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In February 1840 Ramón Baca and Esquipulas Caballero, officers of the presidial troops of New Mexico, attempted a military revolt against the New Mexican governor, Manuel Armijo. Since a soldiers' revolt that failed, as this one did, was no rarity in Mexico, Governor Armijo's account of the affair in the New Mexico Archives attracted no attention and remained untranslated for nearly a century and a half.1

Two years later George Wilkins Kendall also described the incident in an account as well-known to posterity as Governor Armijo's was unknown. Kendall's condemnation of Armijo has influenced seven generations of readers and persuaded scores of writers that Armijo was a monster, a great coward, an insatiable lecher, and a ruthless oppressor of what Kendall describes as the governor's stupid, timid, ignorant countrymen. Of Armijo's side of the story writers have been unaware.2

Kendall had reason to loathe Armijo. As editor of the New Orleans Picayune Kendall had come to New Mexico in the fall of 1841 for health, adventure, and a good story for his newspaper. He joined a party of invading Texans who were armed for war but also outfitted with merchandise, to conquer or to trade, whichever appeared better on arrival. In eastern New Mexico Armijo arrested the Texans as enemy invaders, for Texas and Mexico were then at war. Although Kendall was travelling under a United States passport, he was forced to share the long walk with the Texans. Seething with fury all the way, Kendall stored up vengeful memories of New Mexico and Governor Armijo for his newspaper articles published in 1842 in the Picayune. He also used the complaints of "a gentleman who
has known that petty tyrant and his career for nearly fifteen years,”
probably Manuel Alvarez, the energetic United States commercial
agent and quasi consul for Americans in New Mexico. Kendall’s
articles were reprinted in 1844 as *Narrative of the Texan Santa Fe
Expedition*, a bestselling book bought by 40,000 Americans of that
time and reprinted regularly ever since. 3

In 1846 the Mexican War started. Perhaps Kendall’s description
of Armijo was of some use to President Polk and his expansionist
partisans in convincing Americans that Manifest Destiny could have
no higher mission than to free the timorous, downtrodden New
Mexicans from Armijo’s tyranny. Kendall’s report of Armijo’s avarice
and venality probably persuaded United States emissaries to try
to bribe the governor into abandoning all defense of New Mexico
in the face of the American invasion. Certainly the invaders were
familiar with the book. Journals of soldiers of the Army of the West
show that many had Kendall’s book tucked in their knapsacks, and
that its contents helped shape their low opinion of New Mexico
and its people. 4

Kendall’s description of Armijo in his *Narrative of the Texan
Santa Fe Expedition* is a diatribe. It describes Armijo’s low and
disreputable parents, his profligate youth spent stealing neighbors’
wealth, his fortune obtained through gambling—none of which is
true. 5

Armijo’s power, writes Kendall, was obtained through assassi­
nation and intrigue:

Armijo I could not look upon but as a second Robespierre, only
requiring a field of equal extent to make him equally an assassin, a
murderer, a blood-thirsty tyrant. His power, I knew, had been pur­
chased by blood—I saw that it was sustained by blood. . . . [I have]
abundant material . . . yet . . . unused, with stories of his atrocious
acts that would bring a blush upon the brow of tyranny, . . . horrible
murders, [and] . . . many a thrilling story of his abuse of . . . women,
that would make Saxon hearts burn with indignant fire. . . . Assas­
sinations, robberies, violent debauchery, extortions, and innumer­
able acts of broken faith are themes upon which I am armed with
abundant and most veritable detail, but my readers would sicken. . . . 6

Kendall’s most extensive example of the vicious character of
Armijo was the Baca-Caballero affair, recited below using much of Kendall's rhetoric. Armijo, wrote Kendall, had conceived a lascivious passion for beautiful young Soledad Abreu, daughter of a former governor, but the young lady proudly spurned his advances. Armijo was patient and not above intrigue. After promoting a match between Soledad and Alférez Esquipulas Caballero, he honored their nuptials by officiating as sponsor. Then he renewed his vile importunities with, as he thought, better prospect, for as Caballero's commander he held the young officer's destiny in his hands. Soledad remained invulnerable to his threats and persuasions. He retaliated by degrading her unoffending husband and her favorite uncle, another young alférez named Ramón Baca. 7

These two young men had already incurred Armijo's displeasure. They were suspected of fomenting revolt among the soldiers, some twenty of whom had been thrown into jail for refusing their wages in Armijo's corn at the exorbitant price of $4 per fanega. Armijo's outrageous act of tyranny caused such public excitement that the governor was obliged to advertise a contract for supplying the soldiers with corn to the lowest bidder. Even Armijo's stupid countrymen were not deceived, knowing well that Armijo paid off public dues in his merchandise at enormous profits, and that no bidder could take the contract at any price since the insolvent government never paid any creditor but Armijo. 8

So the matter rested, Kendall says, and Armijo began making good the deep oaths of vengeance he had sworn. In a grand public review of troops, Armijo promoted two other officers to a rank above that of Baca and Caballero. The humiliated officers, the most deserving and meritorious in the entire troop, presented a respectful petition to the government for reinstatement. Their petition so irritated the tyrant that he threatened them with instant death if they ever again molested him with their importunities. Caballero was thrown in prison and shackled; Baca was ordered banished upon some frivolous charge. 9

On the day he was to leave the country, Baca declared that he would raise an insurrection to kill Armijo or die in the attempt. With great boldness he walked directly under Armijo's window while trying to incite his fellow-soldiers to rebellion. The soldiers, whether from fear of Armijo or lack of confidence in Baca, refused
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to revolt. Baca and Caballero were sent to Mexico to be tried for treason, but they were released in Chihuahua and proceeded to Mexico City on their own to present their case. In Mexico they failed to obtain redress because the imminent arrival of the Texas expedition prevented the central government from daring to tamper with New Mexico's tyrannical governor. 10

So ended Kendall's account, which needed only a happy ending to serve as a Victorian melodrama. (In fact, Elliott Arnold used the plot for a successful novel, The Time of the Gringo. 11) But the motives and private encounters that a novelist may invent, or that Kendall may describe without reference to a source, are not available to the historian. The archives, of course, say nothing about Armijo's lust for Soledad, nor do they hint that Armijo promoted the match between Soledad and Esquipulas.

Armijo's pursuit of Soledad is not of record except for the marriage itself, which occurred not in 1837 as Kendall states, but on 3 August 1839. Manuel Armijo served as a witness, but his presence at the wedding was not remarkable. It was custom (and a legal requirement in colonial days) for an officer to ask his commander's permission to wed, and courtesy to invite him to the wedding. If the lusty Armijo still pursued Soledad with his "vile importunities," it seems to have escaped public notice. 12

Some of Kendall's story can be verified in part. His description of the revolt of the soldiers at being offered Armijo's corn instead of cash salary is apparently based on an incident that occurred in 1837 after a rebellion in northern New Mexico. After Armijo gathered an army and put down the rebellion, he became governor. The rebellion left New Mexicans bankrupt, with no money to pay the presidial troop. On 1 November 1837, treasurer Juan Rafael Ortiz wrote to Armijo, then in Albuquerque, that "the soldiers made much resistance to taking wheat at four pesos per fanega, although they finally agreed to take it at this price." 13

Nothing in the records suggests that the corn (or wheat) was Armijo's or that the soldiers' resistance assumed proportions of a revolt. Perhaps Kendall's statement that the soldiers were thrown in jail was based on a different incident. In July 1838, the soldiers again went without pay, and Armijo was forced to collect their arms and send the soldiers to their homes for lack of funds to provide
them with even the minimum daily needs. Some of the men loudly objected and were confined to the interior patio of the Governor's Palace until they calmed down. Neither Caballero nor Baca was connected in the records with either incident. 14

Still, Kendall was correct in assuming that Governor Armijo profiteered on provisions for the troop. Armijo stated to James J. Webb, a Santa Fe trader, that he paid off soldiers with his own merchandise, "thus making a profit for himself and a saving to the government," as the trader reported. He was not the only governor guilty of graft. Through the centuries Mexican governors had skimmed the cream from military contracts, and lesser officials had supplemented their salaries in similar ways. In New Mexico, American traders contributed to the corruption by bribing officials and smuggling goods. Americans did not consider this dishonest, nor did the Mexican officials so regard their own embezzlement. 15

If Armijo was indeed a "second Robespierre," "an assassin," and a "blood-thirsty tyrant," Kendall spares us the "most veritable detail" of it. He also spares us any proof of his statements. Kendall's method of discrediting Manuel Armijo was through brilliant use of exaggeration, generalization, unfounded assumptions, untruths, and an occasional nugget of pure and undeniable fact—the tools of the accomplished propagandist. Although Kendall's judgments were clouded by his ignorance of Mexican culture and of the political and social background of its people, his stereotypes and misconceptions of Mexican people and customs appear to have been taken at face value by his readers. Besides, Kendall's writing was witty, colorful, and convincing, as the number of his unquestioning followers attests. Unfortunately for Manuel Armijo he ran foul of one of the best writers of the nineteenth-century West.

Armijo never bothered to present his side of the story to the public, although he was probably aware of Kendall's view of him. Charles Bent, American trader of Taos, mischievously sent Kendall's sketches of New Mexico, published in the New Orleans Picayune, to United States Commercial Agent Manuel Alvarez of Santa Fe early in 1843, suggesting that Alvarez show them to Armijo ("you may let the big man have the pickune [Picayune] if you pleas it may be gratifying to him to se what is said of him" wrote Bent in his peculiar orthography). 16
Although Kendall represented the Baca-Caballero affair as a direct result of Armijo's illicit passion for Soledad Abreu, records show that Armijo's treatment of these two young officers resulted from their lapses of discipline and poor bookkeeping. As commander of the presidial troops, Armijo wrote that "subordination is the leading principle of the army," and his attitude towards his soldiers showed that he meant to enforce this principle. In 1838 when Esquipulas Caballero, first alferez and adjutant of the Taos Company, sent in his company accounts without the proper form of address for his commander, he was thrown in jail and not released until he wrote Armijo a formal apology, "recognizing my fault as well as the distinction which His Excellency has pleased to honor me, and for many great favors." Armijo forgave the young man who was only twenty-four and the son of the commander of the Santa Fe presidial troop, Col. José Caballero. 17

Once back in Armijo's favor, Esquipulas was entrusted with positions of responsibility. In 1838 he was sent to Chihuahua to inform the commander there of the "disgraceful occurrence" when the soldiers resisted being disbanded and were confined in the patio of the Governor's Palace. In February 1839 Armijo noted that Esquipulas wrote up his company accounts badly but willingly, unlike his aging father Col. José Caballero and Alferez José Silva of the Bado company who each demanded a hundred pesos and expenses for doing the same work with the same lack of skill. Esquipulas continued to behave well and was sent in command of twenty soldiers to escort the caravan of American merchants in July 1839 to prevent smuggling. Armijo had no further complaints about him at this time. 18

The unsatisfactory behavior of Esquipulas Caballero was as nothing compared to the insubordination of the arrogant and rebellious Ramón Baca. Like his friend Caballero, Baca was the son of a military man and had powerful connections. His sister Josefa was married to Santiago Abreu, a former governor of New Mexico and district judge in 1835, when young Baca was commissioned second alferez of the presidial troop. 19

Alferez Baca took his new commission very seriously. At a dance in January 1835 he publicly denounced Sgt. Donaciano Vigil of the presidial troop for sitting on the same bench with him and not
removing his hat. He ordered the sergeant to report to quarters to be arrested for insubordination. When the sergeant failed to report, Baca had him jailed and held incommunicado in shackles. Within a few days a military judge declared the sergeant innocent of Baca’s accusation and suggested that the officers, including Esquipulas Caballero who had supported Baca in the investigation, be severely rebuked for quarreling with their inferiors in public. 20

Worse, Ramón Baca was flagrantly insubordinate in his military capacity. In 1838, while Armijo was leading a militia expedition against the Navajos, the presidial troops remained in Santa Fe under command of Lt. Col. Juan Estevan Pino. Alférez Baca at this time publicly criticized the government “in shocking terms” as Pino reported. For eight days Baca was imprisoned, where he continued his demonstration of disrespect for his commission and commander by criticizing Pino’s arrangements for his imprisonment. 21

Although Kendall wrote that Ramón Baca was “one of the most deserving and meritorious in the whole corps,” his high spirits and insubordination were in the end his downfall. It was not primarily Baca’s military deficiencies that caused him to be passed over for promotion in 1840, however, but his inefficiency at keeping company accounts. In 1839 Armijo had written that as paymaster of the Taos Company Baca was inept at keeping records and was “causing paralysis” in that office. 22

When Armijo himself was criticized by his superior for the poor showing of the economic and accounting office of the New Mexico presidial troops, he answered that he was about to close this office because the commander José Caballero was too old and ill to handle it and had no knowledge of accounting in the first place. Armijo wrote that only two sergeants in the corps, Donaciano Vigil and Antonio Sena, were capable of discharging these tasks, but Vigil was fully occupied in the civil offices, and Sena was stationed in Chihuahua where he was useless to New Mexico. In fact, Armijo wrote, the two most able soldiers in the Santa Fe presidial troop had been retained in Chihuahua ever since Armijo assumed office. He begged that these two sergeants, Tomás Martínez and Antonio Sena, be returned to New Mexico and that Martínez be promoted to alférez. 23
By the next mail Armijo was notified that the president of Mexico had granted Armijo's request to recall sergeants Tomás Martínez and Antonio Sena to New Mexico. On 28 November 1839 Antonio Sena, still a sergeant, was elected paymaster of the troop. Sena was an excellent clerk and accountant for the company, and his beautiful signature and rubric grace the records of this period. Later he was a distinguished citizen of New Mexico, serving as judge of Santa Fe, prefect of the first district, and member of the Departmental Assembly. Tomás Martínez (also called Martín), was more controversial. Although he had had a long and distinguished service record since 1822, Manuel Alvarez described him as a brutal man who had abused, insulted, and wounded Alvarez on the cheek during the Texan invasion when Alvarez was thought to be on the side of the Texans. Tomás Martínez was further diminished in Alvarez's regard by being Armijo's nephew and most intimate friend. 24

On 1 January 1849 Armijo heard from the minister of war that he would be allowed to fill his vacancies as he had requested. At the next review of troops, Sgt. Martínez was promoted to first alférez because of "the imperious necessity of having competent officers in the economic branch and offices of accounting of this presidial company," as Armijo wrote. The appointment passed over Second Alférez Ramón Baca, a result that Armijo fully intended. Later in his letter Armijo added that the appointment of Martínez succeeded in getting rid of "the discontented who are here only for their subsistence and the title of their employment," referring no doubt to Ramón Baca and Esquipulas Caballero. 25

Armijo ostensibly passed over Baca for good reason above and beyond his anger at rejection by Caballero's pretty wife (if indeed this personal motive existed). The disappointed officer reacted strongly: let Manuel Armijo tell the rest of the story in his words, which rival Kendall's in vitality and overstatement:

When I proposed sergeants Tomas Martinez and Antonio Sena for first and second alferezces of this company, I was well aware that Don Ramon Baca and others held seniority in the rank of second alferez and that I ought to propose Baca for the place rather than Martinez and to discuss his future position with him, but knowing well his vicious and incorrigible conduct, so nourished in wickedness
that he is already almost beyond reform, I was foresighted enough to propose Martinez for first alferez without fearing that any blame would attach to me or that my own conscience would accuse me of wrong-doing in the matter. Such fears would be unfounded in this case for my only aim was to act with justice no matter what discontent might ensue. Because my actions are justified without possibility of contradiction and without my needing to speak in my own behalf, justice will triumph in its own cause and in mine.

On the first day of this month Martinez was included in the inspection list as first alferez in the place of Alferez Ramon Baca, who became aware of it before the list left the quartermaster’s office. He had already begun to show inplacable jealousy, to whisper his discontent around town, sowing discord in people’s minds and inciting them to conspire against the government, but because of its infamy his plan failed. He dissembled in everything, hiding his great weakness with deception. On the fourth day he presented a petition complaining of injury or of being passed over without regard to his seniority (and the decree that I affixed to this is contained in the copy marked no. 1). The fifth, sixth, and seventh day passed without further complaint from him, probably while he was plotting his iniquitous intrigues. On the eighth day he made a denunciation (appended as document no. 2) which although anonymous was readily recognizable as his project. Then his supporters, whom I believe were very few, offered him their cooperation in starting the revolution when he was resolved to do it. As soon as I received the denunciation I issued a citation for him to appear in my office, and when he arrived I accused him of being the author of the denunciation, which he admitted. Immediately I offered him all the judicious advice possible, to see if by persuasion I could dissuade him from becoming the leader of such an enterprise, the results of which would be ruinous to him should they occasion my proceeding against him with the vigor that the laws provide for such cases. By his demonstrations of disobedience, by being convinced that although his machinations were against my very life, and because I never really feared them, I thought it best to leave him at large. But since he was already making attempts against my life and plotting ways to assassinate me, it was necessary to protect myself. In his wild frenzy he collaborated with his nephew Alferez Esquipulas Caballero, instigating him to meet with him at about one o’clock that night, taking advantage of the silence at the presidial guard house to win over the guard and with this force achieve his end. But his
honorable commander Alferez Manuel Ramirez would not let him pass to accomplish this purpose, and on the contrary took every precaution to secure the place he was guarding, performing his duty well in giving immediate notice of the occurrence to the adjutant and to me, thus gathering evidence for the criminal case I ordered him to form, which I send on to you for your information. Likewise, I dictated all the measures necessary to avoid a disturbance in the town, and with the arrest of the leaders pacification was achieved without which there would have been a riot.

In spite of all that had happened, it seemed lamentable to me to bring about the ruin of these restless men merely because their rancor was directed at my person, and I wished to give them proof of the indulgence with which I was treating them, so I advised Baca that he was to march for the Villa of Alburquerque to place himself under orders of Captain Gregorio Ortiz, with orders not to set foot in this city again. In the meantime the people were pacified and everything is as shown in copies nos. 3 and 4. But this fellow Baca, abusing the indulgence and kindness that I extended to him, convinced perhaps that my measures were not dictated out of these feelings but out of fear of him and of his rash undertakings, and his intentions being far from complying at that time with my orders that he begin his march, he tried again to arouse the people. With a clamor in the shadows in front of my palace directed at the troops and also at the gatherings of innumerable people who were watching, he excited them again to uproar. Of this scandalous subversive act there was an eye-witness, inspector of Rural Militia, Don Mariano Chavez, who was then in this city and at my palace, invited here by me to discuss matters relating to better service, security, and tranquillity for the inhabitants. I had foreseen this event and ordered Chavez to seize a pair of shackles and throw Baca in jail.

From here he will leave with a regular escort and in company with his accomplice Caballero to present himself in that capital to answer charges made by this command. I beg of you that neither of them be allowed to return here for five years after their commissions have been taken away from them and their careers destroyed. However bad it may be for me after this time, this is the penalty I seek for them, for the horrible crime of conspiracy they have committed, and I repeat my request that their punishment not be further prolonged according to the spirit of the law, taking into consideration their youthful ignorance and vehemence.

In order to suspend the commissions of these officers, I have
utilized one of your superior orders, that of November 2 of last year, which in effect empowers me in such cases according to the evidence, and for the sake of the public tranquillity of this department and the well-being of its people, for whom my method of support and financing I hope merits your approval.

This is not, Your Excellency, the first scandalous crime that proves the criminal bent of Baca. There is another that he committed in 1838 against the late Lieutenant Colonel of Rural Militia Don Juan Estevan Pino. At the time I myself had marched against the Navajo, I entrusted Pino with the command of the Department, because circumstances demanded it and because he had all my confidence. In this misdeed, Baca said to his commanding officer two wicked things—he railed against the government, and after being arrested for this, he railed against the measures necessary for his secure imprisonment. He was subdued, and I do not know the considerations that moved Senor Pino to excuse such a serious wrongdoing, but on my return to the command I found him at full liberty. About this action and about the ungovernable conduct of said Baca, the congressional deputy Don Vicente Sanchez Vergara can inform you in great detail. I do not wish to weary or distract you, busy as you are, with more and worse reference to the criminal conduct of these officers, nor will I allow myself to describe to you the state of anxiety and insecurity in which this government exists, expecting that your efficiency will see fit to approve my measures, and to dictate those which in your wisdom you may consider useful to its security and growth. God and Liberty. February 1, 1840. To His Excellency the Minister of War and Navy.26

Like Kendall's sketch, the governor's letter is not exactly a disinterested or truthful account of the Baca-Caballero conspiracy. If, as Armijo asserts, his action in passing over Alférez Ramón Baca was "justified without possibility of contradiction," why must he defend the act so vehemently? If Armijo was convinced that Baca meant to assassinate him, would he have allowed him to remain at large? Was the governor's "indulgence and kindness" his reason for banishing rather than executing the young officers on the spot for attempted assassination—or was the real reason that no such assassination was attempted, as suggested by their later exoneration? Was Armijo's kindly request not to have them banished for more than five years consistent with the fury with which he greeted
their subsequent release? These questions cast doubt on the veracity and sincerity of Armijo’s letter; the tone of it, alternately fawning and fierce, reflects his puzzling personality. But the facts of the conspiracy as presented by Armijo are an alternative to those presented by Kendall, and now at least there are two sides to the story.

Baca and Caballero were escorted to Chihuahua and released, whence they went to Mexico City to petition the president to restore their commissions. A council of war determined they were not guilty of Armijo’s charges. Both were to resume their service in the army as alfereces, Caballero in New Mexico and Baca in Chihuahua. Thus Kendall’s statement that they failed to obtain redress was not true.  

Armijo was furious. On 9 January 1841 he wrote the chief of staff that the crime of the young men was indubitable and proven, that it was of such a nature as to threaten the ruin of the department, and that if his banishment of them was not acceptable to the supreme government he would happily consent to be subjected to a court martial “in order to show the world that I acted in this matter with the necessary impartiality.” He also declared twice—and vehemently—that Baca and Caballero would not be allowed to agitate in New Mexico while it was under his command:

I know very well the corrupt conduct of these young officers. I know that they have the consent and tolerance of the troop to play prohibited games with it, with which they can succeed in surprising the government, depriving it of its very existence, and returning it to days of mourning like those of 1837. I have the most profound reason for fearing this may happen. . . .  

Armijo did indeed have a profound reason to fear that soldiers would overthrow the government. In October 1840 a military plot to assassinate Armijo had been uncovered. Testimony taken in the case showed that discontent among the troops was general. The conspirators wanted the assassination to look as if a soldier with a bayonet had killed the governor “so that it would not be known which soldier did it, since all of them were aggravated with His Excellency.”
The two leaders of the latest conspiracy against Armijo's life, Julián García and Tomás Valencia, were banished, probably more effectively than Baca and Caballero. After several more angry letters from Armijo in 1841, the president ordered Baca and Caballero to remain in Chihuahua, where Baca died soon after. By July 1842 Caballero had returned to Santa Fe and resumed his military career. Armijo promoted him to first alférez of the Santa Fe company in October 1842. In January 1843 Caballero was to serve as advocate in a criminal case, but he was too ill to appear. By March he had recovered sufficiently to accept Armijo's promotion to lieutenant and acting commander to the Santa Fe company. In this rank he died on 17 August 1843, of natural causes as the records say. Tomás Martínez, now a brevet captain in the Santa Fe Company, also died in 1843.30

Manuel Armijo and George Wilkins Kendall have given us conflicting accounts—a story either of two young officers persecuted by a jealous and tyrannical dictator or of two young officers threatening a governor with death or military revolt. The governor was either a monster, as he has been portrayed in history, or a real, flawed, human creature with tendencies for good and evil. Kendall himself had to admit that were Armijo "not such a cowardly braggart and so utterly destitute of all moral principle, [he] is not wanting in the other qualities of a good governor." A third viewpoint, that of Baca and Caballero, can perhaps be found among the National Archives of Mexico, along with the documents cited in Armijo's letter quoted above. These documents may someday be discovered and published and complete the file on the Baca-Caballero affair.

Some may consider the Baca-Caballero affair a minor event and hardly worth the effort of analysis. So it would be, had not George Wilkins Kendall exaggerated its importance in his Narrative in order to illustrate the wickedness of Manuel Armijo. But Kendall's biased judgment of Armijo has prevailed in the works of historians and popular writers for nearly a hundred and fifty years; for all these years this most famous figure of the Republican period of New Mexico has stood condemned without trial. Let this be a portion of his defense.
NOTES

1. Manuel Armijo to the Minister of War, 1 February 1840, Mexican Archives of New Mexico, microfilm edition (MANM), roll 26, 368–74, State Records Center and Archives (SRCA), Santa Fe.


13. MANM, roll 23, 483-85.
16. Charles Bent to Manuel Alvarez, Taos, 7 January 1843, Benjamin Read Papers, SRCA.
17. Armijo on subordination. 5-6 September 1838, General Orders Notebook, MANM, roll 35, 655; Alferez Caballero to Armijo, 13 January 1838, MANM, roll 24, 1146-47; José Caballero and family in the 1826 census of Santa Fe, MANM, roll 6, 527-33.
18. Armijo to the Commander General at Chihuahua, 8 August 1838, MANM, roll 24, 1265-66; 20 March 1839, MANM, roll 24, 1289-92; 17 June 1839, MANM, roll 24, 1299-1300.
19. The 1826 census of Santa Fe shows that Ramón, son of Manuel and Estefana Baca, was fifteen years old in 1826 (MANM, roll 6, 527-33); for Josefa, see her testimony and other documents dated 3 April 1838 and later in MANM, roll 25, 343-63.
22. Kendall, Narrative, 1: 356; Armijo to commander of the Taos Company, 6 March 1839, MANM, roll 26, 525.
24. Minister of War to Commander General of New Mexico, 31 October 1839, MANM, roll 26, 122-23; José Hernández, Santa Fe company records, 28 November 1839, MANM, roll 26, 804. For Sena as judge, see MANM, roll 33, 559-60;
as member of the assembly, see minutes for January to July 1845, MANM, roll 38, 991–94; as prefect, see Sena to Armijo, Santa Fe, 5 June 1846, MANM, roll 41, 169–71. Martínez’s service record is in MANM, roll 28, 408–9; Manuel Alvarez describes Martínez in a letter to Daniel Webster, Washington City, 2 February 1842, Consular Despatches, Santa Fe; Armijo praises Martínez’s knowledge, discipline, and character in a letter to the Minister of War, 29 May 1839, MANM, roll 26, 350–52.


26. Armijo to the Minister of War, 1 February 1840, MANM, roll 26, 368–74, translation by Janet Lecompte. The original letterbook transcription is hurried and careless, without paragraphs and accents, and with many abbreviations and local usages. I have added paragraphing. The supporting documents referred to in the letter are not in the New Mexico Archives.

27. Armijo to the Chief of Staff, 7 May 1841, MANM, roll 26, 450; Kendall, Narrative, p. 358.


29. Testimony of José Tenorio in the proceedings against Julián García and Tomás Valencia, 12–16 October 1840, Juzgado 1° of Santa Fe, MANM, roll 28, 182–214.

30. Letterbook, Juzgado 1° of Santa Fe, 22 October 1840, MANM, roll 28, 53; Armijo to Chief of Staff, 17 March, 19 May, and 20 June 1841, MANM, roll 26, 437–38, 456, 457; Santa Fe presidial company records, 1842, MANM, roll 32, 520, 593; judicial proceedings, military cases [January 1843], MANM, roll 33, 1147–48; Santa Fe presidial company records, 1843, MANM, roll 34, 59. For the demise of Tomás Martínez, see Santa Fe presidial company records for September and October 1843, MANM, roll 34, 58, 64; and petition of his widow in records of Juzgado 1°, Santa Fe, 1844, MANM, roll 36, 107–9.