A Sense of Place

THE SEAT OF FUTURE EMPIRE:
UNCOVERING THE ORIGINS OF AUSTIN’S EXCEPTIONALISM

TERI E. FLACK

In April 1839, when they chose Waterloo as the permanent seat of government for the Republic of Texas, the commissioners declared, “they are satisfied that a truly National City could at no other point within the limits assigned them be reared up” and “the citizen’s bosom must swell with honest pride when standing in the Portico of the Capitol of his Country, he looks abroad upon a region worthy only of being the home of the brave and free.” Vice President Mirabeau B. Lamar is credited with envisioning the area surrounding Waterloo as the most worthy location for this capital. The story begins with a buffalo hunt and ends with Lamar, standing on the hill where the state capitol building now stands, declaring “This should be the seat of future Empire.” At the time, however, Waterloo consisted of only a few families located at the junction of Shoal Creek and the Colorado River. No buildings of size, much less a “capitol with a portico,” could be found there. In fact, no city, nor even a village, existed. It took imagination to envision a Texas empire. It took imagination to envision not just a capitol but “a truly National City” on the edge of the Texas frontier. It took imagination for Texans to envision Austin as an exceptional city before they created it. The story of Austin’s creation endures because it represents the first expression of Austin’s exceptionalism and validates the belief that Austin has always been a special place.

Throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, professional and amateur historians have repeated the story of the buffalo hunt and Lamar’s declaration, with each author adding his or her own embellishments and modifying some details to fit his or her desired narrative. All of the narrators treat the narrative, however apocryphal, as gospel; they do not question the basic elements of the story: Lamar visited Waterloo before becoming president, and he camped at Jacob Harrell’s cabin located where Shoal Creek empties into the Colorado River. Lamar and his men engaged in a buffalo hunt and felled at least one buffalo. After the hunt, Lamar stood on a bluff above the Colorado and made his famous declaration.

No published accounts of this declaration appeared until the turn of the century when *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* published two separate accounts of the story. O.M. Roberts published the first account in 1898, nearly 60 years after the events took place. Of all narrators, he embellished the narrative the least. He qualified his account by stating, “for many years afterwards there was occasionally mentioned a report that Lamar while vice-president came with a party to this place on a hunt.” He described the hunt tersely: “He [Lamar] early one morning shot and killed a buffalo in the narrow valley where Congress Avenue in the city of Austin is now situated.” Then, he ended his account with a version of the declaration story: “in taking a survey of the mountains and country around he said with poetic ardor to his comrades, ‘Here should be located the capital of Texas.’” In
writing about early Texas historians, Laura McLemore asserts, by 1898 “Roberts . . . was one of the few remaining Texans with a lived memory of the Texas Republic.” This fact put him in a unique position to tell the story because the passage of so much time left no one to challenge his version or to question the authenticity of his memory. Distinct from the versions of the story that came after his, Roberts’ narrative was not particularly heroic or mythic.

Alex Terrell’s 1910 account provided more drama and added vivid details to the story. He began by adding an element of legitimacy to his narrative. Unlike Gov. Roberts, Terrell listed several eyewitness sources for his account. The Rev. Edward Fontaine, Lamar’s personal secretary and Terrell’s friend, told Terrell the details of the story, as did James O. Rice and Willis Avery, two of the rangers who accompanied Lamar on the hunt. To further add authenticity, Terrell explained, “the foregoing account of Lamar’s remark on Capitol hill may seem to have the odor of romance; but there are still living in Austin a few persons who knew Mr. Fontaine. I never had cause to doubt his veracity. Both James O. Rice and Willis Avery verified to me all the incidents of the buffalo hunt.” According to Terrell, all three witnessed the hunt, but Rice and Avery did not witness Lamar’s declaration.

Terrell’s account began when “General Lamar, in the autumn of 1837 or 1838, weary with official duties, came to the upper Colorado on a buffalo hunt.” He obtained a ranger escort from Fort Prairie, located about six miles downstream from what would become Austin. Lamar, Fontaine, and their ranger escort camped for the night at the cabin of Jacob Harrell. The next morning, Harrell’s little son awoke them saying the prairie was filled with buffalo. Terrell’s story continues:

Lamar and his men were soon in the saddle, and after killing all the buffalo they wanted were assembled by the bugler on the very hill where now stands the State Capitol building. Lamar, while looking from that hill on the valley covered with wild rye,—the mountains up the river, and the charming view to the south, remarked, “This should be the seat of future Empire.”

Terrell added that Willis Avery told him “Lamar killed on that hunt with his holster pistol near where the Avenue Hotel now stands the largest buffalo bull he ever saw” and that Rev. Fontaine thought the availability of building stone and wood, and the location’s natural beauty was what inspired Lamar to make his declaration.

Unlike Roberts, whose declaration seems a bit mundane, the words ascribed to Lamar by Rev. Fontaine are significant. By quoting Lamar as declaring “this should be the seat of future Empire,” Fontaine implies a much more magisterial intention—Lamar does not just identify a location for the country’s capital, he predicts Texas will be a great empire. The term, “seat of empire,” harkens back to George Washington’s reference to New York City as “the seat of the empire” in 1785. Legal historian Daniel Hulsebosch asserts, “a seat of empire was geographically central, commercially vibrant, and internationally formidable.” At the time of Washington’s statement, the survival of the newly created Confederation as an empire was not a foregone conclusion. Indeed Federalists, such as Alexander Hamilton, John Madison, and Washington sought a union stronger than a confederation with a positive vision of an American empire. They developed a plan to accomplish their vision, including the restoration of overseas economic ties, a central bank, a strong military, the systematic promotion of westward migration, and a unified approach to the Indians. Lamar’s vision of the Texas republic, or empire, included these same elements.
When Lamar entered office as Texas’ second president, he did not just oppose annexation but actively worked to transform the nascent republic into a great empire. Lamar looked westward, seeking a Texas empire that stretched from the “Sabine River to the Pacific Ocean and away to the Southwest,” and the election of 1838, in some respects, constituted a referendum on where to locate the capital—on the coast looking east or in the west facing the frontier. Supporter Senator George Sutherland of Matagorda asserted that Lamar favored a capital in the western part of the state:

He is truly Western in his feelings as well as interest... for instance, the location of the seat of government... [H]is entire interest is West of the Colorado... It will promote emigration to the West, thereby giving protection to the frontier settlements, and enhancing the value of our lands. It will also increase most rapidly the settlement of the lands of the Colorado, and of the country west of it, thereby increasing the capital and interest of that section of the country, which will result in important public improvements, increasing the facilities of commerce and trade...  

In his inaugural address and first report to Congress, Lamar laid out his vision for an independent Texas. He stressed the need for a central bank, a strong military, and an active defense against hostile Indians and Mexican banditti. He particularly cited the need to protect frontier settlements arguing, “the importance of... extending protection to our exposed and suffering fellow-citizens cannot fail to attract your early and most serious notice.” As for the empire, he asked his fellow Texians to join him in striving to “elevate our young Republic into that proud rank which her unrivaled beauty and unbounded wealth entitle her to take among the nations of the earth.” To answer Lamar’s call, the Congress took up the matter of the seat of government immediately.

Unlike previous attempts to locate a capital site, this Congress decided to delineate the territory in which the capital could be located in such a way that the city of Houston, the current capital, could not qualify. Additionally, they placed the decision-making process with five commissioners appointed by the Senate and House of Representatives. The commissioners could not be elected officials, and the legislation required them to conduct their work in secret. The act also specified that the commissioners would have the final say—the site location would not be put to a vote of the people. In addition, it authorized the commissioners to accept donations of land, purchase the land, or seek to have a jury in the county determine the fair value for the land under condemnation proceedings. Congress declared the name of the seat of government “shall be the city of Austin.” President Lamar signed the bill on January 14, 1839.

The commissioners worked fast. On April 15, 1839, they reported their choice of the community of Waterloo on the Colorado River as the location of the seat of government, a conclusion they reached after they “traversed and critically examined” land on the Brazos and Colorado Rivers. They voted three to two in favor of a Colorado location, and once they made that decision, they unanimously chose Waterloo over Bastrop. Before making their final report, the commissioners had the Chief Justice of Bastrop County convene a jury to determine the fair price for the landowners whose land had been chosen as the site and to condemn the land. Their decision established the city of Austin on the banks of the Colorado River.

Aware that some Texans might view with skepticism their decision to place the
capital in an undeveloped region of the state, the commissioners used their report to argue
the superiority of the location to all other possible choices. They began by declaring:

> the Colorado was more central in respect to Territory, and this in connection
> with the great disiderations (sic) of health, fine water, stone, stone coal, water
> power &c, being more abundant and convenient on the Colorado than the
> Brassos (sic) river, did more than counterbalance the supposed superiority of
> the lands as well as the centrality of position in reference to population,
> possessed by the Brassos river.\(^{19}\)

The commissioners used the remainder of their report to justify their choice and extol the
virtues of the chosen location. They “were of the opinion that within a short period of time
following the location of the Seat of Government on the Frontier, the extension of the
Settlements produced thereby, will engender other theories of defence (sic), on lands now
the homes of the Comanche and the Bisson (sic).”\(^{20}\) They were sure that occupation of the
site would “effectively close the pass [used by] Indians and outlawed Mexicans for ages.”\(^{21}\)
They reported in glowing terms of the abundance of available resources, including “opposite
the site, at a distance of a mile, Spring Creek and its tributaries [which] afford perhaps the
greatest and most convenient water-power to be found in the Republic.”\(^{22}\) The
 commissioners expressed confidence that a “great thoroughfare” between Santa Fe and the
Texas coast would be constructed through the capital city facilitating commerce throughout
Texas.\(^{23}\) In conclusion, they agreed other sections of Texas were just as fertile, “but that no
other combined so many and such varied advantages and beauties as the one in question.”\(^{24}\)
The location of this new city of Austin was simply exceptional.

Did President Lamar dictate the selection of Waterloo as the location of the capital? He
envisioned a “future empire” extending from Texas to the Pacific Ocean, and he knew
that establishing the capital on the frontier would draw the population to the west, aiding
Texas in establishing an undisputable claim on that territory. The speed with which the
commissioners made their decision certainly lends credence that the location was a foregone
conclusion. Alex Terrell asserted, based on information provided to him by Edward
Fontaine, Lamar specifically told the commissioners to “go to Jake Harrell’s cabin and look
carefully at that location,” and “Lamar’s admiration of the ground near Harrell’s cabin had
much to do with the report of the Commissioners.”\(^{25}\)

Two of Lamar’s biographers agree Lamar would probably have at least suggested a
frontier location. Philip Graham explained, “Their choice could not be justified except in
terms of the future. . . . The commissioners, under Lamar’s persuasion, had put aside all
considerations of personal comfort, and disregarded actual distribution of population as well
as the grave danger of Indians, to select a capital to meet the needs of a great republic far in
the future.”\(^{26}\) Peter Gambrell adds, “The location appeared to them to have been designed
by nature for the seat of government,”\(^{27}\) a fact not included in Terrell’s account. Early Texas
historian William Kennedy noted, “The site was chosen with a view to its commercial
advantages. When a communication shall be opened between Santa Fe and the ports of
Texas, and between the Red River country and Matamoros, Austin will form the point of
intersection to the two lines.”\(^{28}\)

The report remains the only written record of the commissioners’ work. Consequently, no records exist to prove unequivocally whether or not they began their work
with a pre-determined outcome; however, a reading of a variety of the contemporary
writings leads to that conclusion. A letter dated January 19, 1839, by an anonymous writer in Houston, declared, “I am confidently of the opinion that the commissioners will select some point on the Colorado.” On January 24, 1839, the Matagorda Bulletin published a January 18th letter from its reporter for the House of Representatives which stated, “It appears to be the general impression here, at present, that the Colorado will be the favored river whose banks will be honored by the metropolis of Texas.” A letter from L. H. McNeil to William Perry on January 20, 1839, informed Perry that commissioners had been selected to choose a location for the seat of government and concluded, “I have no doubt but it will go on the Colorado above Bastrop some place.” W. J. Jones’ February 8th letter to President Lamar asserted, “I have every reason to believe that the seat of government will be located on the Colorado between this place and the mountains, probably at their foot and I have no doubt the selection will be the most judicious which can be made within the limits assigned the Commissioners by the law. In that event the Capital of the Nation may command the entire trade of New Mexico.” A March 21, 1839, letter from Asa Brigham, a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence, to James F. Perry was more explicit. He stated, “Now for the seat of govt it is fixd on the Waterloo league. So there is no need of concessions of any kind to get it there.” It appears the commissioners’ likelihood of selecting the site on the Colorado River was an open secret.

Edward Burleson, a hero of the Texas Revolution and long-time resident of Bastrop County, deserves a measure of credit for the selection of Waterloo as the site of the capital. Austin and Travis County historian Mary Barkley suggests Burleson accompanied Lamar on the fateful buffalo hunt, deliberately bringing him to Waterloo, the town that Burleson established. While no other accounts link him to the hunt, he did work to move the legislative process in a direction benefitting his economic interests. Senator Burleson took advantage of several opportunities during the Senate debate to amend the bill successfully. In particular, he succeeded in restricting the selection area to the country between the Trinidad [Trinity] and Colorado Rivers and to locations above the San Antonio Road, which crossed the Colorado River at Bastrop. This provided a very limited area, the boundaries of which “did include two certain contenders, Bastrop, the only eligible town of more than a handful of families, and Waterloo, both lying in Burleson’s district and including property he owned.” The legislation included provisions to prevent commissioners from benefitting personally from their decision through land speculation and prohibited them from any “purchase, bargain, or contract for any land, tenements or hereditaments, within the Republic” during their term of office. Burleson declined the opportunity to serve as a commissioner. His decision may have been influenced by the knowledge that President Lamar intended to appoint him to an important military position; however, he also may have been influenced by his desire to profit from the establishment of the capital at Waterloo. Burleson’s biographers acknowledge that “possibly Burleson recognized that his ownership of property in likely sites would have made his participation on the commission extremely difficult, if not impossible.”

Burleson was something of a land speculator. During the fall of 1838, Burleson negotiated with the executor of Stephen F. Austin’s estate to ensure that if officials found Austin’s claim to the land valid, the executor would recognize the position of the Waterloo settlers. At the same time, he purchased from the heirs of Samuel Goocher (or Goucher) their interest in a league located on the Colorado near Waterloo, a grant ultimately included in the land condemned by the commissioners for the city of Austin. In the winter of 1839, Burleson successfully passed legislation establishing a charter for the city of Waterloo;
however, the charter did not take effect because the commissioners chose it as the location for the capital. That Burleson ultimately benefitted financially has led some to conclude that speculation contributed to the choice of Waterloo as the site of Austin.

Two contemporary writers acknowledged the influence of land speculation on the choice of Austin’s location, although none mentioned Burleson by name. Anson Jones, the Republic’s last president, made a notation in his private journal on September 13, 1839, stating, “No policy could possibly have been more unwise than the removal of the seat of government to Austin, and corrupt means were used to place it there.” Early Texas historian William Gouge also acknowledged the likelihood of speculation when he wrote, “The removal [of the government to Austin] was an act of folly, . . . but it afforded an opportunity of speculating on the sale of lots in the new metropolis, and it invited speculations to lands in the interior; and these two motives combined were too strong to be resisted.” Regardless of the influence of land speculators, the commissioners made their choice, and Texans made the best of it.

In the spring of 1839, no city existed on the site of the future capital. The hamlet of Waterloo consisted of Jacob Harrell and two or three other families. William “Uncle Billy” Barton lived across the river on Spring Creek near the springs that one day would bear his name. The settlement of Montopolis, located several miles downstream from Waterloo, consisted of about 20 families. Edwin Waller, whom Lamar sent to lay out the town and build a seat of government, built Austin from scratch in six months. Lamar and the Congress expected Congress would convene in the new capital in October 1839 and all archival records would re-locate from Houston to Austin. Waller met the goal.

Although little more than a frontier outpost, Austin excited the imaginations of many writers. All saw the special qualities of the place. In August 1839, Surveyor William Sandusky wrote that he felt it was his duty to give an accurate account of the location. He called the surrounding land “a beautiful rich prairie” and described the “avenue rising up from the river . . . through a narrow valley which appears as if made by nature expressly for this noble purpose.” Newspaperman George Bonnell declared, “Like the ancient city of Rome, Austin is built upon seven hills, and it is impossible to conceive of a more beautiful and lovely situation.” Austin’s location had another benefit over coastal locations. He stated, “The city and neighborhood are entirely healthy, and the malignant fevers which are so fatal in some parts of the coast country, are here entirely unknown.” A May 1, 1839, letter to the editor of the Houston Telegraph from “Veritas” refuted negative claims about the capital’s location and stated, “With regard to its health and beauty, it is unnecessary to say a single word. Every person who has seen it, concur in the opinion that it is the most beautiful spot of earth which nature ever found. It is watered by innumerable springs, cool, and so clear that you may see the bottom in 25 or 30 feet water.” Following a glowing description of its many attributes, a December 11, 1839, Houston Telegraph article declared, “In contemplating this scene, the eye of fancy can scarcely fail to range forward into the future, when flocks and herds shall enliven these hills and dales, and neat cottages and elegant mansions shall be scattered abroad over the country, combining to form a picture of beauty and loveliness unsurpassed by aught the poet has fabled of fairy land.”

Visions of a westward-looking empire also came with the location. General Albert Sidney Johnston, a member of Lamar’s cabinet, approved of the bold choice of a frontier location. He wrote, “I believe the foundation of this town has no precedent in history. The government placed itself on a frontier open to its foes, and faced there the centre of its
future dominion.” In his address to a joint session of Congress in November 1839, the first session located in the new capital city, Lamar addressed the importance of the location to the future of the country. “It is perceived in the centrality of its geographical position, the apparent healthfulness of its climate, the beauty of its scenery, the abundances and convenience of its material for constructing the most permanent edifices; . . . and its adaptation to protection against Indian depredations, thereby inviting settlement to one of the finest portions of our country.” The new Austin clearly met the criteria for a seat of empire: centrally located (within the total expanse of the territory of Texas), commercially vibrant (at least it would be when the highways to Santa Fe and other parts of the empire were completed), and internationally formidable (not at the moment of creation, but it was expected to exert influence over relations with Mexico and the Indians).

Despite these justifications for placing the capital on the western frontier and despite the likelihood that land speculation played a role, the more romantic justification for the site’s selection as the seat of government persists, and in fact, remains the dominant narrative. Two primary groups of chroniclers—Lamar biographers and Austin/Travis County historians and promoters—have kept the buffalo hunt/Lamar declaration narrative alive. Biographers use it to portray Lamar as a visionary and modify it to make Lamar more mythic and heroic. Historians and promoters use it to convey Austin’s destiny as an exceptional place. From the early twentieth century to the present, chroniclers of Austin’s history have used this narrative to portray this particular location as the chosen place.

Many narrators have added new “facts,” chosen to emphasize specific “facts” from Terrell’s story, or omitted “facts” that did not fit their particular narrative. Consequently, the creation story has evolved over the years. In her master’s thesis about Travis County, University of Texas student Aloise Walker Hardy recounted the Terrell version almost verbatim, as does a history of Austin by A.C. Greene. Austin and Travis County historian Mary Starr Barkley declared, “The story of the buffalo hunt is well-known” and asserted that Lamar bagged the buffalo “after rushing it up the ravine that later became Congress Avenue.” She extrapolated that after the hunt other locals must have joined Lamar, and “they surely discussed locating the capital city in Travis County,” notwithstanding the fact that Travis County did not exist at the time.

The creation narrative continues to evolve. Recent histories have added new dimensions to the story. Author Jeffrey Kerr suggests that Jacob “Harrell likely heard Lamar speak of the upcoming presidential election and Lamar’s excellent chances of winning it.” Kerr then argues “Mirabeau Lamar’s true interest in the region of the upper Colorado River lay not with winning votes but with building empire.” Kerr fills his story of the buffalo hunt with vivid details:

Once mounted, they rode north up a muddy ravine that intersected the river. There they encountered the sight that so consistently thrilled early Anglo-Texans and that seems so unimaginable to us today: hundreds and thousands of buffalo scattered across the landscape to the horizon. Rather than employ the easier but less exciting method of picking off animals from afar with their rifles, Lamar and his companions charged among the beasts and blazed away with pistols. Later, the men realized that Lamar had felled by far the largest prey, a mammoth bull that dwarfed anything they had ever seen. The animal died at what months later became the intersection of Austin’s Congress Avenue and Hickory (8th) Street.
Later the hunters gathered to a pre-arranged bugle call atop the hill at the head of the ravine. Looking south toward the river, all admired the beautiful scenery that stretched before them. But it was Mirabeau Lamar, a romantic dreamer who wrote poetry in his spare time, who carried his thoughts beyond the pleasure of the moment to proclaim, “This should be the seat of future empire!”

Some narrators embellished the story further, incorporating heretofore unwritten details. In a 2010 blog, Benjamin Gustafsson posed the question, “One can easily understand why Houston wanted the capital to be located in the city that bore his name, but why did Lamar insist that it be moved to the little-known frontier town of Waterloo that would one day become Austin?” The answer? “Apparently, Lamar had fallen in love with an area near Waterloo, owned by a friend of his named ‘Uncle’ Billy Barton, where he would hunt for buffalo and rejuvenate himself in the refreshingly icy pools of water created by springs from an underground aquifer. When Lamar was missing, his staff would travel to the area and follow herds of buffalo to find him.”

The account shows the influence of the buffalo hunt narrative; however, the story has transformed to incorporate the importance of Barton’s springs to Lamar’s decision. The Austin creation narrative, apparently, is too important to exclude such an iconic cultural resource as Barton Springs. Perhaps, with such an influx of non-Texans into the greater Austin area, the author felt the need to incorporate Barton Springs into the story of Austin’s exceptionalism. After all, Barton Springs is synonymous with Austin; therefore, it must have been important in the creation of Austin.

Early narratives did not ignore Barton Springs. Indeed, references to Billy Barton’s springs frequently can be found in diary entries, letters, newspaper articles, and even the commissioners’ report establishing the seat of government at Waterloo. Writers often included Barton’s springs as a part of their assessment of the attributes of the region; however, the springs must have been singular enough that when William Sandusky created a map of the newly established city of Austin in 1839, he specifically drew in Barton’s springs (Figure 1).

Sometimes a writer cited the recreational value of a dip in the springs; however, many reports focused on the springs’ usefulness as an economic resource. Many writers referenced the possibility of harnessing the power of the springs to power a mill. George Bonnell wrote “Spring creek is a stream of eighteen miles in length, which enters the Colorado from the west, one mile above the City of Austin. . . . About one mile from the river, at a place called Barton’s springs, it is again supplied with water . . . and runs with a brisk current to the river. A company are about erecting a mill at this place.” In December 1839, Billy Barton agreed to give possession of the stream of water from his big spring to power a sawmill; however, he died before the deal could be consummated.
The buffalo hunt/declaration narrative endures because it provides Austinites and Texans with a heroic and mythic creation story, and it enables them to believe that Austin is a special place. No first-person accounts of the story exist, because writers chronicled the narrative long after the actual events; however, collective memories are often created from a variety of sources, including stories passed down from one person to another. Societies may embrace such a group memory because the shared remembrance it represents helps the society create an identity and brings present meaning to past events.\textsuperscript{53}

For decades, Austinites lived with the threat that the people of Texas would move the capital elsewhere. Indeed, many years passed before the people declared Austin as their capital permanently. Now, most Texans cannot envision another city in that role. The state capital has become embedded in the fabric of the city, as integral a part of the city's identity as Barton Springs. The buffalo hunt/declaration narrative provides Texans with a justification for the claim to Austin as their capital. It enables Austinites to understand how Austin came to be here, validating their claim to a special place.\textsuperscript{54}

Today, narrators more often use the story of the buffalo hunt and Lamar's declaration as a way of promoting Austin as an exceptional place rather than venerating Lamar's vision of empire. The addition of Barton Springs, an iconic Austin place, to the narrative further enhances the story. The narrative serves to inform newcomers and longtime residents alike that Austin was a chosen place, a special place—Austin did not just recently become exceptional; it was destined to be exceptional, and Texans recognized that exceptionalness before they even created Austin.

The usefulness of the narrative prevents people from questioning its veracity. Perhaps having been repeated for over a hundred years, it has become the truth, or maybe what is important is not so much whether the narrative is true, but that it could be true. Austin’s creation story survives and thrives because we prefer to believe a tale of a buffalo hunt and a
visionary declaration than to inquire whether this special place was chosen because land speculators could make a profit. Laura Lyons McLemore, a chronicler of early Texas historians, concluded it matters less whether a story is provable because “what people believe to be true about their past is usually more important in determining their behavior and response than truth itself.” Texans will continue to believe Austin is an exceptional place regardless of the accuracy of any myths about its creation. They appreciate a mythic creation story because it fits their image of Texas.
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