), 116-117; "An Act for Collecting and Conveying Indian Prisoners to the Waco Village," December 28, 1842, in Gammel, *Laws of Texas*, II: 825-826. Some Comanche bands did not attend the initial peace councils at Tehuacana Creek because they were reportedly "on an expedition taking 300 Mexican prisoners in to 'exchange and ransom.'" See Bollaert, *Diaries*, 165.

efforts, which contributed to the Anglo-Native peace arranged at Tehuacana Creek in 1843, the war dragged on for decades.

Conclusion

Moore's murderous 1840 slave raid, the largest massacre ever perpetrated by the Republic of Texas, characterized the kind of warfare that enveloped the southwestern borderlands during the next forty years. Rather than the clash of Native, Hispanic, and Anglo "civilizations" depicted by generations of American historians, this internecine conflict arrayed a protean coalition of indigenous bands and their allies against rangers and planters who built communities on violence, dispossession, and the racial exploitation of slavery.

During the 1820s the arrival in Texas of removed eastern tribes, Anglo planters, and black slaves provided the fledgling Mexican republic with opportunities to secure and revitalize its northeastern borderland. At the same time, the influx of new populations, many of them brought against their will, augured further conflicts among a number of competing factions. Although politically isolated, the rapid success of Anglo slavers during the so-called 'Texas Revolution" sparked widespread resistance to the plantation complex among the enslaved, indigenous bands, Tejanos, bandits, traders, and other social outcasts. Intensifying during the late 1830s, this struggle marked the last phase of the long war for Texas.

Conclusion: Slaving, Borderlands, Fragments

Churned by a century and a half of war and slavery, the Texas borderland roiled in a world of fragments by 1840. Although colonialism destroyed many nations, a few powerful indigenous confederacies held their ground. Cartographically imposing, the imperial republics of Mexico and the United States were generally unable to exert control over their aboriginal or colonial populations. Wracked by political instability, Mexico struggled to assert its sovereignty internally and along its northern border. In the United States, no resolution to sectional tensions over slavery appeared imminent.

Locked in a cruel embrace with slaving nation-states, indigenous peoples and captives of all cultures made their own histories of enslavement and emancipation. During the preceding era, the violent disruption of European invasions created a pastoral-plantation borderland of disparate indigenous and colonial peoples. Contested and competing systems of slavery characterized this process. During the first half of the eighteenth century, missions in Texas and plantations in Louisiana congregated unfree workers as the economic bases for relatively poor, defensive colonies within the rival French and Spanish empires. Challenged by indigenous and black resistance, colonial societies relied on Native alliances to bolster their control. In turn, these alliances enveloped other indigenous bands into broader conflicts over labour and territory. Thus all participants became slavers as well as potential targets for others. The widening scope and intensifying violence of Apache, Comanche, French, Wichita, and Spanish warfare between the 1770s and the 1790s is illustrative of the kaleidoscopic violence unleashed by slaving. These conflicts were bound up with developments in more distant continental and Atlantic worlds. The consequences of saltwater slaving, racialized social control, revolutionary ideologies, and the collapse of European empires reverberated into the borderlands. In the U.S., Indian Removal and

the emergence of the Cotton Kingdom introduced volatile new elements to the borderlands. Organized by U.S. citizens, the westward expansion of plantation slavery directly challenged indigenous territoriality, inaugurating a second period of sustained conflict between 1825 and 1840.

Utilizing a borderland space to examine how indigenous engines of capture comingled with plantation slavery has significant implications for the study of early modern slavery in North America. Raiding and commercial slaving, although rooted in their respective continental and Atlantic contexts, were not strictly oppositional. The exchange of personnel, animals, and goods remained constant features of the pastoral-plantation borderland. Commercial slaving transformed indigenous warfare without replacing Native practices of incorporation that added new members to militarized bands. Culturally specific notions of gender, honor, and vengeance persisted on all sides. Likewise, the long-distance transfer of captives, away from kin and homelands, was integral to conditioning slaves. Facilitating these human, material and cultural exchanges, indigenous-colonial alliances also stretched across economies of violence. At times, these pacts provided valuable military support to the Euro-American plantation zone.

Nevertheless, the mutually-constitutive aspects of the cruel embrace had their limits. Inter-indigenous alliances and localized cooperation among Native and black peoples posed viable challenges to Euro-American visions of mastery. At the structural level, indigenous and colonial slaving had fundamentally different objectives. Even with the increasing commodification of captives within Apache, Comanche, and Wichita societies, indigenous kinship structures continued to incorporate some prisoners as new members. Other social patterns, particularly associational membership and nomadic pastoralism, precluded the emergence of a large slave class. Raiding and captive-taking did not create societies dependent

on the productive capacity of unfree labourers. Conversely, Euro-Atlantic slavers sought to assemble enormous numbers of slaves to generate private wealth. Racism developed to identify and control members of this enslaved black proletariat. Focused on producing goods, usually valuable plant by-products, the extractive designs of plantation slavery insured that both land *and* people would be commodified. In short, the purposes for which indigenous and colonial societies acquired and mobilized unfree labour remained largely incongruent.

The conceptualization of this pastoral-plantation borderland – a space that overlay Native homelands and European colonies – also reorients the political history of the North American West. United States historiography generally ignores the westward expansion of plantation slavery, particularly the roles of Native, French and Spanish slaving that predated the Louisiana Purchase and shaped the region's political economy. The historical significance of Apache and Comanche alliances and raiding practices inflected every aspect of Euro-American imperialism from 1700 onwards – their relevance did not begin with the U.S. invasion of Mexico in 1846. Locating indigenous and black resistance to the plantation zone during the 1820s and 1830s also broadens scholarly understandings of slavery's expansion and abolition during the nineteenth century. Ongoing struggles between bands, villages, nations, and empires over the imposition of slave regimes continued to characterize borderland politics during the 1840s and 1850s. The actions of multi-ethnic bands allied with maroons and traders disrupt the nationalist, and usually teleological, versions of United States history structured by westward expansion and chattel slavery. Echoing John Quincy Adam's 1836 vision of a Pan-American civil war, another critic prophesized that if Mexico embraced the "war-cry" of black and Native liberation, "future generations will shudder" at the "pending convulsion."[1]

[1] Nicholas Doran Maillard, *A History of the Republic of Texas, From the Discovery of the Country to the Present Time; And the Cause of her Separation from the Republic of Mexico* (London, 1842), 271-272.

With Texas' slave population swelling from 11,000 in 1840 to 182,000 in 1860, the last generation of African-American slaves bore witness to the ways war and slavery had transformed the southwestern borderlands. Born into slavery in 1857 and raised in northeast Texas, Will Adams' grandmother told him how the Red River country was once dominated by Caddos. But during Adams' youth the remnants of the confederacy lived at the margins of plantation society, "po' folks" reduced to stealing and begging for sustenance. Shedding further light on the violent upheavals that reordered the historic Hispano-Indigenous borderland into a plantation zone, Louisa Austin remembered how her former master "come to Texas an fit de Injins an' Mexicans" and later " he brung ole Mis an' he slaves."[2] Nevertheless, multi-ethnic bands constituted a very real threat to the Southern empire for slavery. By 1850 Anglo-Texans believed that upwards of 1,500 black slaves were fighting alongside the Comanche warriors defending their lands in central Texas.[3]

From the perspective of Anglo-American planters, the expansion of chattel slavery beyond the Mississippi beckoned order, not chaos. The preeminent spokesman of American slavery, South Carolina Senator John C. Calhoun, insisted on the "tendency of Capital to destroy and absorb the property of society and produce a collision between itself and operatives [workers]." Calhoun argued that black slavery forestalled class conflict, guaranteeing "equality among the whites" by forestalling the means "by which one white man could domineer over another." A virulent conglomeration of capital and political interests, the American "Slave Power" destroyed what it could not contain. Orchestrated by Southern planters and their allies, the annexation of Texas (1845) and the U.S. war against Mexico (1846-1848) redrew the

[2] Will Adams interview, in Rawick, *The American Slave*, Volume 4: Texas Narratives, Part 1, 1-3; Louisa Austin interview, in Rawick, *The American Slave*, Supplement, Series 2, Volume 2: Texas Narratives, Part 1, 121.

[3] Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (New York, 1963), 343.

political geography of the continent. Confirmed by the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the conquest of northern Mexico by the United States opened vast swathes of territory for incorporation within the plantation zone, thus intensifying domestic discord over slavery. Although the Republic of Texas bankrupted itself fighting Mexico and Native peoples, state membership in the U. S. federation proved temporary.

Disappointed with the federal government's inability to unequivocally enforce black bondage, Texan slave masters led their state into the ranks of the Confederacy in February, 1861. It was a movement attended by rabid fears of African-American and white abolitionists, as well as concerns unique to the plantation borderland. Along with the usual allusions to the North's "unnatural and sectional" animosity, Texans' declaration of secession cited Washington's failure to protect their "property" from "the Indian savages on our border" and the "banditti from […] Mexico."[4] As the North and South lurched towards the first slaughter at Bull Run, the Civil War heralded epochal changes in national and global labour regimes. There would be further reckonings in the West.

[4] "A Declaration of the Causes which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union," February 2, 1861, in Ernest W. Winkler, ed., *Journal of the Secession Convention of Texas 1861* (Austin, 1912), 61-65. For master and slave actions in precipitating the final crisis, see Donald E. Reynolds, *Texas Terror: The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1860 and the Secession of the Lower South* (Baton Rouge, 2007); Wendell G. Addington, "Slave Insurrections in Texas," *Journal of Negro History* 35:4 (October 1950): 408-434.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

Archivo General de Indias (AGI), Papeles Procedentes de Cuba (PPC), Clayton Library, Houston, TX.

Archivo General de Mexico (AGM), Dolph Briscoe Center for American History (CAH), University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Andrew Jackson Houston Collection (AJHC), Texas State Library and Archives Commission, Austin, TX.

Bexar Archive (BA), CAH.

David G. Burnet Papers, CAH.

Documents Related to Texas, 1797-1810 (DRT), Bancroft Library (BL), University of California, Berkeley, CA.

Gilder Lerhman Collection, New York City, NY.

Herbert E. Bolton Papers (BP), BL.

Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA.

Louisiana Historical Center (LHC), New Orleans, LA.

Louisiana Papers (LP), BL.

Melrose Collection, Cammie G. Henry Center, Watson Memorial Library, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, LA.

Monroe Library, Loyola University, New Orleans, LA.

Nacogdoches Archive (NA), Ayer Collection, Newberry Library, Chicago, IL.

Natchitoches Parish Conveyance Records (NPCR), Natchitoches Parish Courthouse, Natchitoches, LA.

Robert Bruce Blake Papers, CAH.

Rosenberg Library, Galveston, TX.

Williams Research Center (WRC), The Historic New Orleans Collection, New Orleans, LA.

Newspapers

Brazos Courier, Brazoria, TX.

New Orleans Gazette, New Orleans, LA.

Telegraph and Texas Register, Houston, TX.

Texas Republican, Marshall, TX.

Published Primary Sources

Allain, Mathé, and Gerard L. St. Martin, eds. and trans. "A Slave Trial in Colonial Natchitoches," *Louisiana History* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 57-91.

Allan, T. C., ed. "Reminiscences of Mrs. Annie Fagan Teal," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (*SWHQ*) 34, no. 4 (April 1931): 317-328.

Almonte, Juan N. "Statistical Report on Texas [1835]," edited and translated by Carlos E. Castaneda. *SWHQ* 28, no. 3 (January 1925): 177-222.

Arricivita, Juan Domingo. *Apostolic Chronicle: The Franciscan Mission Frontier in the Eighteenth Century in Arizona, Texas, and the Californias*. 2 vols. Edited and translated by George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey. Berkeley: Academy of American Franciscan History 1996).

Barker, Eugene C., ed. *The Austin Papers*: *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1919*. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1924.

Benedict, J. W. "Diary of a Campaign against the Comanches," *SWHQ* 32, no. 4 (April 1929): 300-310.

Benson, Nettie Lee, ed. and trans. "A Governor's Report on Texas in 1809," *SWHQ* 71, no. 4 (April 1968): 603-615.

Berlandier, Jean Louis. *The Indians of Texas in 1830*. Edited and translated by John C. Ewers and Patricia Reading Leclercq. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1969.

Berquin-Duvallon, Pierre-Louis. *Vue de la Colonie Espagnole du Mississippi, ou des Provinces de Louisiane et Floride Occidentale, en l'Année 1802*. Paris: Imprimerie executive, 1803.

Binkley, William C., ed. *Official Correspondence of the Texan Revolution*. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936.

Bolton, Herbert E., ed. and trans. *Athanase de Mézières and the Texas-Louisiana Frontier, 1768-1780*. 2 vols. New York: Kraus, 1970.

Brasseaux, Carl A., ed. and trans. *A Comparative View of French Louisiana, 1699 and 1762: The Journals of Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville and Jean-Jacques-Blaise d'Abbadie*. Lafayette: Center for Louisiana Studies, 1981.

Brinckerhoff, Sidney B. Brinckerhoff and Odie B. Faulk, eds. and trans. *Lancers for the King: A Study of the Frontier Military System of Northern New Spain, with a Translation of the Royal Regulations of 1772*. Phoenix: Arizona Historical Foundation, 1965.

Brown, John Henry. *Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas*. Austin: L. E. Daniell, 1890.

Burnet, David G. "David G. Burnet's Letters Describing the Comanche Indians," edited by Ernest Wallace. *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 30 (1954): 115-140.

Caitlin, George. *North American Indians*. Edited by Peter Mathiessen. New York: Penguin, 1989.

Canales, Isidro Vizcaya. *La Invasion de los Indios Barbaros al Noreste de Mexico en los Anos de 1840 y 1841*. Monterrey: Publicaciones del Instituto Tecnologico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, 1968.

Carter, Clarence Edwin, ed. *The Territorial Papers of the United States*. 28 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Castaneda, Carlos E., ed. "A Trip to Texas in 1828," *SWHQ* 29, no. 4 (April 1926): 249-288.

DeShields, James T. *Border Wars of Texas; Being an Authentic and Popular Account, in Chronological Order, of the Long and Bitter Conflict Waged between Savage Indian Tribes and the Pioneer Settlers of Texas*. Tioga: The Herald Company, 1912.

Dimmick, Gregg J., and John R. Wheat, ed. and trans. *General Vicente Filisola's Analysis of Jose Urrea's Military Diary: A Forgotten 1838 Publication by an Eyewitness to the Texas Revolution*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007.

Dolbeare, Benjamin. *A Narrative of the Captivity and Suffering of Dolly Webster among the Camanche Indians in Texas; With an Account of the Massacre of John Webster and his party, as related by Mrs. Webster. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.*

Erath, George Bernard. "Memoirs of George Bernard Erath," edited by Lucy A. Erath, *SWHQ* 26, no. 3 (January 1923): 207-233.

Gaillardet, Frédéric. *Sketches of Early Louisiana and Texas*. Translated by James L. Shepherd III. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.

Galvez, Bernardo de. *Instructions for Governing the Interior Provinces of New Spain, 1786*. Translated by Donald E. Worcester. Berkeley: Quivira Society, 1951.

–. “Notes and Reflections on the War with the Apache Indians in the Provinces of New Spain,” edited and translated by Elizabeth A. H. John and John Wheat. *The Journal of Arizona History* 25, no. 3 (Autumn 1984): 301-315.

Galvin, John, ed., *Through the Country of the Comanche Indians in the Fall of Year 1845: The Journal of a U.S. Army Expedition led by Lieutenant James W. Abert*. San Francisco: John Howell, 1970.

Gammell, H. P. M. N., ed. *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*. 20 vols. Austin: The Gammell Book Company, 1898.

Garrison, George Pierce, ed. *The Diplomatic Correspondence of the Republic of Texas*. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1908.

Gracy II, David B., ed. *Establishing Austin’s Colony: With the Laws, Orders, and Contracts of Colonization*. Austin: Pemberton Press, 1970.

Green, Rena Maverick, ed. *Memoirs of Mary A. Maverick*. San Antonio: Alamo Printing Company, 1921.

Gregg, Josiah. *Commerce of the Prairies*. Edited by Max L. Moorhead. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.

Hatcher, Mattie Austin, ed. and trans. “Texas in 1820,” *SWHQ* 23, no. 1 (July 1919): 47-68.

Hatcher, Mattie Austin, and Margaret Kenney Kress, eds. and trans. “Diary of a Visit of Inspection of the Texas Missions made by Fray Gaspar Jose de Solis in the Year 1767-68,” *SWHQ* 35, no. 1 (July 1931): 28-76.

Hobbs, James. *Wild Life in the Far West*. Hartford: Wiley, Waterman, and Eaton, 1875.

Holley, Mary Austin. *Texas: Observation, Historical, Geographical, and Descriptive*. New York: Arno Press, 1973.

Hollon, W. Eugene, and Ruth Lapham Butler, eds. *William Bollaert’s Texas: Diaries Kept by William Bollaert in Texas, 1842-44*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956.

Houston, Sam. *The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863*. 8 vols. Edited by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker. Austin: Jenkins Publishing Company, 1970.

Jackson, Jack, and William C. Foster, eds. and trans. *Imaginary Kingdom: Texas as Seen by the Rivera and Rubi Military Expeditions, 1727 and 1767*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995.

Jackson, Jack, and John Wheat, ed. and trans. *Texas by Teran: The Diary kept by General Manuel de Mier y Teran on his 1828 Inspection of Texas*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000.

James, Thomas. *Three Years among the Indians and Mexicans*. Edited by Walter B. Douglas. St. Louis: Missouri Historical Society, 1916.

Jenkins, John Holland. *Recollections of Early Texas*. Edited by John Holmes Jenkins III. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958.

John, Elizabeth A. H., and John Wheat, eds. and trans. "Views from a Desk in Chihuahua: Manuel Merino's Report on Apaches and Neighbouring Nations, ca. 1804," *SWHQ* 95, no. 2 (October 1991): 138-176.

John, Elizabeth A. H., and Adan Benavides, Jr., ed. and trans. "Inside the Comancheria, 1785: The Diary of Pedro Vial and Francisco Xavier Chaves," *SWHQ* 98, no. 1 (July 1994): 26-56.

Jones, R. L., ed. "Folk Life in Early Texas: The Autobiography of Andrew Davis," *SWHQ* 43, no. 2 (October 1939): 158-176.

Kavanagh, Thomas W., ed. *Comanche Ethnography: Field Notes of E. Adamson Hoebel, Waldo R. Wedel, Gustav G. Carlson, and Robert H. Lowie.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.

King, C. Richard, ed. *Victorian Lady on the Texas Frontier: The Journal of Ann Raney Coleman*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press 1971.

Kinnaird, Lawrence, ed. and trans. *Spain in the Mississippi Valley, 1765-1794*. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949.

Lack, Paul D., ed. *The Diary of William Fairfax Gray: From Virginia to Texas, 1835-1837*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1997.

Lamar, Mirabeau B. *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*. 6 vols. Edited by Charles Adams Gulick Jr. and Katherine Elliott. Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones, 1921-1927.

LaVere, David, and Katia Campbell, ed. and trans. "An Expedition to the Kichai: The Journal of Francois Grappé, September 24, 1783," *SWHQ* 98, no. 1 (July 1994): 58-78.

Leutenegger, Benedict, and Marion Habig, eds. and trans. "Report on the San Antonio Missions in 1792," *SWHQ* 77, no. 4 (April 1974): 487-498.

Leutenegger, Benedict, ed. and trans. *Letters and Memorials of the Father Presidente Fray Benito Fernandez de Santa Ana, 1736-1754: Documents from the Missions of Texas from the Archives of the College of Queretaro*. San Antonio: Old Spanish Missions Historical Research Library, 1981.

Linn, John J. *Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas*. New York: D. & J. Sadler, 1883.

Lopez, Jose Francisco. "The Texas Missions in 1785," edited and translated by J. Autrey Dabbs. *Preliminary Studies of the Texas Catholic Historical Society* (Austin, 1940): 5-23.

Lowrie, Walter, and Matthew St. Clair Clarke, eds. *American State Papers: Documents, Legislative and Executive, of the Congress of the United States.* 38 vols. Washington D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1832.

Lundy, Benjamin. *The War in Texas; A Review of the Facts and Circumstances, Showing that this Contest is the Result of a Long Premeditated Crusade Against the Government, Set on Foot by Slaveholders, Land Speculators, & C. with the View of Re-establishing, Extending, and Perpetuating the System of Slavery and the Slave Trade in the Republic of Mexico*. Philadelphia: Merrihew & Gunn, 1836.

Magnaghi, Russell M., ed. and trans. "Texas as Seen by Governor Winthuysen, 1741-1744," *SWHQ* 88, no. 2 (October 1984): 167-180.

Maillard, Nicholas Doran. *A History of the Republic of Texas, From the Discovery of the Country to the Present Time; And the Cause of her Separation from the Republic of Mexico*. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1842.

Margry, Pierre, ed. *Découvertes et Établissements des Français dans L'Ouest et dans le Sud de L'Amérique Septentrionale (1614-1754): Mémoires et Documents Originaux.* 6 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Jouaust et Sigaux, 1886.

Matson, Daniel S., and Albert H. Schroeder, eds. and trans. "Cordero's Description of the Apache – 1796," *New Mexico Historical Review* 32 (1957): 335-356.

Mills, Elizabeth Shown, ed. *Natchitoches 1729-1803: Abstracts of the Catholic Church Registers of the French and Spanish Post of St. Jean Baptiste des Natchitoches in Louisiana*. New Orleans: Polyanthos, 1977.

Morfi, Juan Augustin. *History of Texas, 1673-1779*. Translated by Carlos E. Castaneda. 2 vols. Albuquerque: The Quivira Society, 1935.

Movina, Timothy, and Jesús F. de la Teja, eds. *Recollections of a Tejano Life: Antonio Menchaca in Texas History*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013.

Muir, Andrew Forest, ed. *Texas in 1837: An Anonymous, Contemporary Narrative*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958.

Norall, Frank, ed. *Bourgmont: Explorer of the Missouri, 1698-1725*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press, 1988.

Nute, Grace Lee, ed. “Documents Relating to James Dickson’s Expedition,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 10, no. 2 (September 1923): 173-181.

Opler, Morris Edward, ed. *Myths and Legends of the Lipan Apache Indians*. New York: American Folk-Lore Society, 1940.

Pena, Jose Enrique de la. *With Santa Anna in Texas: A Personal Narrative of the Revolution*. Edited and translated by Carmen Perry and James E. Crisp. College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1997.

Pitot, James. *Observations on the Colony of Louisiana from 1796 to 1802*. Translated by Henry C. Pitot. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.

Rawick, George P., ed. *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979.

Reagan, John H. “The Expulsion of the Cherokees from East Texas,” *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 1, no. 1 (July 1897): 38-46.

Rister, Carl Coke. *Comanche Bondage: Beale’s Settlement and Sarah Ann Horn’s Narrative*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Rivaya-Martinez, Joaquin, ed. and trans. “The Captivity of Macario Leal: A Tejano among the Comanches, 1847-1854,” *SWHQ* 117, no. 4 (April 2014): 372-402.

Rowland, Dunbar, ed. *Official Letter Books of W.C.C. Claiborne, 1801-1816*. Jackson: Mississippi State Department of History and Archives, 1917.

Rowland, Dunbar, A. G. Sanders, and Patricia Galloway, eds. and trans. *Mississippi Provincial Archives: French Dominion, 1749-1763.* 5 vols. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984.

Ruiz, Jose Francisco. *Report on the Indian Tribes of Texas in 1828*. Edited and translated by John C. Ewers and Georgette Dorn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.

Sibley, John. *Report from Natchitoches in 1807*. Edited by Annie Heloise Abel. New York: Evangeline Genealogical and Historical Society, 1987.

Sibley, Marilyn McAdams, ed. “Across Texas in 1767: The Travels of Captain Pagès,” *SWHQ* 70, no. 4 (April 1967): 593-622.

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

Smithwick, Noah. *Evolution of a State, or Recollections of Old Texas Days*. Austin: Gammell Book Company, 1900.

Sowell, A. J. *Early Settlers and Indian Fighters of Southwest Texas*. Austin: Ben C. Jones & Co. Printers, 1900.

Taylor, Virginia H, ed. and trans. *The Letters of Antonio Martinez: Last Spanish Governor of Texas, 1817-1822*. Austin: Texas State Library, 1957.

Thomas, Alfred Barnaby, ed. and trans. *After Coronado: Spanish Exploration Northeast of New Mexico, 1696-1727*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1935.

–, ed. and trans. *Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1941.

United States Congress. *Senate Executive Documents*. 32nd Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1852-1853.

Vigness, David M., ed. and trans. "Nuevo Santander in 1795: A Provincial Inspection by Félix Calleja," *SWHQ* 75, no. 4 (April 1972): 461-506.

Weber, David J., and Conchita Hassell Winn, eds. and trans. *Troubles in Texas, 1832: A Tejano Viewpoint from San Antonio with a Translation and Facscimile*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1983.

West, Elizabeth H., ed. and trans. "Bonilla's Brief Compendium of the History of Texas, 1772," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 8, no. 1 (July 1904): 3-72.

White, Gifford E., ed. *The 1840 Census of the Republic of* Texas. Austin: Pemberton Press, 1966.

Wilbarger, John Wesley. *Indian Depredations in Texas: Reliable Accounts of Battles, Wars, Adventures, Forays, Murders, Massacres; Together with Biographical Sketches of Many of the Most Noted Indian Fighters and Frontiersmen of* Texas. Austin: Hutchings Printing House, 1889.

Winfrey, Dorman and James M. Day, eds. *The Indian Papers of Texas and the Southwest, 1825-1916*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995.

Winkler, E. W., ed. *Journals of the Congress of the Republic of Texas*. Austin: Austin Print Company, 1911.

Yoakum, Henderson. *History of Texas From the First Settlement in 1685 to Its Annexation to the United States in 1846*. 2 vols. New York: Redfield, 1855.

Books

Adorno, Rolena. *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Alt, Susan M., ed. *Ancient Complexities: New Perspectives in Precolumbian North America*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2010.

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *The Indian Southwest, 1580-1830: Ethnogenesis and Reinvention*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1999.

–. *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820-1875*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.

Aptheker, Herbert. *American Negro Slave Revolts*. New York: International Publishers, 1963.

Aron, Stephen. *American Confluence: The Missouri Frontier from Borderland to Border State*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 2006.

Aten, Lawrence E. *Indians of the Upper Texas Coast*. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

Babcock, Matthew. *Apache Adaptation to Hispanic Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Baptist, Edward E. *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.

Barr, Juliana. *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Barr, Juliana and Edward Countryman, eds. *Contested Spaces of North America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2014.

Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A New History of Global Capitalism*. New York: Penguin, 2015.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Betty, Gerald. *Comanche Society: Before the Reservation*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2002.

Blackhawk, Ned. *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Bolton, Herbert E. *Texas in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century: Studies in Spanish Colonial History and Administration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1915.

Bowes, John P. *Land Too Good for Indians: Northern Indian Removal*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Bradley, Ed. *"We Never Retreat": Filibustering Expeditions into Spanish Texas, 1812-1822*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015.

Brasseaux, Carl A., and Glenn R. Conrad, eds. *The Road to Louisiana: The Saint-Domingue Refugees, 1792–1809*. Lafayette: Center for Louisiana Studies, 1992.

Brice, Donaly E. *The Great Comanche Raid: Boldest Indian Attack on the Texas Republic*. Austin: Eakin Publishers, 1987.

Britten, Thomas A. *The Lipan Apaches: People of Wind and Lightning*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2009.

Brooks, James F. *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Brown, Richard Maxwell. *Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Buenger, Walter L., and Arnold De Leon, eds. *Beyond Texas Through Time: Breaking Away from Past Interpretations*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2011.

Burnard, Trevor and John Garrigus. *The Plantation Machine: Atlantic Capitalism in French St-Domingue and British Jamaica*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

Burton, H. Sophie and F. Todd Smith. *Colonial Natchitoches: A Creole Community on the Louisiana-Texas Frontier*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008.

Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Cameron, Catherine M. *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016.

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

Carocci, Max and Stephanie Pratt, eds. *Native American, Adoption, Captivity, and Slavery in Changing Contexts*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Castaneda, Carlos E. *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936*. 7 vols. Austin: Von-Boeckmann Jones, 1936-1958.

Christian, Asa Kyrus. *Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*. Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones, 1922.

Clarke, Mary Whatley. *Chief Bowles and the Texas Cherokees*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.

Clastres, Pierre. *Society Against the State: Essays in Political Anthropology*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Zone Books, 1989.

Confer, Clarissa, Andrae Marak, and Laura Tuennerman, eds. *Transnational Indians in the North American West*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2015.

Curtin, Philip D. *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Dawdy, Shannon Lee. *Building the Devil's Empire: French Colonial New Orleans.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Deer, Sarah. *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

DeLay, Brian. *War of a Thousand Deserts: Indian Raids and the U.S.-Mexican War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *Nomadology: The War Machine*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Din, Gilbert C. *Spaniards, Planters, and Slaves: The Spanish Regulation of Slavery in Louisiana, 1763-1803*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1999.

Diouf, Sylviane A. *Slavery's Exiles: The Story of the American Maroons*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.

Dubois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1903.

DuVal, Kathleen. *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Ekberg, Carl J. *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2007.

Ethridge Robbie, and Sheri M. Shuck-Hall, eds. *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: The Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Everett, Dianna. *The Texas Cherokees: A People between Two Fires, 1819-1840*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.

Farrer, D. S., ed. *War Magic: Religion, Sorcery, and Performance*. New York: Bergham Books, 2016.

Ferguson, R. Brian, ed. *Warfare, Culture, and Environment*. New York: Academic Press, 1984.

Ferguson, R. Brian, and Neil L. Whitehead, eds. *War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 1992.

Forbes, Jack D. *Apache, Navajo, and Spaniard*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960.

Gallay, Alan. *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

–, ed. *Indian Slavery in Colonial America*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009.

Gaspar, David Barry, and David Patrick Geggus, eds. *A Turbulent Time: The French Revolution and the Greater Caribbean*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1997.

Gould, Eliga H. *Among the Powers of the Earth: The American Revolution and the Making of a New World Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Grinnell, George Bird. *The Fighting Cheyennes*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956.

Guy, Donna J., and Thomas E. Sheridan, eds. *Contested Ground: Comparative Frontiers on the Northern and Southern Edges of the Spanish Empire*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press, 1998.

Haas, Jonathan, ed. *The Anthropology of War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hahn, Stephen, and Jonathan Prude, eds. *The Countryside in the Age of Capitalist Transformation: Essays in the Social History of Rural America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

Hall, Gwendolyn Midlo. *Africans in Colonial Louisiana: The Development of Afro-Creole Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.

Hall, Thomas D. *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350-1880*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1989.

Hämäläinen, Pekka. *The Comanche Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Himmel, Kelly F. *The Conquest of the Karankawas and the Tonkawas, 1821-1859*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1999.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1965.

Hogan, William Ransom. *The Texas Republic: A Social and Economic History*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969.

Hyde, Anne F. *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the American West, 1800-1860*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011.

Iborra, Vicente Ribes. *Ambiciones Estadounidenses Sobre la Provincia Novohispana de Texas*. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas, 1982.

John, Elizabeth A. H. *Storms Brewed in Other Men's Worlds: The Confrontation of Indians, Spanish, and French in the Southwest, 1540-1795*, 2nd ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.

Johnson, Walter, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.

Kastor, Peter J. *The Nation's Crucible: The Louisiana Purchase and the Creation of America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

Kavanagh, Thomas W. *The Comanches: A History 1706-1875*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Kelley, Sean M. *Los Brazos de Dios: A Plantation Society in the Texas Borderlands, 1821-1865*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2010.

Kelton, Paul. *Epidemics and Enslavement: Biological Catastrophe in the Native Southeast, 1492-1715*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

Kiernan, Ben. *Blood and Soil: A World History of Genocide and Extermination from Sparta to Darfur*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Kurtz, Donald V. *Political Anthropology: Paradigms and Power*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 2001.

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

Lakomaki, Sami. *Gathering Together: The Shawnee People through Diaspora and Nationhood 1600-1870*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014.

La Vere, David. *The Caddo Chiefdoms: Caddo Economics and Politics, 700-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

–. *Contrary Neighbors: Southern Plains and Removed Indians in Indian Territory*. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 2000.

Lavina, Javier, and Michael Zeuske, eds. *The Second Slavery: Mass Slaveries and Modernity in the Americas and the Atlantic Basin*. Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2014.

Lee, Wayne E., ed. *Empires and Indigenes: Intercultural Alliance, Imperial Expansion, and Warfare in the Early Modern World*. New York: New York University Press, 2011.

Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic.* Boston: Beacon Press, 2013.

Martin, Bonnie, and James F. Brooks, eds. *Linking the Histories of Slavery: North America and Its Borderlands*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press, 2015.

Mapp, Paul W. *The Elusive West and the Contest for Empire, 1713-1763.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.

Meillassoux, Claude. *The Anthropology of Slavery: The Womb of Iron and Gold*. Translated by Alide Dasnois. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Miller, Joseph C. *The Problem of Slavery as History: A Global Approach*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Minor, Nancy McGowan. *The Light Gray People: An Ethno-History of the Lipan Apaches of Texas and Northern Mexico.* Lanham: University Press of America, 2009.

–. *Turning Adversity to Advantage: A History of the Lipan Apaches of Texas and Northern Mexico*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2009.

Moore, John H., ed. *The Political Economy of North American Indians*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Moorhead, Max L. *The Apache Frontier: Jacobo Ugarte and Spanish-Indian Relations in Northern New Spain, 1769-1791*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968.

– . *The Presidio: Bastion of the Spanish Borderlands*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.

Nance, Joseph Milton. *After San Jacinto: The Texas-Mexican Frontier, 1836-1841*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1963.

Newcomb, W.W., Jr. *The Indians of Texas: From Prehistoric to Modern Times*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.

Newell, Margaret Ellen. *Brethren by Nature: New England Indians, Colonists, and the Origins of American Slavery*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015.

Obadele-Starks, Ernest. *Freebooters and Smugglers: The Foreign Slave Trade in the United States after 1808*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2007.

O'Connor, Kathryn Stoner. *The Presidio La Bahía del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga, 1721 to 1846*. Austin: Von-Boeckmann Jones, 1966.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Poole, Deborah A., ed. *Unruly Order: Violence, Power, and Cultural Identity in the High Provinces of Southern Peru*. Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1994.

Powell, Philip W. *Soldiers, Indians, Silver: The Northward Advance of New Spain, 1550-1600*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952.

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

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

Price, Richard, ed. *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Pritchard, James. *In Search of Empire: The French in the Americas, 1670-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Ramsay, Jack C. *Thunder Beyond the Brazos: Mirabeau Lamar, A Biography*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1984.

Rediker, Marcus. *The Slave Ship: A Human History*. New York: Viking, 2007.

Reyna, S. P., and R. E. Downs, eds. *Studying War: Anthropological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach, 1994.

Reynolds, Donald E. *Texas Terror: The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1860 and the Secession of the Lower South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007.

Richter, Daniel K. *Before the Revolution: America's Ancients Pasts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Ricklis, Robert A. *The Karankawa Indians of Texas: An Ecological Study of Cultural Tradition and Change*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Robinson, Lila Wistrand, and James Armagost, eds. *Comanche Dictionary and Grammar*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1990.

Robinson, Sherry. *Apache Voices: Their Stories of Survival as told to Eve Ball*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.

Rushforth, Brett. *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.

Salinas, Martin. *Indians of the Rio Grande Delta: Their Role in the History of Southern Texas and Northeastern Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.

Salmon, Roberto Mario. *Indian Revolts in Northern New Spain: A Synthesis of Resistance*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1991.

Santiago, Mark. *The Jar of Severed Hands: Spanish Deportation of Apache Prisoners of War, 1770-1810*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2011.

Santos-Granero, Fernando. *Vital Enemies: Slavery, Predation, and the Amerindian Political Economy of Life.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009.

Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2000.

Smallwood, Stephanie E. *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from African to American Diaspora*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Smith, F. Todd. *The Caddo Indians: Tribes at the Convergence of Empires, 1542-1854*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995.

–. *From Dominance to Disappearance: The Indians of Texas and the Near Southwest, 1786-1859*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

Snyder, Christina. *Slavery in Indian Country: The Changing Face of Captivity in Early America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Taylor, William B., and Franklin Pease G. Y., eds. *Violence, Resistance, and Survival in the Americas: Native Americans and the Legacy of Conquest*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1994.

Taylor, Alan. *American Colonies: The Settling of North America*. New York: Penguin, 2004.

–. *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies*. New York: Vintage Books, 2010.

Teja, Jesús F., de la. *San Antonio de Bexar: A Community on New Spain's Northern Frontier*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1996.

Thornton, John K. *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Tomich, Dale W., ed. *The Politics of the Second Slavery*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2016.

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

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

Usner, Daniel H. *Indians, Settlers, and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley before 1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Valerio-Jimenez, Omar S. *River of Hope: Forging Identity and Nation in the Rio Grande Borderlands*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.

Vidal, Cécile, ed. *Louisiana: Crossroads of the Atlantic World.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2014.

Warren, Harris Gaylord. *The Sword was their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943.

Weber, David J. *The Mexican Frontier, 1821-1846: The American Southwest under Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.

–. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

–. *Barbaros: Spaniards and their Savages in the Age of Enlightenment*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Weddle, Robert S. *After the Massacre: The Violent Legacy of the San Saba Mission*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2007.

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wood, Peter H., Gregory A. Waskelov, and M. Thomas Hatley, eds. *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989.

Wolf, Eric R. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Honor and Violence in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Zappia, Natale. *Traders and Raiders: The Indigenous World of the Colorado Basin, 1540-1859*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.

Articles

Addington, Wendell G. "Slave Insurrections in Texas," *Journal of Negro History* 35, no. 4 (October 1950): 408-434.

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

Anderson, H. Allen. "The Delaware and Shawnee Indians and the Republic of Texas, 1820–1845," *SWHQ* 94 (October 1990): 231-260.

Archer, Christon I. "The Deportation of Barbarian Indians from the Internal Provinces of New Spain, 1789-1810," *The Americas* 29, no. 3 (January 1973): 376-385.

Babcock, Matthew. "Roots of Independence: Transcultural Trade in the Texas-Louisiana Borderland," *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 2 (2013): 245-268.

Barker, Eugene C. "The Influence of Slavery in the Colonization of Texas," *SWHQ* 28, no. 1 (July 1924): 1-33.

Barr, Juliana. "Geographies of Power: Mapping Indian Borders in the 'Borderlands' of the Early Southwest," *William and Mary Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (January 2011): 5-46.

Bialuschewski, Arne, and Linford D. Fisher. "New Directions in the History of Native American Slavery Studies," *Ethnohistory* 64, no. 1 (January 2017):1-17.

Blyth, Lance R. "Fugitives from Servitude: American Deserters and Runaway Slaves in Spanish Nacogdoches, 1803-1808," *East Texas Historical Journal* 38, no. 2 (October 2000): 3-14.

Bolton, Herbert E. "The Founding of the Missions on the San Gabriel River, 1745-1749," *SWHQ* 17, no. 4 (April 1914): 323-378.

Bridges, Katherine, and Winston DeVille. "Natchitoches in 1766," *Louisiana History* 4, no. 2 (Spring 1963): 145-159.

Brooks, James F. “Served Well by Plunder: *La Gran Ladroneria* and Producers of History Astride the Rio Grande,” *American Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (March 2000): 23-58.

Bryan, Jimmy R., Jr. “More Disastrous than All: The Surveyors’ Fight, 1838,” *East Texas Historical Journal* 38, no. 1 (March 2000): 3-14.

Bugbee, Lester G. “Slavery in Early Texas,” *Political Science Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (September 1898): 389-412.

Burton, H. Sophie. “Vagabonds along the Spanish Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1769-1803: ‘Men who are Evil, Lazy, Gluttonous, Drunken, Libertinous, Dishonest, Mutinous, etc. etc. etc – And Those are Their Virtues,’” *SWHQ* 113, no. 4 (April 2010): 438-467.

Burton, H. Sophie and F. Todd Smith, “Slavery in the Colonial Louisiana Backcountry: Natchitoches, 1714-1803,” *Louisiana History* 52, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 133-188.

Calhoun, Daniel H. “Strategy as Lived: Mixed Communities in the Age of New Nations,” *American Indian Quarterly* 22, no. 1/2 (Winter-Spring 1998): 181-202.

Calloway, Colin G. “Neither White nor Red: White Renegades on the American Indian Frontier,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (January 1986): 43-66.

Caron, Peter. “’Of a Nation which the others do not understand’: Bambara slaves and African Ethnicity in Colonial Louisiana, 1718-1760,” *Slavery & Abolition* 18, no. 1 (1997): 98-121.

Cohen, Paul. “Was there an Amerindian Atlantic? Reflections on the Limits of a Historiographical Concept,” *History of European Ideas* 34, no. 4 (August 2008): 388-410.

Cook, Philip C. “Alexis Grappé: From French Marine to North Louisiana Frontiersman,” *Journal of the North Louisiana Historical Association* 34 (Winter 2003): 30-42.

DeLay, Brian. “Independent Indians and the U.S.-Mexican War,” *American Historical Review* 112, no. 1 (February 2007): 35-68.

Dunn, William E. “Apache Relations in Texas, 1718-1750,” *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 14, no. 3 (January 1911): 198-175.

Duval, Kathleen. “Cross-Cultural Crime and Osage Justice in the Western Mississippi Valley, 1700-1826,” *Ethnohistory* 54, no. 4 (October 2007): 697-722.

Fisher, Linford D. ‘Why shall wee have peace to bee made slaves’: Indian Surrenderers during and after King Philip’s War,” *Ethnohistory* 64, no. 1 (January 2017): 91-114.

Ford, Lacy K. “Making the 'White Man's Country' White: Race, Slavery, and State-Building in the Jacksonian South,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 19, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 713-737.

Furstenberg, Francois. “The Significance of the Trans-Appalachian Frontier in Atlantic History,” *American Historical Review* 113, no. 3 (June 2008): 647–667.

Gladwin, Thomas. “Comanche Kin Behavior,” *American Anthropologist* 50, no. 1 (January-March 1948): 73-94.

Haggard, J. V. “The Neutral Ground between Louisiana and Texas, 1806–1821,” *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 28 (October 1945): 1001-1128.

Hämäläinen, Pekka. “The Politics of Grass: European Expansion, Ecological Change and Indigenous Power in the Southwest Borderlands,” *William and Mary Quarterly* Vol. 67, No. 2 (April 2010): 173-208.

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

Hammond, John Craig. “Slavery, Settlement, and Empire: The Expansion and Growth of Slavery in the Interior of the North American Continent, 1770-1820,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 32, no. 2 (Summer 2012): 175-206.

Hinderaker, Eric, and Rebecca Horn. “Territorial Crossings: Histories and Historiographies of the Early Americas,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (July 2010): 395-432.

John, Elizabeth A. H. “Nurturing the Peace: Spanish and Comanche Cooperation in the Early Nineteenth Century,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 59, no. 4 (October 1984): 345-369.

Kars, Marjoleine. “Dodging Rebellion: Politics and Gender in the Berbice Slave Uprising of 1763,” *American Historical Review* 121, no.1 (February 2016): 39-69.

Kastor, Peter J. “’Motives of Peculiar Urgency’: Local Diplomacy in Louisiana, 1803-1821” *William and Mary Quarterly* 58, no. 4 (October 2001): 819-848.

Kaye, Anthony E. “The Second Slavery: Modernity in the Nineteenth-Century American South and the Atlantic World,” *Journal of Southern History* 75, no. 3 (August 2009): 627-650.

Kelley, Sean M. “’Mexico in His Head’: Slavery and the Texas-Mexico Border, 1810-1860,” *Journal of Social History* 37, no. 3 (Spring 2004): 709-723.

Kinnaird, Lawrence, and Lucia B. Kinnaird. “Choctaws West of the Mississippi, 1766-1800,” *SWHQ* 83, no. 4 (April 1980): 349-370.

Kokeny, Andrea. “The Construction of Anglo-American Identity in the Republic of Texas, as Reflected in the *Telegraph and Texas Register*,” *Journal of the Southwest* 46, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 283-308.

Lachance, Paul F. “The Politics of Fear: French Louisianans and the Slave Trade, 1786-1809,” *Plantation Society in the Americas: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Tropical and Subtropical History and Culture* 1, no. 2 (June 1979): 162-197.

Langfur, Hal. “Moved by Terror: Violence as Inter-Cultural Exchange in Late Colonial Brazil,” *Ethnohistory* 52, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 255-289.

Leglaunec, Jean-Pierre. “Slave Migrations in Spanish and Early American Louisiana: New Sources and New Estimates,” *Louisiana History* 46, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 186-209.

Liljegren, Ernest R. “Jacobinism in Spanish Louisiana, 1792-1797,” *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (January 1939): 47-97.

Madley, Benjamin L. ‘Unholy Traffic in Human Blood and Souls’: Systems of California Indian Servitude under U.S. Rule,” *Pacific Historical Review* 83, no. 4 (November 2014): 626-667.

Miles, Edwin A. “The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835,” *Journal of Negro History* 34, no. 2 (1949): 73-94.

Moorhead, Max L. “The Spanish Deportation of Hostile Apaches: The Policy and the Practice,” *Arizona and the West* 17, no. 3 (Autumn 1975): 205-220.

Morris, Christopher. “An Event in Community Organization: The Mississippi Slave Insurrection Scare of 1835,” *Journal of Social History* 22, no. 1 (October 1988): 98-113.

Narrett, David E. “José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara: ‘Caudillo’ of the Mexican Republic in Texas,” *SWHQ* 106, no. 2 (October 2002): 194-228.

Nelson, Al B. “Campaigning in the Big Bend of the Rio Grande in 1787,” *SWHQ* 39, no. 3 (January 1936): 200-227.

O’Malley, Gregory E. “Beyond the Middle Passage: Slave Migration from the Caribbean to North America, 1619-1807,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 66, no. 1 (January 2009): 125-172.

Poole, Deborah A. “Landscapes of Power in a Cattle-Rustling Culture of Southern Andean Peru,” *Dialectical Anthropology* 12, no. 4 (1987): 367-398.

Ricard, Ulysses S. “The Pointe Coupée Slave Conspiracy of 1791,” *Proceedings of the Meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society* 15 (1992): 116-129.

Richmond, Douglas W. “Africa’s Initial Encounter with Texas: The Significance of Afro-Tejanos in Colonial Tejas, 1528-1821,” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2 (2007): 200-221.

Rivaya-Martinez, Joaquin. “A Different Look at Native American Depopulation: Comanche Raiding, Captive Taking, and Population Decline,” *Ethnohistory* 61, no. 3 (Summer 2014): 391-418.

Rothman, Joshua. “The Hazards of the Flush Times: Gambling, Mob Violence, and the Anxieties of America’s Market Revolution,” *Journal of American History* 95, no. 3 (December 2008): 651-677.

Sandberg, Brian. “Beyond Encounters: Religion, Ethnicity, and Violence in the Early Modern Atlantic World, 1492-1700,” *Journal of World History* 17, no. 1 (March 2006): 1-25.

Sidbury, James, and Jorge Canizares-Esguerra. “Mapping Ethnogenesis in the Early Modern Atlantic,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (April 2011): 181-208.

Shuck Hall, Sheri-Marie. “Borderlands and Identities in Imperial Texas: The Alabamas and Coushattas in the Anti-Comanche Union, 1820-1840,” *International History Review* 25 (September 2003): 563-591.

Smith, Ralph A. “Mexican and Anglo-Saxon Traffic in Scalps, Slaves, and Livestock, 1835-1841,” *West Texas Historical Association Year Book* 36 (October 1960): 98-115.

–. “Indians in American-Mexican Relations Before the War of 1846,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 43, no. 1 (February 1963): 34-64.

Stagner, Stephen. “Epics, Science, and the Lost Frontier: Texas Historical Writing, 1836-1936,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 12, no. 2 (April 1981): 165-181.

Stone, Erin Woodruff. “America’s First Slave Revolt: Indians and African Slaves in Espanola, 1500-1534,” *Ethnohistory* 60, no. 2 (Spring 2013): 195-217.

Tate, Michael L. “Comanche Captives: People Between Two Worlds,” *The Chronicles of Oklahoma* 72, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 228-263.

Teja, Jesús, F. de la, and John Wheat. “Bexar: Profile of a Tejano Community, 1820-1832,” *SWHQ* 89, no. 1 (July 1985): 7-34.

Tjarks, Alicia V. “Comparative Demographic Analysis of Texas, 1777-1793,” *SWHQ* 77, no. 3 (January 1974): 291-338.

Trigger, Bruce. “Early Native North American Responses to the European Encounter: Rationalistic vs. Romantic Interpretations,” *Journal of American History* 77, no. 4 (March 1991): 1195-1215.

Vigness, David M. “Indian Raids on the Lower Rio Grande, 1836-1837,” *SWHQ* 59, no. 1 (July 1955): 14-23.

Webre, Stephen. “The Problem of Indian Slavery in Spanish Louisiana, 1769-1803,” *Louisiana History* 25, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 117-135.

Winfrey, Dorman H. “Mirabeau B. Lamar and Texas Nationalism,” *SWHQ* 59, no. 2 (October 1955): 184-205.

Winkler, Ernest William. “The Cherokee Indians in Texas,” *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 7, no. 2 (October 1903): 95-165.

Wolfe, Patrick. “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 387-409.

Yaremko, Jason M. “Colonial Wars and Indigenous Geopolitics: Aboriginal Agency, the Cuba-Florida-Mexico Nexus, and the Other Diaspora,” *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 35 (2010): 165-196.