

10-1974

## ETHJ Vol-12 No-2

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj>



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

Tell us how this article helped you.

---

### Recommended Citation

(1974) "ETHJ Vol-12 No-2," *East Texas Historical Journal*: Vol. 12: Iss. 2, Article 1.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol12/iss2/1>

This Full Issue is brought to you for free and open access by SFA ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in East Texas Historical Journal by an authorized administrator of SFA ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu](mailto:cdsscholarworks@sfasu.edu).



## EAST TEXAS HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

### OFFICERS

Robert S. Maxwell, President .....	Nacogdoches
Maury Darst, First Vice-President .....	Galveston
Charles K. Phillips, Second Vice-President .....	Nacogdoches
Mrs. Tommie Jan Lowery, Secretary .....	Lufkin

### DIRECTORS

		<i>Term Expires</i>
Mrs. W. S. Terry .....	Jefferson .....	1974
Ralph A. Wooster .....	Beaumont .....	1974
Claude H. Hall .....	Bryan .....	1974
Mrs. E. H. Lasseter .....	Henderson .....	1975
Ralph Steen .....	Nacogdoches .....	1975
Maury Darst .....	Galveston .....	1975
Eliza Bishop .....	Crockett .....	1976
Lee Lawrence .....	Tyler .....	1976

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Allan Ashcraft .....	Bryan
Robert Glover .....	Tyler
Ralph Goodwin .....	Commerce
Frank Jackson .....	Commerce
Archie P. McDonald, Editor-in-Chief .....	Nacogdoches
Mrs. Charles Martin .....	Midland
James L. Nichols .....	Nacogdoches
Ralph A. Wooster .....	Beaumont

### MEMBERSHIP

PATRONS contribute to the work of the Association \$100 or more, payable if desired over a period of five years.

SUSTAINING MEMBERS contribute to the work of the Association \$50 or more, payable if desired over a period of five years.

REGULAR MEMBERS pay \$6 dues annually.

STUDENT MEMBERS pay \$4 dues annually. A student enrolled in high school or college is eligible for membership.

P.O. Box 6223, NACOGDOCHES, TEXAS 75961, SFA Station

\$3.00 per copy to nonmembers.

\$2.00 per copy to members.

Vol. XII, No. II—East Texas Historical Association

EAST TEXAS HISTORICAL JOURNAL

---

---

Volume XII

Fall 1974

No. 2

---

---

CONTENTS

HISTORY OF EL CAPOTE RANCH  
*by Duncan Glenn Muckelroy* .....Page 3

THE NEGLECTED REGIMENT: EAST TEXAS HORSEMEN  
WITH ZACHARY TAYLOR  
*by Thomas H. Kreneck* .....Page 22

1855: THE KNOW-NOTHING CHALLENGE IN EAST TEXAS  
*by Waymon L. McClellan* .....Page 32

A NACOGDOCHES COMPANY IN THE CONFEDERATE ARMY  
OF NEW MEXICO  
*by Martin Hardwick Hall*.....Page 45

“MORONS,” MONKEYS, AND MORALITY: REACTIONS  
TO THE SCOPES TRIAL IN TEXAS  
*by Charles R. Wilson* .....Page 51

THE PAPERS OF THE TEXAS REVOLUTION, 1835-1836:  
AN APPRAISAL  
*by Archie P. McDonald* .....Page 64

EAST TEXAS COLLOQUY  
*by Bobby H. Johnson* .....Page 68

BOOK REVIEWS .....Page 74

NACOGDOCHES, TEXAS

P.O. BOX 6223

SFA STATION 75961

Archie P. McDonald, Editor

## BOOK REVIEWS

- Chapman, *The Man Who Led Columbus to America*, by Jack D. L. Holmes.
- Weddle, *Wilderness Manhunt: The Spanish Search for La Salle*, by Mark A. Burkholder.
- Burt and Ferguson, *Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now*, by Marietta LeBreton.
- Pourade, *The Sign of the Eagle: A View of Mexico—1830 to 1855*, by D. S. Chandler.
- Gaddy, *Texas in Revolt*, by Marilyn McAdams Sibley.
- Koury, *Arms for Texas: A Study of the Weapons of the Republic of Texas*, by John Osburn.
- Henderson, *A Long Long Day For November*, by David M. Vigness.
- Mullins, *Republic of Texas: Poll Lists for 1846*, by Carolyn R. Ericson.
- Flanagan, *Sam Houston's Texas*, by Stanely E. Siegel.
- Welch, *Historic Sites of Texas*, by Carolyn Parker.
- Carter, *Stagecoach Inns of Texas*, by Charles G. James.
- Tyler, *Santiago Vidaurri and the Southern Confederacy*, by Thomas Schoonover.
- McDonald, *Make Me a Map of the Valley: The Civil War Journal of Stonewall Jackson's Topographer*, by Betty Davis.
- Pitkin, *The Captain Departs: Ulysses S. Grant's Last Campaign*, by Herman Hattaway.
- Smith and Haley, *Life on the Texas Range*, by Ben Procter.
- Sibley, *George W. Brackenridge: Maverick Philanthropist*, by John O. King.
- McDonald, *Recollections of a Long Life*, by Walter N. Vernon.
- Baker, Rae, Minor and Connor, *Water For The Southwest: Historical Survey and Guide to Historic Sites*, by David B. Gracy II.
- Clark and Halbouty, *The Last Boom*, by Bobby H. Johnson.
- Adams, *Texas Cities and the Great Depression*, by David McComb.
- Owens, *Impressions of the Big Thicket*, by Reese Kennedy.
- Talbot, *The Big Thicket*, by Lois Williams Parker.
- Wilhoit, *The Politics of Massive Resistance*, by Numan Bartlet.
- Deaton, *The Year They Threw the Rascals Out*, by Joe E. Ericson.
- Pilkington, *My Blood's Country: Studies in Southwestern Literature*, by Ernest Speck.
- Adams, *The Whig Party of Louisiana*, by Henry C. Detloff.

## HISTORY OF EL CAPOTE RANCH

by Duncan Glenn Muckelroy

The history of El Capote Ranch is rich in source materials. This paper utilizes only several of the numerous research documents that contain the recorded history of El Capote Ranch. It is not probable that the Ranch Headquarters of The Museum of Texas Tech University at Lubbock, Texas, could have selected a log cabin with more historical significance and more available research materials that the headquarters of El Capote Ranch.

Jose de la Baume acquired the first concession to the land of El Capote Ranch from the Mexican government on November 4, 1828.<sup>1</sup> This special grant was practically a gift from the Mexican government. The only official explanation for giving this six leagues of land to de la Baume was that ". . . de la Baume had lived in Bejar since 1806 and had been promised land." This six leagues of land laid within the limits of the empresario grant that originally had been made to Green C. DeWitt on April 25, 1825.<sup>2</sup>

Jose de la Baume was born in 1731 in the Seignory of Baume, Province of Avignon in Montpellier, France.<sup>3</sup> He inherited the title of "Count" from his father Joseph, along with an estate of land and property.<sup>4</sup> De la Baume immigrated to America at some time prior to the acquisition of independence by the United States. It is known that he fought in the American Revolution, because in his will he states, "I have filed a claim against the Supreme Government of the United States of America asking for the pension awarded to those who fought in the War for Independence, since I was captain of a company which fought for the cause of America in the glorious struggle against Britannia power."<sup>5</sup> After his first wife died, de la Baume married Luisa Cutrie at Nacogdoches, Texas. De la Baume reared as his own son, a child named Valerio. This child previously had been born out of wedlock to his second wife and a third party. His second marriage produced four children named Victoria, Joseph, Gertrudis and Sancir Pedro.<sup>6</sup>

At the time of his death in 1834,<sup>7</sup> de la Baume listed his residence to be in the Alameda of San Antonio, Texas.<sup>8</sup> His homestead in San Antonio, known as "La Baume Place," was a "double stone house." It was situated on the present-day grounds of city park property, south of East Commerce Street and across the street from present-day St. Joseph's Church. During the life of de la Baume, this area was called "Cotton Wood Grove."<sup>9</sup>

In his will of 1834, de la Baume declared that the lands of El Capote were to be divided among the five children. He stressed that Valerio was to inherit a share equal to that of the remainder of his children, without prejudice to a preferred share of one sitio of land partitioned to Sancir Pedro. De la Baume also stated that the inheritance of the lands at El Capote should not be divided and distributed until after all his debts and funeral expenses were paid and settled.<sup>10</sup> The signatures of the witnesses of this will included John W. Smith and Erasmo Seguin.<sup>11</sup> This is important because John W. Smith was the first anglo mayor of San Antonio in 1837,<sup>12</sup> and the town of Seguin was named after Erasmo Seguin who also was distinguished since he was one of the most influential people during the pre-revolutionary period of Texas.<sup>13</sup>

Victoria inherited one league of El Capote land from her father, and she purchased a second league, the preferred share, from her brother Sancir Pedro as recorded in a deed

---

*Duncan Glenn Muckelroy, formerly research historial at the Museum of Texas Tech University when this article was written, is presently serving as the Historic Preservation Coordinator for the Texas State Historical Survey Committee in Austin.*

dated June 4, 1835. In a deed dated January 24, 1850, Victoria conveyed her ownership of these two leagues and Gertrudis conveyed her ownership of the one league that she had inherited to Michael Erskine.<sup>14</sup> In a deed dated June 1, 1844, Joseph conveyed his ownership of the one league that he had inherited to Michael Erskine.<sup>15</sup> Thus, Valerio inherited two leagues of the six leagues of El Capote.

In the document dated June 25, 1832, that deeded the six leagues from the Government of the State of Coahuila and Texas to Jose de la Baume, Jose obligated himself to pay \$206.00 to the state of Coahuila and Texas in accordance with article 22 of the law of colonization. This obligation passed to the Republic of Texas after the Texas Revolution. Although Jose apparently paid the taxes, if any, that were levied on the six leagues of El Capote, he did not pay any part of the \$206.00.<sup>16</sup> After Jose's death, Valerio did not pay the taxes levied on his two sections, nor did he pay his part of the \$206.00.<sup>17</sup> While Victoria, Joseph, Gertrudis, and Sancier Pedro paid the taxes levied on their respective parts of the other four leagues, none of them paid their part of the \$206.00. Since this obligation was not fulfilled by Jose or his children, the Republic of Texas sold the land at auction in 1844 to the highest bidder who also would pay the \$206.00<sup>18</sup> plus the accumulated taxes on the two leagues owned by Valerio which totaled to be \$25.86.<sup>19</sup>

John P. Erskine was the highest bidder when the six leagues of land was sold at auction.<sup>20</sup> John P. was the son of Michael Erskine. In fact, John P. was acting under the instructions of his father who financed the purchase. Michael paid Joseph \$400.00 for his league of El Capote.<sup>21</sup> Victoria and Gertrudis were paid a total of \$750.00 for their respective holdings of three leagues at El Capote, and, in addition, Michael deeded to them the "Cotton Wood Grove" property of twelve acres and the house on the property.<sup>22</sup> For the two leagues of Valerio, Michael paid \$800.00.<sup>23</sup>

In a deed of release dated February 8, 1845, Michael Erskine also acquired all of the improvements that French Smith had made at El Capote. This document is very important because it indicates that French Smith built the log cabin which is presently at the Ranch Headquarters in Lubbock. The deed reads in part, "put him [Michael Erskine] into full and free possession of all my [French Smith] improvements made upon the same [El Capote] in every manner whatsoever together with the houses, out houses, cribs, stables, cow pens . . ."<sup>24</sup>

French Smith is one of the many colorful and significant characters in the history of El Capote. In 1840, he was one of the volunteers who attempted to rescue three ladies held captive by raiding Comanche Indians. About 500 Comanches had made a raid through Texas and had burned the town of Linnville, Texas, a trading point on the coast of Lavaca Bay. Mrs. Crosby, Mrs. Watts, and a black girl were captured. Men rallied from the surrounding areas to fight the marauding Comanches, and a battle was fought at Plum Creek, now in Caldwell County. At the outbreak of the fight, the Indians attempted to kill their three lady prisoners. Although Mrs. Crosby was shot with an arrow in the breast and soon expired, her husband was able to comfort her in her dying moments. Nearby laid the body of the black lady who also had been killed. Mrs. Watts also was shot with an arrow in the breast, but ironically the arrow was deflected by a steel corset that she was wearing. The inflicted wound proved to be extremely painful, but not fatal.<sup>25</sup>

Along with John P. Erskine and Andrew Erskine (a brother of John P.), French Smith participated in the Battle of Salado. On September 11, 1842, the Mexicans under General Adrian Woll captured San Antonio in a surprise attack. This news traveled swiftly from settlement to settlement, and once again Texans were called to arms to repel a Mexican invasion. Seguin became one of the principal points of rendezvous. On the

following morning, the volunteers rode toward victory, and defeated the Mexican forces when they encountered them on the Salado Creek six miles east of San Antonio on September 18, 1842.<sup>26</sup>

One aspect of French Smith's personality was revealed in an incident which occurred in September, 1846. At that time, the first term of the District Court was held in Seguin. French Smith was among the members of the first grand jury. The first bill was the *State v. William Baker*. Baker was found guilty of the theft of a hair brush, as charged. His sentence was to be whipped publicly in the county square. This sentence was only partly carried out, however, because French Smith picked up a rock and told the man who was administering the whipping to desist after about five licks were delivered.<sup>27</sup>

A substantial portion of the history of El Capote Ranch is connected with the history of the family of Michael Erskine. Michael's grandfather, Henry, and grandmother, Jean Thompson, immigrated to America from Scotland in 1740. A son named Michael was born in 1752 in Maryland. It was this son that married Margaret Pauline, the widow of Captain John Paulee, and fathered the Michael Erskine who owned El Capote Ranch. Michael's mother, Margaret, was captured by the Shawnee Indians and held captive nearly four years before the Indians would accept a ransom for her. At the time of her capture in September, 1779, Captain John Paulee was murdered by the Shawnee. Not long after Margaret was freed, she married Michael's father.<sup>28</sup> Michael was born near Union, in present West Virginia, on January 9, 1794,<sup>29</sup> the last of the five children born of that marriage. He had three brothers and one sister.

In 1817, Michael married Agnes D. Haynes in Monroe County, Virginia.<sup>30</sup> Five sons and five daughters were born during that marriage. Catherine Haynes was born in 1817; John Paulee, 1819; William Haynes, 1822; Margaret Jane, 1824; Andrew Nelson, 1826; Elen Powel, 1828; Malinda Mary, 1829; Alexander Mahism, 1831; Michael Henry, 1834; Agness Ann, 1839.<sup>31</sup> Michael's wife was born on April 2, 1797, and died at El Capote on September 5, 1856.

In 1830, Michael and his family moved to Huntsville, Alabama where he engaged in farming for the next four years. Then, the Erskine family farmed at Bolivar and Clinton, Mississippi for an additional four years. The Erskine family, with the exception of the three older daughters, settled on Arenosa Creek in Texas about ten miles west of Port Lavaca in 1839. Catherine, Margaret, and Elen were left at Huntsville, Alabama, with Michael's brother, Dr. Alexander Erskine, to continue their education.

While living next to Arenosa Creek, an alarm was sounded on August 6, 1840, that resulted in the gathering of five black men and a number of the Erskine's neighbors at the Erskine place for protection against a Comanche raiding party. During that period, Comanches numbering as many as 1,000 frequently raided in that area. The Comanches usually raided as far to the southeast as Linnville, Texas, which they sacked and burned on this raid on August 9. The Erskine house was surrounded by a scouting party of twenty-seven Comanches. While the Indians were attacking the Erskine house, a young doctor named Bell rode into view of the battle. In Bell's desire to assist the besieged, he tried to reach the house by running the gauntlet through the savages. To the horror of those watching inside, he was surrounded, killed and scalped. After the scalping of Dr. Bell the Indians seemed satisfied, and left to join the main body on their way to Linnville.

In the fall of 1840, the Erskine family moved from Arenosa Creek in Jackson County to El Capote Ranch in Gonzales County.<sup>32</sup> Approximately one-half of El Capote Ranch became located in Guadalupe County when this county was created in March of 1846.<sup>33</sup> The bottom lands of the Guadalupe on El Capote Ranch were usually from two to four

miles wide. These bottom lands were less subject to overflow than those of any other large river in Texas. Timber was abundant in the river bottom. Most of the timber was large and very valuable, especially in many of the nearby areas where timber of any kind was scarce. In February of 1852, Frederick Law Olmstead wrote that the principal species were pecan, hickory, cypress, cotton wood, box-alder, white oak, and walnut.<sup>34</sup> The axe hewn logs of the one room log cabin now at the Ranch Headquarters in Lubbock were shaped from elm trees.<sup>35</sup> Although El Capote was a ranch, a portion of its best bottom land was cultivated. The land farmed was located in the flat bottom prairie just beyond the heavy growth of timber near the river. The rich, black clay soil was difficult to work, but it produced high yields.<sup>36</sup> Where the bottom prairie ended, the land rose abruptly and a variety of soil and scenery emerged. For the most part, the land became rolling prairie, with some chapparal and groves of live-oaks near the terrace. In elevated tracks, sandy hills were located further away from the river. This rolling sandy soil was comparatively poor and covered by a thin growth of post-oaks and black-jacks.<sup>37</sup> El Capote Ranch derived its name from El Capote Spring and El Capote Peak that were near El Capote Ranch Headquarters.

Invaluable descriptions of the area of El Capote in 1843 and 1846 are provided by William Bollaert and Dr. Ferdinand Roemer. William Bollaert was a historian, world traveler, geographer, ethnologist, antiquarian, and scientist. At the age of thirty-three, Bollaert came to Texas in 1840 to examine the interior and coastline of the Republic of Texas for the British Admiralty. In addition to his admiralty reports he wrote 1,274 personal pages of *Texana*.<sup>38</sup> Dr. Ferdinand von Roemer received his Ph.D. degree in Paleontology at Berlin, and came to Texas at the age of thirty-four. From November, 1845, until May, 1847, Roemer explored East and Central Texas. His resulting journal concentrated on his studies of the fauna and flora, and the geology of his travels. Being German, Roemer also wrote extensively of the German immigrants he encountered.<sup>39</sup>

The following section of quoted descriptions was taken from the writings of William Bollaert.

"September 15th, 1843: Ten miles travelling brought us to Gonzales. It is situated on the eastern bank of the Guadalupe River and an excellent position it is for a town. This part of the country formerly formed part of De Witt's Colony. Mr. De Witt is dead, but his family resides in the vicinity.

In 1835, 2nd of October, there was a flight here under Captain [John H.] Moore, who commanded the Texans—the Mexicans were under General Castonada [Francisco Castaneda] the Mexicans had to retreat. Previous to the commencement of the war, the Mexicans had furnished frontier, towns, in particular, with artillery. But afterwards they wished to take such arms from the settlers. Ugartechea, the Mexican General, who had his headquarters at San Antonio, sent 200 men to Gonzales to return the artillery. They encamped on the western bank of the river and sent orders to Captain Moore, who had only some twenty men, to deliver up the cannon. His reply was "Come and take it." For a week or more General Castonada diplomatized, but receiving a few rounds of grape and cannister from the Texans, returned to San Antonio, reporting to his superiors "that it was utterly impossible to carry his orders into effect."

Gonzales was burnt by order of General Houston on his retreat in 1836, with a view to prevent Santana [sic] taking up quarters or finding refuge there; it has been partially re-built and only awaits peace to rise like the Phoenix from its ashes. Situated on so beautiful a stream, probably navigable to this place by small steamboats, surrounded by so inviting a country and on the main road to

the West and Rio Grande, with such advantages, Gonzales will become an important point.

On the map Seguin is placed too near Gonzales and ought to be placed as if at the apex of a triangle, the distance of Seguin from Gonzales being 35 miles and from San Antonio, 34. Gonzales was founded in 1827 [1825] and named after a Mexican General [Rafael Gonzales], was incorporated under the Mexican regime and consists of four leagues, laid off as town land, divided in blocks etc. and contained some 4 to 500 inhabitants. The corporation, I am informed, are willing to make donation of a certain quantity of town land to merchants, artizans, mechanics, and enterprising people who might choose to settle here. Or town lots may be purchased for the corporation payable at the convenience of the purchaser. In many other places in the Republic, the same, I have no doubt, would be done.

September 16th, 1843: We started, rather a large party, from Gonzales for San Antonio, for still some fear is entertained of Comanches lurking about, particularly in the vicinity of San Antonio. Our party was composed of Old Texas warriors, hunters, traders, etc. Three miles from Gonzales, came to the San Marcos. This river and the lands on the upper part of the river are spoken of by those who have visited that part of the country with raptures. The road up the bank at the point where we forded without much difficulty was at a gradient of about 80°. Many of us had not seen a clear stream for some time, and we enjoyed copious draughts of it. We rode liesurely along. The weather was fine. Many plants in flower and the pastures improving.

I may mention here that capsicum or Red Pepper grows abundantly in Texas, particularly an indigenous sort called Chiltipin and is found in great quantities. It is about the size of a pea, of colours red and green. When dried it makes a very hot cayenne pepper, and when put into vinegar, gives it a fine flavour; there is a river named after this plant on the coast.

It was after the sun set before we crossed the Guadalupe at the part known as the Capote, the settlement of Major E. \_\_\_\_\_ [Erskine]; we found many travellers going to and from the West already "camped down," their fires gently blazing, the coffee pot on, and venison roasting. Mr. L. \_\_\_\_\_, myself and some of our party were accomodated by Major E. \_\_\_\_\_ for the night.

September 17th, 1843: Strolled about the banks of the "Murmuring Guadalupe," its stream clear, the flowers and vegetation new to me and the gaudy "Cardinal" flitting about. The Capote Mountain is a conspicuous object, being isolated and elevated above the prairie 350 feet, and said to be composed of indurated silicious matter; it is covered with small timbers. Traveling some 10 miles up the Guadalupe we re-crossed it, it being nearer to do so than continue on its western bank owing to a bend in the river; and a short distance below Seguin "non'd" and had dinner under the shade of some trees that surrounded a farm. They supplied plentifully with milk, buttermilk, and on our asking if they could bake us some cornbread, a very pretty lass undertook to supply our wants. Caught cat-fish, trout, and buffalo fish in Guadalupe. One mile from our resting place crossed the river again at "The falls."

Now we fell in with fine pastures, particularly the musquit and gama grasses, and tree of same name (a species of acacia or mimosa), a plant looking like clover, moreover a cactus-the opuntia, I think.<sup>40</sup>

The next section of quoted observations was selected from the journal of Dr. Ferdinand von Roemer.

We did not reach Gonzales in the evening, but camped a few miles this side [east] of it in an oak grove. Before reaching this grove, we had to ford Peach Creek which contained scarcely enough water to wet our feet, but which like most streams of Texas, sometimes rises twenty to thirty feet and disrupts communication for several days. On the following morning we reached Gonzales which resembles other so-called cities of West Texas. About thirty to forty poor, dilapidated frame houses and log cabins were scattered about on the level plain. Not far distant, a seam of forest extended along the rim of the Guadalupe bottom. The resources of the place seemed to be in keeping with its cheerless aspect. No sugar, coffee, or other necessities could be bought in the entire place—nothing but bad whiskey.

Spring, by the way, had already made its appearance. The peach trees were in full bloom on the day of our arrival, February 2, 1846. In the bottom of the creek we found a suffrutescent variety of chestnut in bloom.

After leaving Gonzales, we followed the course of the Guadalupe until we reached our destination, New Braunfels, the road leading us in agreeable changes through fertile valleys or over low hills composed of gravel and sand. The country was more settled here, as we came upon farms every few miles.

We were ferried across the San Marcos a few miles beyond Gonzales, which is here a narrow, sluggish, muddy stream, scarcely twenty paces wide. Later we learned to know it again in its upper course as a beautiful, rapidly flowing stream of incomparable clearness.

We now came to the farm of Mr. King, an old gentleman with a hugh paunch (by the way, in Texas a rather rare attribute). He had come here as one of the first settlers and in the course of years had developed his place into a thriving farm. When immigration into Western Texas had increased rapidly, especially among the Germans, he had found further profitable income by maintaining an inn, which does not require a great outlay of money. All that is needed are a few beds for the guests. Almost any farmhouse could serve as an inn. When the guest arrives in the evening, usually on horseback, his horse is immediately unsaddled by negroes, or, in the absence of them, by the traveler himself with the aid of the host. Thereupon he enters the hall where a bucket of water, a gourd used as a dipper, and tin basin are found. After washing face and hands, the traveler seats himself on a rather uncomfortable chair, with a seat made of calfskin stretched tight across it, and chats with the host about politics or the crops. In the meantime supper is being served in the living room. In some houses, the host asks his guests in a sly manner to follow him into an adjoining room, and here offers them a drink of whiskey or cognac diluted with water and with sugar added, in order to stimulate the appetite.

Supper consists of tea or coffee, warm cornbread and fried bacon. These articles of food are always found, but in the better inns bisquits are served hot in addition to eggs, butter, honey, and canned fruits. The hostess, or at least some feminine member of the family sits at one end of the table and serves the tea. This is done in the most dignified and solemn manner. The cups are passed in silence, and later repassed in the same manner to be refilled. No sound is uttered by her except the necessary question, asked in a quiet, indifferent tone of voice: "You take tea or coffee, sir?" "Do you take milk or sugar in your coffee?" In the explanation of the latter question, I wish to remark that the milk and sugar are added to the tea or coffee by the hostess serving it.

The host urges his guests now and then to partake of this or that food, but a

conversation on his part does not take place during the meal. In eight to ten minutes the whole "operation" of eating is finished and the guests assemble on the porch for an hour, in order to enjoy the cool breezes and to chat before retiring. The sleeping quarters are usually confined to one room where two or three beds are found. Each guest selects his bed and if there is not a sufficient number to go around, the guests must share beds. On the following morning breakfast is served. It is a duplication of supper in every detail, as far as the food is concerned. The journey is then resumed immediately after breakfast.

A lodging of this kind, including corn and fodder for the horses, can be had for \$1.00 to \$1.25.

Considering that everything eaten by man and beast is raised on the farm, with the exception of sugar and coffee, it is apparent that such a business is profitable. All cities and hamlets also have hotels which offer more conveniences at a higher cost.

Mr. King's farm was situated conveniently as well as pleasantly. The house, with its many small outhouses, stood on a hill. Lying in front of it was a small cornfield, forty acres in area, enclosed by a strong fence extending to the bottom of the Guadalupe. Another fence enclosed a thirty-acre pasture, also extending to the forested bank of the river.

His farm contained, in addition to this, eight acres of untilled, unfenced land. His chief source of income was his corn crop; but the raising of hogs, sheep and cattle added to his revenue.

Mr. King did not own slaves, but cultivated his farm with the help of his sons and hired white laborers or slaves. He was trying to sell his farm for \$3,000 in order to buy several slaves and establish a new farm elsewhere. The wish to possess slaves is inherent in all Texas farmers who do their own work, since the profitable cultivation of cotton and sugar cane can be carried on only with slave labor. The social standing of a slave-owning planter is also quite different from that of the farmer who has to till his own soil by the sweat of his brow.

It rained very hard the entire night. When, in the morning we had traveled a mile, a little insignificant creek kept us from proceeding farther, as it was swollen so badly that we could not ford it with the wagons. We were obliged to return to Mr. King's house to wait until the water had receded.

During our extended stay, the young people in the home of Mr. King made us all manner of offers for bartering. One wanted to trade or sell a horse; the other who was soon to be married, wanted to trade a good cow and calf for a black frock coat; a third wanted my saddle with which he had fallen in love, and offered me a much better one in trade, according to his opinion. Boys from eight to ten years participated in the bartering with articles of small value and showed a shrewdness seldom found in boys of the same age in Germany. Trading and bartering are more common in Texas than in any other part of the United States. A Texan is ready at any moment, even while traveling, to trade or sell anything he wears, whether it be his coat or shirt, if he can make an advantageous trade. He expects this from anyone else. He had no conception of becoming attached to an article through constant use and is greatly surprised when a German does not care to part with an article, even if offered a price greater than its worth.

At noon on the following day the water of this brook had fallen sufficiently to allow us to continue our journey. The road led us in pleasant changes through small prairies and forests, with the valley, bordered by a chain of hills, to the

right of us and the bottom of the Guadalupe to the left.

The following day brought us safely to our destination. By getting an early start, we arrived at the hamlet Seguin in the afternoon. The houses of this place were half ridden beneath the live oaks, scattered about. Only about a dozen could be seen from the road and they resembled the houses we had seen in other places mentioned.<sup>41</sup>

This writer has not been able to determine much of the history of Michael and his wife, Agnes, while they lived at El Capote. In a letter written by Alexander M. Erskine from Lewisburg, Virginia, dated April, 1826, to his brother Andrew Nelson Erskine at El Capote, Alexander asked, "I want you to tell me whether father is making any sugar or not; and I want to know whether father has moved into that new house which was nearly done when sister Elen wrote?"<sup>42</sup> On June 6, 1845, Michael Erskine wrote a letter at El Capote to his brother Doctor Alexander Erskine in Huntsville, Alabama. This is the only letter written by Michael that his researcher has been able to locate. In part, Michael said, "on the 31st Mr. Miller and Margaret left for home—John went with him, intending to go as far as Houston, but today he returned and informs me that he left them at La Grange where they would take the stage . . . I move along here as well as I can—work hard, live poor and am respected by the poor chaps. There are but few rich people in this part of the country. And no claims to be superior to another on account of his wealth . . . Andrew talks of going to Austin to study surveying with a friend of his who has given him an invitation—My advice is for him to remain at Seguin, at school, for a little while. He will leave here in a few days for Austin to see his friend Mr. Hector who has lately taken to himself a help mate. As I have but little time to spare—I will come to the point where you ask about Blood stock. How to advise you I know not. If I had have had Blood stock here a few years ago, I could have traded them well for land, and might been now do pretty well with them. But would not advise you to involve yourself in sending them here as they might turn out badly, or not to your expectation—choice lands in this part of Texas is not a drug and they are really worth more than is generally supposed. If you can send your stock, or a part of them to me we, I mean, John, Andrew and myself will make a trade for you. It may turn out to be a bad one—at all events you cannot lose much, because you can not sell Blood stock when you deal for cash."<sup>43</sup>

In another letter written by Alexander M. Erskine from Lewisburg, Virginia, dated August, 1846, to his brother Andrews N. Erskine at El Capote, Alexander wrote, "I was glad to hear that you were all well and that you and brother John did not join the army. I was very glad to hear that mother's health was as good as usual and I hope the trip to Sewilow (or Cibolo as you call it) will improve it. I was very glad to hear that all the crops were promising but I was sorry to hear that you would not be able to save the oats." An additional comment of interest in this letter reads, "and tell him [Michael] also that Mr. Samuel Paris was here the other day and told me the next time I wrote home to tell Father I saw him and that he sent his best respects to him. He said he will be out there pretty soon to look at the country and if he likes it he will go there to live and if he don't [sic] he will do like many others do; that is stay away."<sup>44</sup> The reference Alexander made to his mother's health proved to be ironic, because when his letter was received at El Capote on October 1, 1846, his mother had been dead since September 5, 1846.<sup>45</sup>

From the time of the death of Michael's wife, this writer has not been able to learn much of the history of Michael, until he left on a cattle drive from El Capote to California. Much of the information pertaining to Michael during this period between 1846 and 1854 was found in an agreement of partnership entered into by Michael and his son John P. This agreement of partnership was dated October 28, 1847. Since most of the information in this document is extremely valuable, the following quotations were taken from this document.

Both of the county of Guadalupe and State of Texas and living at the Capote farm . . . agree that this stock of cattle (all except work oxen which was to be the separate property of the said Michael) should be put into partnership . . . share and share alike. The said John to superintend the management of the farm. The said Michael to have the use of any cows he may wish for milk and butter . . . The partnership to continue for five years from the 1st day of January, 1847. At the expiration of which time all stock then on hand to be equally divided between the said Michael and John. The said Michael has an equal right with the said John to sell or otherwise dispose of any portion of said stock of cattle and purchase sheep with the funds the sheep are to be held in the same way as the cattle . . . John shall take the management of . . . his present stock of horses and mules. Also the farming tools, wagons, etc. Also all of said Michael's stock of hogs. The said Michael agrees with the said John that he the said John shall have the one third part of all the crops raised on said farm. And also the one third part of all the stock of hogs after a support of the said Michael's family, both white and black. And a support of the stock of the premises. . . this partnership shall continue for four years from the 1st day of January next (1848) at the end of which time a division is to take place of the stock of hogs and the crop on hand . . .

Should the Negroes belonging to Doctor Alexander Erskine be taken out of the possession of the said Michael Erskine, then the said John has the right to terminate and put a stop to this partnership or to continue it with the Negroes which the said Michael now owner . . .

Should the said Michael Erskine be disposed of the Capote place by the La Baume's who are now contending for it; the said John has a right to put an end to the partnership or continue it. . .

John D. Anderson and his family is to live at the Capote with the said Michael and John for the next year 1848, free of expenses (except clothing) and the said Anderson is to have at least thirty acres of ground to cultivate for which he is not to pay any rent.

The said John P. Erskine is to give his undivided attention to the management of said farm stock. And the said Michael Erskine is not bound to do anything unless he may think appropriate to do so.

For the true performance of the foregoing we and each of us, bind ourselves to each other in the penalty of Ten thousand dollars . . . this 28th day of Oct. 1847. . .

Memorandum of the Negroes which are upon the Capote place agreeable to the foregoing agreement. Bill, Anthony, Peter, and Cato, Negroes belonging to Michael Erskine. Dinah and Sarah, Johnson, Vina, Fean, Mose, Louisiana, Mary, and Lise. Dinah's children, Jose and Frances, Sarah's children. Making twelve of Doctor Erskine's and four of M Erskine's.

Michael was considering leaving El Capote to travel to California in 1849. Although this writer has not been able to determine the purpose for his contemplations, it is known that Andrew was considering leaving El Capote to participate in the gold rush of '49. In a letter written by Alexander from Lewisburg, Virginia, dated March 13, 1849, to his brother Andrew at El Capote, Alexander pleads, "Brother have you really any intention of going to California in search of gold? Are you willing to hazard your life for the gain of a little shining dust? . . . already in your fancy you are a rich man, you have gold in abundance, more than you can make use of. But go to California and your glorious dream, your golden visions will dissipate like mist before the coming of the bright king of

day. But admit there is gold in abundance. You have a wife. What will you do with her? Certainly not take her with you. . . . Remain at home. . . ."46 From the information in a letter written by Alexander from Lewisburg, Virginia, dated June 16, 1849, to his brother Andrew at El Capote, it appears that Michael also was considering leaving El Capote to join the gold rush of '49. Alexander wrote, "use all your endeavors to persuade father from going to California. He is to [sic] old to undertake such a wild adventure." In this letter Alexander also wrote of a cholera epidemic in the area of El Capote. He expressed concern by writing, "I am also alarmed, because father wrote me, the cholera was at home. Anthony [presumably the Negro belonging to Michael] had it and was not expected to live. I heard that it was raging fearfully in San Antonio. Tis a dreadful disease. Its march is constantly onward, nothing can check its mad course."<sup>47</sup>

Significant news of El Capote also is contained in a letter written by Alexander from Lewisburg, Virginia, dated November 1, 1849, to his brother Andrew at El Capote. Alexander said, "I am surprised to learn that the Indians have begun to make depredations again. I hope they will not molest you or father. It is probable they came down for the purpose of horse stealing, and having fallen upon the German colony, the inhabitants being much frightened, not accustomed to see [sic] Indians, have left their dwellings and fled precipitely, leaving the Indians a rich booty of horses and etc. I do not suppose they meditate any such invasion as the one, they attempted some seven or eight years ago since, when they burnt Linnville and pillaged other towns. They cannot muster a sufficient force now, to strike the Texans with awe. A handful of Texans would scatter them as they would a swarm of flies. The gallant Hays with his Rangers would. I am sure."<sup>48</sup>

More news is found and questions are raised in a letter from Alexander in Lewisburg, Virginia, dated February 8, 1850, to Andrew at El Capote. Alexander wrote, "I suppose you are so much engaged with your agricultural and domestic duties that you have not much time to devote to letter writing. I am glad to hear that you have removed to the Capote, since you will be nearer to father, and will enjoy the society of our family more. You say you intend turning your attention to stock raising. Do you think it will be profitable? Where will your market be, not New Orleans? Does father still continue to raise sheep and does he experience and profit therefrom. There are many questions concerning Texas, her institutions, natural resources, productions, and principal markets, which I wish to ask but I shall leave them unasked now, and it will suffice me to know something of the Capote Farm, how many acres it contains, what improvements have been made since I was there, and what are the principal productions that are raised. I am very anxious to learn more about my home, and since you have again settled there, you are the one who can best answer my inquiries."<sup>49</sup>

On May 6, 1850, Alexander wrote the following in a letter mailed at Buchanan, Virginia, to his brother Andrew at El Capote, "You say that father has raised not sheep? I really thought that he had; that the Capote was running with herds of sheep; and had almost thought that father's flocks were 'upon a hundred hills.' Tis a great pity he cannot engage in a business, which he thinks will be so profitable. But perhaps this imagination has drawn the juncture in too bright glowing colors. I hope your scheme will not be so much the work of imagination, but will in sober reality prove to be as lucrative as you suppose it ever to be. May it prove to be as advantageous as your fond imagination has pictured it. . . . Malinda wrote me some weeks ago that father had sold 12,000 bushels of corn at 45¢ per bushel, was it a cash sale? and when was his corn to be delivered?"<sup>50</sup>

Evidence of agricultural experiments being conducted at El Capote is noted in a letter from Alexander in Lewisburg, Virginia, dated June 17, 1850, to Andrew at El Capote. Alexander stated, "when I arrived here I found the strawberries had not opened, and since I wished to send some seed in my letter I again deferred writing until

now. Enclosed are the seed of two large strawberries, all of which measured three and a half inches in circumference, and one of them nearly four. Aunt thinks you had better plant these seed as soon as you get them in a place which is not too warm. You might plant a part of them at any rate and make the experiment. I will send you the potatoes in the fall as soon as they become matured sufficiently to dig. We have some now, but they are not good being last year's potatoes, and if I could send them to you safe and sound, you would have to keep them through the winter as you cannot plant until next spring, by which time they would become so old they would not sprout. I have not ascertained what would be the cost of transportation on them but will do so and inform you in my next letter." This letter was badly stained, apparently with strawberry juice.<sup>51</sup>

A commentary on the wildlife at El Capote is evident in the following quotation taken from a letter written by Alexander at Lewisburg, Virginia, on November 28, 1850, to Andrew at El Capote. It reads, "ask Mike if he has slain the bear yet, which he boasted he would do so soon as he went home. But I suppose he is more profitable, though perhaps to him not so agreeably engaged, than killing bears."<sup>52</sup>

From information contained in a mortgage deed, it appears that Michael mortgaged El Capote lands in order to acquire the funds needed for his cattle drive to California in 1854. In this deed, dated October 14, 1853, he mortgaged the entire 26,000 acre tract, except for 568 acres that he had mortgaged previously. The mortgage was held by Oliver Burne of Monroe County, Virginia. The mortgage was for the sum of \$18,000. Repayment of the loan was to be on a semi-annual bases from January 1, 1854, until the balance was due on January 1, 1856. Michael was obligated to make the payments to a counting house in New Orleans, Louisiana.<sup>53</sup>

Fortunately, Michael meticulously kept a diary with daily entries during the cattle drive from El Capote to Los Angeles, California. The entries average about 75 to 100 words per day. The drive began in April, 1854, and ended in November, 1854. Remarkably, Michael reached California with about 1000 head of cattle, approximately the same number with which he started, as a result of "picking up" strays along the trail. While Indians posed a serious threat to the cattle throughout the drive, he did not lose as many head of cattle or men to them as did most others, because he hired for \$1,500 the protection of an armed escort under the command of Captain James J. Callahan. This escort usually numbered about twenty men. Michael relied heavily on Captain Callahan for scouting reports on water and grazing locations, as well as for armed protection. A memorandum by Michael before the daily entries begin reads as follows. "Left Sanders with the herd on Sunday the 23rd or 24th [April, 1854] first night stampeded [sic] on the Cibilo—Lost some cattle—Stampeded next night, think we lost but few—camped next night on the Silado (Seguin Crossing)—Cattle quiet—Next passed around the head of the Spring and camped 2½ miles west of San Antonio. Stayed there several days finishing our outfit, and left on Monday, the 1st of May—Traveled for three days without difficulty to Quihe—10 miles west of Casterville where on the night of the 3rd we had a tremendous storm which stampeded our cattle and all scattered. Next day, the 4th we gathered together between 7 and 8 hundred. On the night of the 4th they stampeded again—We remained at that place a week, and got all but about 60 head—37 of them were found and delivered at San Antonio and sold by Andrew. We think we will get others—entire loss in all the stamped is not more than 60 head. Some of them was lost at the Pen—Sent Mr. Callahan back to Seguin for more money, men and horses."

Michael's herd was following the herd of James G. Bell, and others, as is evident by the reference to the carcasses in the following entry. "Friday July 7th. Took our herd to water in lots of 100, 150 and 200 at a time. Watered all well and lost none. One swam across the River [Rio Grande], but we think we will get him again lost no cattle, either in the drive or by watering. Hundreds of dead carcasses are lying on the road, between the

river and Eagle Springs. We left 7 weak cattle at the springs, in charge of Lieutenant Higgins, who kindly proposed to take care of them until Mr. Jett got up the Ox Waggon—If Mr. Jett gets up with his train safe. (He has with those left of Eagle Springs 55 head) we will have accomplished what no other has done. Traveled 100 miles in 3 days with a drove of cattle of 875 head and not loose one [sic] either in driving or watering at the River. All other drovers have lost some."

One of the more interesting references of Michael that pertains to the Indian problem is as follows. "Callahan and men returned tonight—Had a fight on the 5 in the evening with a party of Indians, say near 40 killed all but nine—Took from them sixty five or six Animals most of them Cattle—It turned out to be a party that had been to the settlement in Mexico and was on their return to the Gila River—One Mexican killed—Shepperd (one of our men) slight wounded in the shoulder—four Mexicans wounded slightly Thursday 7th September."

The diary of Michael never mentions the exact number that were participating in the cattle drive, but there were probably about 20 in addition to the military escort of about 20. The names of most of the hands were listed at some time in the text of the diary. Two of Michael's sons, John and Michael Henry, traveled with him. Although Michael relied heavily on both of these sons, he probably relied most on John. John was thirty-five at the time, and Michael was twenty years old.<sup>54</sup>

While Michael and his sons, John and Michael Henry, were away from El Capote, during the cattle drive to California, Andrew Nelson had the responsibility of operating the farm and ranch. When the Erskine family moved to El Capote in 1840, Andrew was fourteen years of age. Although there were many attractions at El Capote for Andrew, he had inherited a wanderlust from his father which constantly tempted him to seek adventures in new fields of action. At the age of seventeen Andrew joined the Texas Rangers, and while he was serving under the command of Captain Jack (J.C.) Hays, he was wounded at the Battle of Bandera Pass, Bandera County.<sup>55</sup> As mentioned earlier, his brother, John, was also fighting in Captain Hays' company by the time of the Battle of Salado on September 18, 1842,<sup>56</sup> although John did not become a Texas Ranger until 1843. During the Battle of Salado, Andrew was wounded by a ball that was never extracted from his right forearm. This wound caused him discomfort for the remainder of his life.

In the latter part of 1844, Captain Hays relinquished his command in the Rangers and resumed his profession as a land surveyor. Andrew also left the Rangers in order to serve as an assistant surveyor in the employment of Captain Hays. Andrew soon realized that his limited knowledge of math would prevent him from becoming a qualified surveyor, if he did not return to school. Consequently, Andrew returned to El Capote in the early part of 1845, and soon was enrolled in school at Seguin. Within two years, Andrew was a much sought after surveyor.

On December 27, 1847, Andrew married Ann Theresa Johnson. Her family had moved to Texas in 1836, and operated a plantation on the Brazos River near Richmond. Her father, Joseph F. Johnson served in General Sam Houston's army and fought at the Battle of San Jacinto. At the time of his marriage, John was operating El Capote because Michael was in Elizabeth City, North Carolina. At the invitation of John, Andrew and his new bride moved to El Capote and shared the responsibility with John of operating El Capote.

El Capote was a very successful operation under John's and Andrew's guidance as evident by their bumper crop of 1848. That year, their corn crop was over 12,000 bushels. This was a record crop in Southeast Texas for a farm of the size of El Capote, and it remained as the record crop for a number of years.

After the bumper corn crop of 1848, Andrew increasingly began to devote his time to surveying. With the assistance of John and the blacks, he built a house for himself on a pleasant site within half a mile of the large headquarters house at El Capote which was situated on a high bluff. It was a comfortable two-story log house and a number of out buildings were also constructed at this location. On August 10, 1849, Andrew's first child, a son named Blucher Haynes Erskine, was born. In the fall of 1849, Andrew wrote of his contentment at El Capote. He commented that the Guadalupe provided fine fishing and swimming opportunities and that there were immense groves of pecan trees and other nut bearing trees, in addition to various fruit trees and berry bushes, which provided a pleasing variety in their diet. By the fall of 1850 Andrew had moved his family to a house in Seguin that had been given to him by his father-in-law. At that time his sister, Margaret Jane, moved into the two story log house formerly occupied by Andrew's family at El Capote. Margaret's husband, James Miller, assisted Michael in operating El Capote as well as operating a tract of land he owned that adjoined El Capote on the west.

After moving to Seguin in 1850, Andrew began operating the first mill built on the Guadalupe River. The largest falls on the river, Eight-Foot Falls, were situated very close down river from the mill at a location referred to as Mill Point. Andrew also operated "Erskine's Ferry" on the San Antonio stage road. In 1852 Andrew completed a large, comfortable, two-story concrete house, which served as his family home for many years.

As mentioned earlier, Andrew was left with the complete responsibility of El Capote when Michael, John, and Michael Henry departed on the cattle drive to California. Michael did not return to El Capote until 1859, and even after this five year absence, Michael continued to leave the management of El Capote in the hands of Andrew. After Michael's return to El Capote most of his time was devoted to planning, arranging and driving cattle from El Capote to New Orleans. Although the cattle drive to California had been very prosperous for Michael, this money was invested in mining ventures that were economic failures. Trying to regain his losses in the mining ventures he drove a herd of cattle from Seguin to New Orleans in 1860, and again in 1861. While he was returning from New Orleans, after the second drive, he died at New Iberia, Louisiana, on May 15, 1862.

As the ominous threat of the outbreak of the Civil War increased, Andrew's inclination of being a participant grew proportionally. It should also be remembered that the vast majority of the friends and associates of Captain Jack Hays were ardent secessionists. When Governor Clark's proclamation was issued calling for Texas volunteers, men from Seguin and Guadalupe Counties organized Company D as a part of the Fourth Texas Regiment. Company D was destined to become one of the most distinguished in the Confederate cause. On April 30, 1862, Andrew and Alexander left with this company to fight in the Civil War. On the bloody battlefield of Sharpsburg (Antietam), Maryland, a minie ball passing through Andrew's temple brought him instant death. During this battle, Alexander was wounded, having been shot through the left arm and shot twice in the side.<sup>57</sup>

El Capote remained the home of many of the Erskines until the property was divided and sold in the 1870's. The 26, 568 acre El Capote was inventoried and appraised in 1862. The tract in Guadalupe County was valued at \$28,780.00, and the part in Gonzales County was valued at \$9,965.00.<sup>58</sup> In 1872, 17,623 acres of El Capote situated in Guadalupe and Gonzales Counties was appraised at \$35,246.00.<sup>59</sup>

After a number of complicated legal transactions between the Erskine heirs and creditors, 19,136 acres of El Capote was sold to Thomas W. Pierce, George F. Stone,

and Daniel Tyler. Those three purchasers formed an "investment syndicate" when acquiring ownership of this land in 1878. Pierce and Stone became co-owners of the 19,136 acres in January, 1878. Since Stone obligated himself to make payments within a shorter period of time than Pierce, Stone became required to pay a total of \$26,000,<sup>60</sup> while Pierce became obligated to pay a total of \$29,000.<sup>61</sup> Tyler became involved in the transaction on August 23, 1878, when Stone conveyed one-third of his undivided one-half interest in the 19,136 acres to Tyler for the cash payment of \$10,000.<sup>62</sup> In the following years the Erskine family eventually sold all of their El Capote lands. In December 1879, Michael Henry sold approximately 476 acres in the original El Capote tract to W. E. Goodrich for \$904.00 cash.<sup>63</sup> Alexander sold his interest in 756½ acres of El Capote property to George F. Stone in May 1882 for his share of the \$2,100.00 cash paid by Stone.<sup>64</sup>

At the death of Daniel Tyler, his part of El Capote was divided through his will between Mary L. Moore and her sister, Edith Kermit Carow, among others.<sup>65</sup> On December 2, 1886, Edith Kermit Carow became the bride of Theodore Roosevelt.<sup>66</sup> In June of 1887, Edith K. Roosevelt conveyed all of her rights to 756½ acres of El Capote to Mary L. Moore. Theodore Roosevelt did not join his wife in this deed of conveyance.<sup>67</sup> However, on April 19, 1897, Edith K. Roosevelt was joined by Theodore Roosevelt in jointly conveying "all the rights, title and interest" of the 756½ acres at El Capote to Mary L. Moore.<sup>68</sup>

It is interesting to note that the quit claim deed through which Theodore Roosevelt and his wife transferred their interest in El Capote to Mary L. Moore must have pleased Mary's husband Alexander. This assumption is made because Theodore Roosevelt was presented as a present from Alexander Moore the charger that he rode during the Spanish-American War in 1898. Appropriately this charger was named "Seguin." Alexander Moore tended to a large number of fine horses at El Capote. A number of those horses, and others from Guadalupe County were used by the "Rough Riders" in Cuba.<sup>69</sup> In fact, one might say that Theodore Roosevelt rode a horse from El Capote to the Presidency.

After a number of complicated legal transactions, 1,388.09 acres of the property at El Capote formerly owned by Alexander and his wife, Mary L., passed into the ownership of Judge Leroy Gilbert Denman and his wife, Sue E. (Carpenter), in 1897. The land involved in these transfers to Judge Denman was the land on which the log cabin, now at the Ranch Headquarters,<sup>70</sup> was located. Judge Denman paid \$17,525.00 in cash for a block of 876¼ acres in this transaction,<sup>71</sup> and he paid \$16,000 in cash for a block of 503¼ acres.<sup>72</sup> The approximately 9½ acres remaining were acquired through various land trades.<sup>73</sup>

Judge Denman was born about five miles north of El Capote in Guadalupe County on October 31, 1855.<sup>74</sup> He was born on his parents ranch and entered a nearby rural school at the age of four. In addition to his classroom education, he was extensively tutored by his father. After graduating from the rural school system, he spent the winters studying in Seguin. During these winters he stayed with a friend of the family, John Ireland, who was later governor of Texas from 1883 to 1887. Judge Denman also read the books in Ireland's home library.<sup>75</sup> After teaching school for about four years, he entered the law school of the University of Virginia from which he graduated in 1880. He practiced law in New Braunfels and San Antonio until 1894, when he was appointed by Governor James S. Hogg as associate justice of the Texas Supreme Court. Judge Denman remained on the Texas Supreme Court until he resigned and returned to private practice at San Antonio in May of 1899.<sup>76</sup>

As soon as Judge Denman purchased the land at El Capote in 1897, his half-brother, Dan I. Denman, moved onto the property to manage it. Judge Denman was able to

spend only the summers at El Capote due to his obligations on the Texas Supreme Court. He, his wife, and their seven children resided in a house at El Capote that Judge Denman built almost entirely by himself. After his return to law practice in San Antonio in 1899, Judge Denman could not find enough time to spend his summers at El Capote. Consequently, he became a "week-end" rancher until his death in 1916.

At the time Judge Denman acquired the cabin at El Capote it was lived in by a black named Oliver Collins and his rather large family. All of Oliver's children were born in the cabin, including a son named Noble Collins who currently works for the city at Seguin. After the death of Oliver Collins in the 1930's, the cabin was used for storage of feed until it was completely abandoned because of the lack of maintenance.

The widow of Judge Denman continued the operation of the ranching and farming activities at El Capote from the time of her husband's death in 1916, until her own death in 1948. In 1933, she terminated all farming operations at El Capote, because she refused to engage in activities requiring governmental permits. Since this decision, the property has been used exclusively for cattle raising and the gathering of wild pecans.

The cabin remained in the ownership of the heirs of Judge Denman until they donated it to the Ranch Headquarters of The Museum of Texas Tech University at Lubbock, Texas in 1970, in memory of Judge Denman.<sup>77</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Ethel Zivley Rafter, "De Witt's Colony," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, VIII (October, 1904), 167.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>3</sup>Jose de la Baume's Will, 1834, Bexar County Archives, San Antonio, Texas, 1-2.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>5</sup>Jose de la Baume's Will, 4.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, 2-3.

<sup>7</sup>Frederick C. Chabot, *With the Makers of San Antonio* (San Antonio, 1937), 260.

<sup>8</sup>Jose de la Baume's Will, 3.

<sup>9</sup>Chabot, *With the Makers of San Antonio*, 260.

<sup>10</sup>Jose de la Baume's Will, 5-6.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 9-12.

<sup>12</sup>Chabot, *With the Makers of San Antonio*, 274.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 118-122.

<sup>14</sup>Victoria de la Baume and Gertrudis de la Baume to Michael Erskine, Deed, January 24, 1850, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>15</sup>Joseph de la Baume to Michael Erskine, Deed, June 1, 1844, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>16</sup>Record of Deeds, Gonzales County Courthouse, Gonzales, Texas, LXXXVIII, 82.

<sup>17</sup>Records of Deeds, Gonzales County Courthouse, Gonzales, Texas, G, 427.

<sup>18</sup>Records of Deeds, Gonzales County Courthouse, Gonzales, Texas, D, 81; LXXXVIII, 82; G, 427.

<sup>19</sup>County of Gonzales and State of Texas to John P. Erskine, Conveyance of Deed, June 26, 1848, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>20</sup>Records of Deeds, Gonzales, LXXXVIII, 82.

<sup>21</sup>Joseph de la Baume to Michael Erskine, Deed, June 1, 1844.

<sup>22</sup>Victoria de la Baume and Gertrudis de la Baume to Michael Erskine, Deed, January 24, 1850.

<sup>23</sup>Records of Deeds, Gonzales, D, 294.

<sup>24</sup>Records of Deeds, Gonzales, D, 81.

<sup>25</sup>A. J. Sowell, *Early Settlers and Indian Fighters of Southwest Texas* (Austin, 1900), 418-419.

<sup>26</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr., (ed.) "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," *Frontier Times* (April, 1928), 301.

<sup>27</sup>Sowell, *Early Settlers*, 427.

<sup>28</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr. (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 300-301.

<sup>29</sup>Walter Prescott Webb (ed.), *Handbook of Texas*, I (Austin, 1952), 570.

<sup>30</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr., (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 300-301.

<sup>31</sup>Genealogical Record, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>32</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr. (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 300-301.

<sup>33</sup>Webb (ed.), *Handbook of Texas*, I, 742-743.

<sup>34</sup>Frederick Law Olmstead, *A Journey Through Texas* (New York, 1969), 231-237.

<sup>35</sup>Dr. Philip R. Morey, Correspondence from Dr. Philip R. Morey, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, Texas Tech University, to Jerry L. Rogers, Director, Ranch Headquarters of the Museum of Texas Tech University, December 5, 1971.

<sup>36</sup>Olmstead, *A Journey Through Texas*, 231-237.

<sup>37</sup>Byrd Lockhart's Field Notes of 6 Leagues of Capote tract, Finished on June 14, 1830, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>38</sup>Webb (ed.), *Handbook of Texas*, I, 184.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, II, 498.

<sup>40</sup>Eugene W. Hollon and Ruth Lamphan Butler (eds.), *William Bollaerts' Texas* (Norman, 1956), 211-214.

<sup>41</sup>Dr. Ferdinand Roemer, *Texas: Described Through Personal Observations* (San Antonio, 1935), 86-90.

<sup>42</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew M. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written in April, 1846, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>43</sup>Michael Erskine to Dr. Alexander Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on June 6, 1845, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>44</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on August 17, 1846, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>45</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr. (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 300.

<sup>46</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on March 13, 1849, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>47</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on June 16, 1849, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>48</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on November 1, 1849, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>49</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on February 8, 1850, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>50</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on May 6, 1850, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>51</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on June 17, 1850, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>52</sup>Alexander M. Erskine to Andrew N. Erskine, Personal Letter, Written on November 28, 1850, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>53</sup>Michael Erskine to Oliver Burne, Mortgage Deed, October 14, 1853, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>54</sup>Michael Erskine, *California 1854: Journal and Other Memoranda*, Typed copy from original, Personal Papers of Mrs. Charles E. Baer, Seguin, Texas.

<sup>55</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr. (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 300.

<sup>56</sup>Sowell, *Early Settlers*, 420.

<sup>57</sup>Blucher Haynes Erskine, Sr. (ed.), "Biography of Andrew Nelson Erskine," 301-310.

<sup>58</sup>Michael Erskine, deceased, Inventory and Appraisement of Community Property, August 21, 1862, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>59</sup>John P. Erskine, deceased, Inventory and Appraisement of Estate, December 7, 1872, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>60</sup>George F. Stone to Daniel Tyler, Special Warranty Deed, August 23, 1878, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>61</sup>John O. Dewees to Thomas W. Pierce, Warranty Deed, January 14, 1878, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>62</sup>George F. Stone to Daniel Tyler, Special Warranty Deed, August 23, 1898, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>63</sup>M. H. Erskine to W. E. Goodrich, Warranty Deed, December 20, 1879, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>64</sup>W. E. Goodrich and A. M. Erskine to George F. Stone, Warranty Deed, May 18, 1881, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>65</sup>Daniel Tyler's Will, April 22, 1886, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>66</sup>Edward Wagenknecht, "Roosevelt, Theodore," *Encyclopedia Americana*, international ed., XXIII, 684-685.

<sup>67</sup>Alfred L. Tyler, Edward L. Tyler, Augustus C. Tyler, Gertrude E. Carow, Edith K. Roosevelt, and Emily L. Carow to Mary L. Moore, Deed, June 1, 1887, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>68</sup>Edith K. Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt to Mary L. Moore, Quit Claim Deed, April 19, 1897, Abstract of Title, compiled by Dibrell and Mosheim Abstract Co., Seguin, Texas, September 25, 1897.

<sup>69</sup>Arwerd Max Moellering, "A History of Guadalupe County, Texas," (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of History, University of Texas at Austin, 1938), 156.

<sup>70</sup>L. G. Denman Estate, Abstract of Title, compiled by Conegan Abstract Co., Inc., Seguin, Texas, August 23, 1929.

<sup>71</sup>Alex Moore and wife to L. G. Denman, Deed, September 22, 1897, Abstract of Title, compiled by Donegan Abstract Co., Inc., Seguin, Texas, August 23, 1929.

<sup>72</sup>Julia A. Miller to Leroy G. Denman, Deed, December 19, 1907, Abstract of Title, compiled by Donegan Abstract Co., Inc., Seguin, Texas, August 23, 1929.

<sup>73</sup>L. G. Denman Estate, Abstract of Title, compiled by Donegan Abstract Co., Inc., Seguin, Texas, August 23, 1929.

<sup>74</sup>Webb (ed.), I, 490-491.

<sup>75</sup>Gilbert M. Denman, Jr., correspondence from Gilbert M. Denman, Jr., Attorney at Law, San Antonio, Texas, to author, Written on December 22, 1972, Filed at the Ranch Headquarters of The Museum of Texas Tech University.

<sup>76</sup>Webb (ed.), *Handbook of Texas*, I, 490-491.

<sup>77</sup>Gilbert M. Denman, Jr., correspondence to author, Written on December 22, 1972.

**THE NEGLECTED REGIMENT:  
EAST TEXAS HORSEMEN WITH ZACHARY TAYLOR**

by Thomas H. Kreneck

During the Mexican War Texas volunteers served in the ranks of the American army, and earned an enviable martial reputation. When General Zachary Taylor launched his initial invasion of the enemy's country from Matamoros to Monterrey in the summer and early fall of 1846, his force included two regiments of mounted Texans. The more famous of these Lone Star partisans was a regiment whose members came from the area that was then considered West Texas, and was commanded by the intrepid Colonel John Coffee Hays. The preoccupation of writers and historians with the activities of the westerners has clearly overshadowed the important services rendered by the East Texas regiment commanded by George Thomas Wood. The purpose of this paper is not only to redress that imbalance by revealing the East Texans in truer focus, but also to explain why they have received less attention than Hays and his men.

The story of the little noted East Texas force began on April 26, 1846, the fateful day Taylor notified Washington that "Hostilities may now be considered as commenced. . . ."

On the same day Taylor sent H. G. Catlett, a Texas citizen, scurrying to Austin with a request for troops. In his letter, Taylor asked Texas Governor James Pinckney Henderson for two regiments of infantry and two regiments of horsemen. The war had begun and Taylor intended to carry the conflict "into the enemy's country."<sup>1</sup> Within a week William G. Cooke, Texas Adjutant General, had issued General Order No. 1 calling for twenty companies of horsemen and requiring the state's counties to supply troops proportional to their population. According to the May 2 order, the mounted men were to serve six months terms, they were to furnish their own horses and weapons, and Point Isabel was selected as their rendezvous site.<sup>2</sup>

Texans responded enthusiastically to the call to war. Amid cheers from the floor and gallery, the state legislature unanimously resolved to recruit the desired regiments. Governor Henderson himself felt confident that more than the desired amount of horsemen could be raised.<sup>3</sup>

General Taylor was victorious at Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma, and had splashed his army across the Rio Grande to occupy Matamoros before the Texas horse units responded to the Adjutant General's directive. Companies originating in the western portion of the state, however, drifted into the rendezvous area earlier than the bulk of the East Texans simply because they had fewer miles to travel. From the beginning, therefore, the West Texans stepped into the limelight.

Even prior to the war the men who became leaders in this newly forming western regiment had been on duty on the Indian frontier as Texas Rangers, and were immediately enrolled in the federal army to maintain the outer limits of the Lone Star state from incursions by hostile red men. Moreover, some of these same Texas Rangers such as Samuel H. Walker, who became Hays' second in command, had been with Zachary Taylor in the opening two battles, in the occupation of Matamoros, and on reconnaissance missions in Mexico. From the outset the men of this force had gained the favor and confidence of General Taylor. Thus, they would receive the favored assignments throughout the northern campaign.

---

*Thomas H. Kreneck is associated with the University of Houston's Department of History.*

Being first on the scene, these Rangers were also the first Texans encountered by the war correspondents from the eastern United States. So when the writers began to speak of Texans in the war, they spoke of them as picturesque, rough-and-tumble Texas Rangers; men like Jack Hays, Walker, Ben McCulloch, Big Foot Wallace, Chris Acklin, Mike Chevallie, John McMullen, and many others, and these fellows were all in the western regiment. The East Texans could only emulate them, and the eager piney woods regiment was eclipsed from the start.

By the latter half of June, Jack Hays assumed the colonelcy and had his newly completed First Regiment, Texas Mounted Rifles in shape for operations against the enemy.<sup>4</sup> His western force was not entirely filled, however, when the East Texas companies began to join Taylor's ranks. Yet, these new arrivals were organized into a separate command, mainly distinguishable by their eastern origins.<sup>5</sup>

The Houston County men under their elected Captain John L. Hall arrived at the rendezvous on June 19, to become Company H, Second Regiment, Texas Mounted Volunteers. They had been the first eastern county to hear the call. George Thomas Wood brought his seventy-four Liberty County men into the camp on June 22, to become Company B. Nacogdoches County's recruits under William F. Sparks rendezvoused with the American forces the same day to enter as Company E. Two days later Captain Otis M. Wheeler's men from San Augustine County crossed the ferry from Padre Island to become A Company.<sup>6</sup>

The day after Wheeler arrived, June 25, the organization assumed regimental strength when six companies rode into camp. Federal officials soon mustered them into the ranks of the American army with appropriate labeling. Company K consisted of the men from Milam under Robert K. Goodloe. Company C was Erwin M. Wilder's Harrison County volunteers from Marshall. Shelbyville sent two units rather than the prescribed one. These two groups loosely styled themselves the Moderators and the Regulators, becoming units D and I respectively. The remaining brace of companies originated in Rusk County under Captain Ashton Ferguson, and in Harrison County, the second from that county, under Bird Holland. These men received the designations of G and F to fulfill the regiment's strength.<sup>7</sup>

The rank and file of the East Texas volunteers had rallied to appeals from the prominent men of their communities who had been contacted by Governor Henderson. They had assembled to form their companies at the spots in their immediate area where the local newspaper, handbills, or word-of-mouth had directed them. They had been in high spirits as they left their woodland homes for the scene of action. Generally, the East Texas partisans had received farewell banquets from the people of their respective communities where the local citizens presented them with the company colors and as gala a send-off as their frontier economies could muster.

The ten units followed a similar route to Point Isabel. Most of them had crossed the ferry at Washington City on the Brazos, passed on to La Grange, through Goliad to Corpus Christi, and thence down Padre Island to General Taylor. They avoided traveling on the mainland from Corpus to the Point on the suggestion of Taylor. The crusty General felt marching down the coastal mainland would invite ambush by the Mexican irregulars who lurked in the desolate country.<sup>8</sup>

Though their spirits had sagged after passing into the inhospitable country south of Goliad, Taylor welcomed them for he needed their services desperately. From the beginning of his Texas adventure the General had been short of horse units. These new arrivals boosted his numbers already increased by the West Texas regiment.

As prescribed by law the East Texans needed to elect their field officers since they had assumed regimental size. This election transpired on July 4 amid the ballyhoo of the

Independence Day celebration. Cannons roared, men shouted, and dogs barked as the members cast ballots above the confusion. George Thomas Wood of Liberty County emerged as the Colonel. An ex-Georgian and resident of Texas since 1839, Wood had taken a leave of absence from his senate seat in the state's congress to come to the front. John Myrick, the Sergeant of the Moderators' Company D, became Lieutenant-Colonel, and William Scurry of Wheeler's unit was elected Major. The staff officers took their positions the next day with the important post of Adjutant being filled by Thomas M. Likens of Hall's company, while John T. Wilson of Holland's unit became the Quartermaster.<sup>9</sup>

The approximately six hundred man force under Colonel Wood, along with Jack Hays' West Texans, then constituted a formidable arm of the invasion army. The average East Texas trooper received the grand sum of twenty dollars per month, the same pay as a regular United States army dragoon. When mounted on their large American horses which towered over the smaller Mexican caballitos, the Texans were described by a federal officer on the border as having "loose discipline" with "no counterpart in any age or country. Neither Cavalier nor Cossack, Mameluke nor Mosstrooper are like him and yet, in some respects, he resembles them all." They eagerly anticipated action now that they sat on the edge of enemy country.<sup>10</sup>

The East Texans soon found out that by federal law their terms were only to run for three month periods. Because he needed the Texas horsemen so badly to strengthen his forces, Taylor decided not to discharge them immediately, but instead proposed to reenlist these units upon expiration of their service every three months. Although such an arrangement proved to be extremely shaky, it was all the General could do if he wanted to keep his volunteers.<sup>11</sup>

While Taylor speculated on how to retain them, Wood's regiment fell victim to the same disillusionment that all the volunteers underwent. They began to agitate to return home. They had come to fight Mexcians, and after arriving and finding no enemy, the routine camp existence wore on their nerves. Uncertainty of what lay ahead upset them. Rumors of all descriptions ran rampant through their camp. Sometimes they heard that General Pedro Ampudia stood with an army in San Luis Potosí, while at other times they received reports that fifty thousand Mexicans under Mariano Paredes bivouacked at Monterrey.

Camp conditions also hurt Texan morale. The federal government found it impossible to keep pace with the massive influx of volunteers so that equipment ran short. Tents came at a premium if obtainable at all. Daily rations consisted of "bread, beans, and beef."<sup>12</sup>

The intermittent rains and blazing border heat made life miserable. Mud clung to everything and made existence on a dirt floor extremely uncomfortable. Camp hygiene suffered, especially among these mounted troopers, who, unfortunately, proved to be more undisciplined than the infantry units. Bivouack areas were filthy and mosquito infested. Diarrhea became acute as the regiments organized and the tune of the "Dead March" became a familiar refrain.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, by the end of July, after stationary life had the East Texans at the end of their wits, Taylor directed them to move out. Wood's eastern horsemen left their Point Isabel encampment in the dust on July 24, snaked the thirty miles to Matamoros, thence up the river, starting the last day of the month. Their trek along the banks of the rising Rio Grande was marked by temperatures that seemed to be hotter and hotter as the days passed, so hot that meat broiled in the skillet without a fire.<sup>14</sup>

After a six and one half day march from Matamoros, the East Texans rode into Camargo on August 15. The scene that met their eyes was one of confusion and

desolation. A flood had recently struck the Mexican town and left only the stone buildings standing. A veneer of mud silt covered everything, and disease infestation resulted. With medical facilities virtually absent the illness spread. Amid this squalor, the United States federal army bustled about making its preparations for a drive into the enemy heartland.<sup>15</sup>

The East Texans began to display some reluctance to reenlist when their terms expired and time came for their reorganization at Camargo. As they pitched camp on the San Juan River the urge to return home intensified and only through the cajoling of Colonel Wood, whom they all admired, were they persuaded to stay. To be sure, the East Texas troopers withstood the longing to abort the mission much better than did the other Texas horse regiment; the West Texas force under Hays lost at least one quarter of its manpower during the reenrollment period.<sup>16</sup>

A growing discontent with their role in the campaign added to the hardships already endured by the Second Mounted Texans to foster a great deal of dissatisfaction with the service. Zachary Taylor and even General Henderson, who had taken a leave from the governorship to assume command of the entire Texas force, began to decline in popularity among the members of the eastern regiment. In the advance into Mexican territory Taylor had assigned the daring route from Matamoros to China to Hays' men, while Wood's force had only been ordered to follow the main columns up the Rio Grande River. Furthermore, Colonel Wood felt that the petty escort duties that his regiment received around Camargo were belittling.

Two days after the easterners arrived in the area Wood received instructions to hold ready two units to accompany General William Jenkins Worth's First Brigade to Cerralvo and escort the returning pack mule train. The Colonel dispatched Wheeler's and Goodloe's companies for this assignment. Captain Hall's men had a similar mission to Reynosa. Protesting these menial tasks, the Colonel issued a formal complaint to Henderson.<sup>17</sup>

The northern Mexican campaign caused hard feelings between George Thomas Wood and James Pinckney Henderson. Wood felt that the western horse regiment received preferential treatment concerning issuance of supplies as well as allocation of duties. After Colonel Wood complained, other conflicts ensued between the two men.

General Henderson did not help the already strained situation when he assumed a more direct role over Wood's regiment than he did over Hays' so that by the end of the campaign the East Texans had a double echelon of command. Also, when the Texans finally encountered enemy action, Henderson tactlessly failed to commend the Colonel for performance of his duties. The animosity reached such proportions that after the campaign General Henderson would refer to Colonel Wood as a "great dog," and it continued to grow in the post war years into a bitter political feud.<sup>18</sup>

Wood still kept his command intact. Its ranks, however, underwent a severe pruning during the last days of August. Even though only thirty-three of its members requested their discharges, the East Texas force suffered a great deal of sickness at the Camargo hell hole, and a goodly portion were mustered out on a surgeon's certificate of disability. The eastern mounted men still remained in one unit if for no other reason than the rumor in camp that a fight awaited them in Monterrey.<sup>19</sup>

When Old Rough and Ready laid his plans for plunging his army to Monterrey, he determined to split his forces. He decided to move the main body northwestward through Mier, thence southwest to Cerralvo. Wood's East Texans, along with Colonel Hays' regiment, were detached under Henderson to take up a parallel line of march along the San Juan through Cadereita to effect a rendezvous with the main army at Marín, twelve miles above Monterrey.<sup>20</sup>

On September 12, Colonel Wood's eastern troops linked up with the western regiment at China. From that city the combined Texan force struck a course for Cadereita. The trip proved so uneventful that the Texans often failed to observe adequate precautions by riding in small bodies, and stooping to drink at the nearest water holes. Their trek along the San Juan took longer than Taylor had expected, and the Texans did not arrive at Marín to lead out the advance guard as the General had wanted.

The Texas force did, however, catch up to the invading American army a few miles down the road at the little hamlet of San Francisco on the afternoon of the 18th. While in San Francisco that night Taylor chose the Texans as the advance unit for the following morning. Yet, the western regiment once again received the post of honor by being placed in the forefront of the column while Wood's men comprised the rear section of the advance, just ahead of the main army.<sup>21</sup>

The East Texans caught their first glimpse of the invested enemy at Monterrey by eight o'clock as the sun's rays burned off the morning mists on September 18. Upon this sight, the whole regiment let out a cheer. The fighting they had come so far to see would begin.<sup>22</sup>

The real action began the following day, a Sunday, the second day of the five days around Monterrey. Taylor proposed to attain victory through a bold pincer movement on both ends of the city. The western regiment under Colonel Hays once again received the more daring mission of leading Worth's Second Division in an attack on the west side of the Mexican defenses, while the easterners had the less spectacular duties of staying with Taylor on the east side.

As the Texans under Hays were off winning national fame by storming Federation Hill, Independence Hill, and the western end of Monterrey,<sup>23</sup> the East Texans under Colonel Wood were involved in some important but less sensational events. The East Texas regiment remained in relative inactivity throughout Sunday, the 20th, but on the next day got a chance to move. Taylor received a message from General Worth on Monday to create a diversion on the east side of the city. In response, General Taylor not only moved his troops in to hit his sector of Monterrey, but detached Wood's regiment and sent them to support Worth. Their opportunity seemed to be at hand.

Under the two echelons of command, Henderson's as well as Wood's, the East Texans marched westward, but received orders to countermarch before they had proceeded very far. Taylor had his force strongly engaged on the east end and considered the aid of the Texas mounted partisans necessary for success in his quarter. Before they regained Taylor's position that day, the heavy firing ceased. So it was that the Second Texas regiment actually missed out on the most bitterly contested action, fighting that cost General Taylor more than a ten per cent casualty rate.<sup>24</sup>

On Tuesday, September 22, all was quiet on the eastern front. Early that morning Taylor sent Henderson, Wood, and the East Texans in pursuit of a body of Mexican lancers reported to be making their way to the village of Guadalupe on the Cadereita road. The volunteers returned after riding five or six miles and seeing nothing. The regiment did court a bit of trouble with some mounted rancheros and lancers who stood near the walls of the citadel, the strongest enemy fortification in the valley, but the Mexicans refused to sally out and fight.<sup>25</sup>

Zachary Taylor assured the East Texans some action when he sent General John A. Quitman and his men into the city on Wednesday morning. Quitman reconnoitered the outer-most Mexican defenses and on his own discretion and under heated enemy fire began to penetrate toward the central plaza area. The East Texans were to follow.

General Taylor ordered the Texans under Wood to aid General Quitman's troops who were by then fighting in the streets. He ordered them to get face to face with the

enemy. The East Texans would be working in conjunction with other volunteers and regulars sent into the heart of Monterrey. After detaching Captain Wheeler's company to the east of their main camp to guard against lancers who might be skirting the city, the regiment proceeded to the city's edge to await orders. At eleven that morning they received instructions to dismount and advance.

Lieutenant-Colonel Myrick and Major Scurry, under the command of Henderson and Wood, each led a battalion-sized force. Under intense fire from the rooftops where the Mexican sharpshooters lay hidden, the Texans effected the union with the regulars and began a house to house, street by street struggle of the same dimensions that Hays' men faced across town. Two Texas companies split off to pass up Matamoros Street in a westerly direction so as to help the advancing flying artillery.

As the two units of East Texans reached a position just north of the cathedral, Scurry, with the units of Johnson, Lyons, and Hall at his back, fought his way to within one block of the enormous church. Although the street fighting lasted four or five hours, the Lone Star boys could not turn the heavy barricades that represented General Ampudia's final effort near the grand plaza.

To their disgust, around four o'clock in the afternoon the East Texans received word to pull out. They had fought hard for the ground they had conquered. It seemed that Taylor had called retreat just when they stood on the brink of victory. As the Texas volunteers retraced their steps carrying their five wounded and one dead, they heard the bark of guns from Hays' men on the west side.<sup>26</sup>

The cease fire and negotiations offered by General Ampudia which commenced Thursday morning, September 24, were most unpopular among the East Texans. They especially detested the Mexican commander whom they considered an inept coward and a ruthless killer. Yet, in drawing up the terms, James Pinckney Henderson served as one of the three commissioners representing Zachary Taylor. Although he objected to allowing the Mexicans to retain their side arms, Henderson defended the terms of capitulation as most expedient. As the Mexicans evacuated the city, Ampudia rode out under a heavy escort of United States regular officers that he had requested so as not to fall into the hands of the *Tejanos sangrientes*.<sup>27</sup>

When occupation of the city began, General Taylor had to do something with the Texans. He would not allow them to dally long because they soon began to cause trouble. Taylor felt their discharge would bring a restoration of quiet and order in Monterrey. As soon as they expressed a desire to leave, he let them go home.

At Walnut Springs, Taylor's main camp during the operations, on October 2, federal authorities mustered out all but one of the units of the Second Texas regiment. Goodloe's company had gone to Cerralvo and was discharged twelve days later. The emancipated Texas warriors began to filter back overland to Camargo via Cerralvo in the warm fall weather.

The East Texans left Monterrey in small groups amid a general state of frolick after sampling an ample amount of Mexican liquor. From Camargo they proceeded by water to Point Isabel, thence by steamers to the various ports nearest their homes. Their fellow citizens received the returning soldiers with barbeques and banquets for the East Texas Regiment, as well as the West Texans, had served their state and nation well.<sup>28</sup>

Although the East Texans had served admirably, their part in the northern campaign remained in relative obscurity because they were eclipsed in the contemporary accounts by the deed of Jack Hays and his westerners. Wood's regiment always seemed to stand in the background. Narratives of Texas participation in the Mexican War by later historians have strengthened this eclipse. Indeed, what might be termed a Texas Ranger mystique began with such contemporary accounts as Samuel S. Reid, *Scouting*

*Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers* (Philadelphia, 1848), S. Compton Smith, *Chile Con Carne or The Camp and The Field* (Milwaukee, 1857), and George Wilkins Kendall's reports in the New Orleans *Picayune*. Walter Prescott Webb in his excellent work *The Texas Rangers; A Century of Frontier Defense* (Boston and New York, 1935), almost formalized this trend to emphasize the activities of the western regiment in northern Mexico. But there were other Texas horsemen in the capture of Monterrey. They were not old-time Rangers, just hardy, willing East Texans, and their story should be preserved.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Taylor to Adjutant General, April 26, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 196 (serial 485), 29 Cong., 1 Sess., 120; *Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, May 6, 1846.

<sup>2</sup>General Order No. 1, Adjutant General's Office, Austin, May 2, 1846.

<sup>3</sup>Clarksville *Northern Standard*, May 13, 1846; Elizabeth Yates Morris, "James Pinckney Henderson" (unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Texas, 1931), 93-94.

<sup>4</sup>Compiled Service Records of Volunteer Soldiers Who Served During the Mexican War in Organizations from the State of Texas. National Archives Microcopy No. 278, a compilation made by the War Department during the 1890's from original muster rolls, monthly returns, payrolls, and other pertinent documents; subsequently cited as *Compiled Service Records*. In this case *Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 1 and 2, company and individual jacket files; Justin H. Smith, *The War With Mexico* (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1963), I, 163-165, 173-175.

<sup>5</sup>*Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 1 and 2, 7 and 8, company and individual jacket files.

<sup>6</sup>*Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 7 and 8, regiment, company and individual jacket files.

<sup>7</sup>*Compiled Service Records, La Grange Intelligencer*, June 6, 1846. The names Moderators and Regulators came from a Shelby County feud of the early 1840's in which over fifty men lost their lives, and finally involved most of East Texas. Although Sam Houston had quelled the near civil war just a few years before, the two companies coming from the county seem to have taken the names in a rather jovial spirit since they travelled together with no disturbance.

<sup>8</sup>James K. Holland, "Diary of A Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXX (July, 1926), 1-2, 6-9, 11-13; *Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, May 6, June 3, 1846.

<sup>9</sup>Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 1-2, 8-9, 11-13; Taylor to Adjutant General, July 31, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 1 Sess., 47; *Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 7 and 8, regimental and individual jacket files; S.H. German, "Governor George Thomas Wood," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XX (January, 1917), 262.

<sup>10</sup>Matamoros *American Flag*, August 9, August 12, 1846; Emory Upton, *The Military Policy of the United States* (New York, 1968), 203; George W. Smith and Charles Judah (ed.), *Chronicles of the Gringos* (Albuquerque, 1968), 40.

<sup>11</sup>Taylor to Adjutant General, June 24, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 34; Taylor to Adjutant General, July 16, 1846, *Ibid.*, 43; Taylor to Adjutant General, July 31, 1846, *Ibid.*, 46-47.

<sup>12</sup>Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 12-23; *Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, July 8, 1846; William Pitt Ballinger to Laura H. Jack, August 21, 1846, Betty Ballinger Collection, Manuscripts Division, Rosenberg Library; *Compiled Service Records*, Roll 7, company jacket files; Taylor to Adjutant General, May 20, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 27.

<sup>13</sup>Thomas D. Tennery, *The Mexican War Diary of Thomas D. Tennery*, edited by D.E. Livingston-Little (Norman, 1970), 23, 25-35; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 12-24, 31, 33; Samuel S. Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers* (Philadelphia, 1848), 26, 125; William Preston Johnston, *The Life of General Albert Sidney Johnston* (New York, 1878), 135; Houston *Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, July 8, 1846; Austin *The Texas Democrat*, August 26, 1846.

<sup>14</sup>Smith, *The War With Mexico*, I, 480; *Compiled Service Records*, Roll 7, company jacket files; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 15-16.

<sup>15</sup>Smith, *The War With Mexico*, I, 212; Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 32-33, 36; Houston *Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, August 19, 1846; Taylor to Adjutant General, September 2, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 131-132.

<sup>16</sup>Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 18-19, 21; *Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 1, 2, 7, and 8, individual jacket files; Henry W. Barton, *Texas Volunteers In the Mexican War* (Waco, 1970), 52-53.

<sup>17</sup>George T. Wood to General James P. Henderson, August 28, 1846, reproduced in Figure II, Talmadge Levell Buller, "The Life and Times of George Thomas Wood," (unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Houston, 1952); Barton, *Texas Volunteers In the Mexican War*, 52; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 20; Matamoros *American Flag*, August 23, 1846.

<sup>18</sup>Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 14, 20; George Thomas Wood to General James P. Henderson, August 28, 1846, reproduced in Figure II, Buller, "The Life and Times of George Thomas Wood"; Llerena Friend, *Sam Houston, The Great Designer* (Austin, 1954), 180, 187, 196; Marilyn McAdams Sibley, "Albert Sidney Johnston In Texas" (unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Houston, 1961), 77-80; Morris, "James Pinckney Henderson," 122; Ralph A. Wooster, "Early Texas Politics: The Henderson Administration," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, LXXIII (October, 1969), 187-192.

<sup>19</sup>*Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 7 and 8, individual jacket files; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 22.

<sup>20</sup>Taylor to Adjutant General, September 12, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 199 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 119; Zachary Taylor to R.C. Wood, September 10, 1846, William H. Sampson (ed.) *Letters of Zachary Taylor, from the Battle-fields of the Mexican War* (Rochester, 1908), 54.

<sup>21</sup>Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 141; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 22-23; Smith, *The War With Mexico*, I, 235-236; Orders No. 120, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 215.

<sup>22</sup>Henderson to Taylor, October 1, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 97; Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 142-143; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 23-25; Smith, *The War With Mexico*, I, 237.

<sup>23</sup>Worth to Bliss, September 28, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 103; Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 151.

<sup>24</sup>Twiggs to Bliss, September 29, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 101-102; Henderson to Taylor, October 1, 1846, *Ibid.*, 97; Taylor to Adjutant General, October 9, 1846, *Ibid.*, 84.

<sup>25</sup>Henderson to Taylor, October 1, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 97; Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 189; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 25.

<sup>26</sup>Taylor to Adjutant General, October 9, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 87; Henderson to Taylor, October 1, 1846, *Ibid.*, 97-98; Quitman to Hamer, September 28, 1846, *Ibid.*, 95-96; *Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, November 16, 1846.

<sup>27</sup>Otis Singletary, *The Mexican War* (Chicago and London, 1960), 42; Morris, "James Pinckney Henderson," 102, 108-109; *Houston Democratic Telegraph and Texas Register*, July 1, November 2, November 16, 1846; *Matamoros American Flag*, October 7, 1846.

<sup>28</sup>Taylor to Adjutant General, September 28, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 4 (serial 497), 29 Cong., 2 Sess., 82; Taylor to Adjutant General, October 6, 1846, House Exec. Doc. No. 119 (serial 500), *Ibid.*, 146; *Compiled Service Records*, Rolls 7 and 8, company jacket files; Holland, "Diary of a Texas Volunteer In The Mexican War," 27-31; Reid, *Scouting Expeditions of McCulloch's Texas Rangers*, 225, 229-232.

## 1855: THE KNOW-NOTHING CHALLENGE IN EAST TEXAS

by  
Waymon L. McClellan

In 1855 the nativistic American (Know-Nothing) Party burst into Texas with the suddenness of a thunderstorm, stirred the state politically, and carried a number of men into office before being permanently defeated in 1856 by a hastily organized Democratic party. Prior to 1855 few ripples had disturbed the quiet surface of Lone Star politics. But beneath the surface currents moved. As the state elections of 1855 neared, Americans prepared to challenge Democratic supremacy.

As Know-Nothings readied to make their bid for power, unsuspecting Democrats plodded on, heedless of warnings by Democratic newspapermen that party organization was essential. Alarmed by the increase in the Whig vote in 1853, R. W. Loughery, well-known editor of the *Marshall Texas Republican*, urged Democratic organization, remarking that "the supineness of the people, the extent of our state, and the want of cheap travelling facilities," made early pleas for a state convention of 1855 necessary. Primarily to nominate candidates for state offices, the convention was to have the secondary role of reconciling the party's Unionist and States Rights' factions.<sup>1</sup> But when the convention met at Huntsville on April 21, delegates from only twelve counties attended, endorsing E. M. Pease and D. C. Dickson as incumbents for governor and lieutenant-governor. The editor of the *Texas State Gazette* promptly posted the two names for re-election.<sup>2</sup>

Then came the Know-Nothings.

Posing as a river improvement convention, the Texas Grand Council of the American Party met June 11, 1855, at Washington-on-the-Brazos and adopted two resolutions. The first authorized the grand secretary to inform each subcouncil of the party's nominees and made each subcouncil responsible for appointing a five member vigilance committee to advance the order's principles and to secure the election of the Know-Nothing ticket. A second resolution charged each council with choosing county electors to defend Know-Nothing principles and to publicize candidates.<sup>3</sup> The convention neither outlined party policies nor drew up a platform.

Know-Nothing nominees for political offices were men of prestige and experience. For governor the convention nominated D. C. Dickson, a medical doctor from Grimes County who had emigrated to Texas in 1841 and had served several terms in the legislature. At the time of his Know-Nothing nomination Dickson was serving as lieutenant-governor.<sup>4</sup> Dickson's opposition to the state system of internal improvements—a plan calling for the state to build, own, and operate railroads—clashed with Governor Pease's views and probably helped him gain the nomination.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to nominating a candidate for governor, the convention chose candidates for lieutenant-governor, land commissioner, Congressman from the Western District, and Congressman from the Eastern District. W. G. W. Jowers, an Anderson County resident and state senator, received the nomination for lieutenant-governor. As candidate for land commissioner the Know-Nothings selected Stephen Crosby, a resident of Travis County serving as chief clerk in the Land Office. John Hancock, a Travis County lawyer and district judge, was selected as the Congressional candidate for the Western District.<sup>6</sup>

---

Waymon L. McClellan is from Tyler, Texas.

For Congressional candidate from the Eastern District (the area east of the Trinity River), the convention chose Lemuel D. Evans of Harrison County over W. B. Ochiltree of Nacogdoches County, an old-line and well-known Whig passed over because of his lack of appeal to Democrats.<sup>7</sup> Evans, a lawyer, had arrived in Texas in 1843 and settled in Fannin County, which he represented in the Annexation Convention in 1845. In 1853 Evans had been a strong contender in the governor's race, particularly in the East.<sup>8</sup>

Word of the Know-Nothing convention swept the state, alarming the Democratic party and prompting a "bombshell" convention which met on June 16. Governor Pease, who had argued that railroads would have to be built at the expense of the state, attended the convention and waived his views on the state system of internal improvements, vaguely promising to cooperate with the people.<sup>9</sup> Members of the convention denounced all secret political factions, specifically condemning the Know-Nothings as enemies of the government. Secrecy, Democrats declared, was the only issue—an issue determined by the American Party's "midnight caucus."<sup>10</sup>

Pease's state system met hot opposition. Easterners felt that they paid the bulk of tax monies,<sup>11</sup> but received scant attention in the building of railroads. Initially, no East Texas papers supported Pease because of his state plan. E. W. Cave, editor of the *Nacogdoches Chronicle*, wanted to support G. W. Smyth of Jasper County, and if Smyth did not run, to back Dickson. Loughery, claiming that the state system would burden the state with debt and taxes, felt that most Texans contested Pease's policies, and, like Cave, wanted to oppose him.<sup>12</sup> Know-Nothing journals, pushing the unpopular state plan as an issue, remarked that all friends of the state system—Democrat, Whig, Know-Nothing, or Nullifier—wanted Pease.<sup>13</sup>

In a circular in which he formally presented himself as a candidate, Pease stressed that he would support any practical plan for railroad construction, reiterating his earlier statement that the state plan would not be an issue. If the state plan were an issue, it would be because the Know-Nothings were making it one. Reassured, Loughery supported Pease, feeling it vital that all Democrats unite behind one candidate in order to defeat Dickson, the Know-Nothing nominee.<sup>14</sup>

Dickson, ignoring nativism and taking a popular stand on the issues of the state plan and the debt bill, a proposal providing for the payment of the Republic's debt with funds received from the sale of public lands, left little for Democrats to attack other than his move from the Democrats to the Know-Nothings. Democrats denounced Dickson as a political opportunist who had once accepted Pease's state plan.<sup>15</sup>

The *Texas State Gazette* had carried Dickson's name as the Democratic candidate for lieutenant-governor, but when his Know-Nothing affiliation became known, Democrats were left without a candidate. Soon, however, county organizations began to advance the name of H. R. Runnels, a wealthy East Texas planter from Bowie County. Democrats considered Runnels sound and reliable on the Know-Nothing question, as he had denied any Know-Nothing affiliation in answering a letter from San Antonio citizens. After the editors of the *Texas State Gazette* gave support to his candidacy in their June 30 issue, Runnels was acknowledged as the official Democratic candidate.<sup>16</sup>

Runnels' opponent, W. G. W. Jowers, the Know-Nothing nominee for lieutenant-governor, campaigned around his home county, preceding his speeches in some areas with anti-Catholic tirades from Baptist ministers.<sup>17</sup> Neither did Jowers escape the charge of opportunism. The *Texas State Gazette* maintained that he would have left the Know-Nothings had he not received the lieutenant-governor's nomination.<sup>18</sup>

Confusion surrounded the candidates for land commissioner. Stephen Crosby, the Know-Nothing nominee, announced shortly before the election that he no longer belonged to the order.<sup>19</sup> Fields, a member of the legislature from Liberty County and a printer by trade, was the Democratic candidate, but controversy surrounded his candidacy also. Some Democratic editors praised him as a faithful Democrat; others suspected him of being a Know-Nothing.<sup>20</sup>

Most of the excitement and controversy of the 1855 election centered around the contest for Congressman from the Eastern District. East Texas Democrats had held a convention in Tyler more than a month before the Know-Nothing state convention, but delegates from only three counties had attended, failing to name a candidate. A week after the state Know-Nothing meeting, a hastily called Democratic convention met in Henderson, likewise producing delegations from only three counties and failing to select a candidate.<sup>21</sup>

Candidates, instead, announced through the press as usual. When three Democrats put their names in contention, observers feared that a spreading of Democratic votes would insure Know-Nothing victory. As insufficient time remained for another convention, the practical solution was the withdrawal of two of the candidates. After consulting friends, Democrats reported, George W. Chilton of Smith County and John T. Mills of Lamar County had decided to abandon the contest in favor of Cass County's Matt Ward.<sup>22</sup>

Both Mills and Chilton published statements giving reasons for their withdrawals. Mills reported that he had foreseen no political emergency, as the Whigs lacked a candidate. Only after beginning his campaign had he heard of the Know-Nothing action at Washington-on-the-Brazos. All three Democratic candidates agreed that a Know-Nothing defeat was the primary objective, Mills wrote, and as a result of a Democratic meeting, he was withdrawing "more than willingly" in order to avoid confusion.<sup>23</sup> In a similar announcement, Chilton placed utmost priority on vanquishing the Know-Nothings, who, he felt, wanted to establish federalism. The party had to be driven "back to the dens of abolitionism." To accomplish the Know-Nothing defeat, he yielded to Ward.<sup>24</sup>

Americans quickly retorted. Evans used the withdrawals of Mills and Chilton to his advantage, capably reversing the burden of secrecy from the Know-Nothings to the Democrats. Three prominent East Texas Democrats, Evans claimed, had met secretly at night in a hotel to decide on a candidate, choosing Ward. The next morning Chilton and Mills had withdrawn.<sup>25</sup> Evans stated that Chilton had been a Know-Nothing for eight months, but had left the order when he could not gain office.<sup>26</sup> Attempting to neutralize the effect of the withdrawals, the Know-Nothing press impugned Ward as the product of a "disunion clique."<sup>27</sup>

Evans disclaimed Know-Nothing membership in speech after speech, stating that he was a conservative Union Democrat.<sup>28</sup> "It has been charged," Evans stated, "that I am the Know Nothing's candidate. It is false and the tongue that uttered it knew it was false." Evans' statements were printed in circular form and distributed, two or three thousand copies going into counties northwest and southeast of Palestine.<sup>28</sup>

Speaking in Marshall, his home, Evans denied membership in any secret society, party, or clique. But, R. W. Loughery countered, a "good source" had declared Evans to be a member of the Marshall Know-Nothing council who had withdrawn in order to state truthfully that he was not a member of any secret society.<sup>30</sup> The "good source" Loughery referred to was Josiah Marshall, the Whig editor of the Marshall *Meredian*, who had switched to the Know-Nothings. In a letter published in the *Texas Republican*, Marshall wrote that he did not say that Evans' name could be found on the books of the

Know-Nothings, but that he had no doubt Evans was a member. Marshall denied saying that Evans had withdrawn. Though complimenting Evans as an "honest, upright, patriotic man," Marshall lacked sympathy for him because of old party loyalties.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, the Marshall *Meredian*, along with the Henderson *Star Spangled Banner* and the Clarksville *Messenger*, supported Evans in the election.<sup>32</sup>

Loughery, seeking to prove Evans the Know-Nothing nominee, cited four proofs: (1) All parts of the state had received the notice of his candidacy about the same time; (2) The men nominated by the convention had all announced; (3) Know-Nothing newspapers supported him; and (4) Evans advocated Know-Nothing principles. Democratic papers, in deciding Evans' status, recalled a conversation in which Evans had told two Tylerites that he had agreed to state Know-Nothing principles in order to get the nomination.<sup>33</sup> Finally, speaking in Palestine, Evans admitted that he had allowed the Know-Nothings to use his name, but only after attending the Democratic fiascoes at Tyler and Henderson and seeing that no Congressional candidate had been chosen.<sup>34</sup>

Confused by Evans' statements, Democratic papers at first seemed ambivalent about opposing him.<sup>35</sup> Loughery had backed Evans until hearing of his participation in the Know-Nothing convention, but, learning of Evans' actions, he was the first to support Ward, doing so because of duty to States' Rights Democrats and to the country.<sup>36</sup> The Jefferson *Herald* and the Henderson *Democrat* pronounced Evans the convention selected nominee.<sup>37</sup> Charles De Morse, long-time editor of the Clarksville *Standard*, emphasized the need to concentrate on one man to beat the "unreliable" who had entered the opposition, but did not name a favorite. Later, hardly a month before the election, De Morse announced that Ward was his choice.<sup>38</sup>

Democratic papers belatedly praised Ward, declaring him the accepted Democratic candidate.<sup>39</sup> Ward, editors wrote, was not only a staunch believer in religious and political freedom, but also a sterling Southerner who would give no favors to abolitionists and freesoilers. In predicting that Ward would go with the South when the "hour of resistance" came and calling for the support of States' Righters,<sup>40</sup> Loughery spelled out the basis for the looming political battles in Texas—a struggle between States' Right proslavers and Unionists.

Evans sought to pass himself off as a Union Democrat who accepted the nativistic attitudes of Know-Nothings. In many instances, especially in the northern counties, Evans reportedly started his addresses by reading and lauding the National Democratic Platform of 1852, then adding his denunciations of Catholics and foreigners "as a sort of graft."<sup>41</sup> Attempting to appeal to the voters' individualism, Evans warned that Democratic editors were trying to dictate to the electorate. While seeking favor with Whigs by acknowledging debt to the great Unionists, Clay and Webster, Evans safely based his philosophy on the revered patriots Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson.<sup>42</sup>

Early favorable comments softened Democratic attacks against Evans. De Morse, for example, had stated that Evans was a long and intimate friend, a gentleman of pure character who should be believed if he said he was not a member of the Know-Nothings.<sup>43</sup> The best attack Democrats could muster was to charge Evans with advocating the voting of foreigners at the National Democratic Convention of 1852, but opposing foreigners in 1855; for being anti-Catholic, but supporting the acquisition of Catholic Cuba; for being enthusiastic for railroads while running for office, but apathetic at other times.<sup>44</sup>

Meanwhile, Matt Ward, Evans' opponent, took a mild stand against the Know-Nothings and emphasized state issues. Calling Know-Nothing secrecy a "flagrant violation of the principles of Republican Government," Ward, nevertheless, felt that the order contained many patriots. Though not Evans' equal as a speaker, the Democratic

candidate possessed a thorough knowledge of the state's business.<sup>45</sup> Calling himself a strict constructionist, he opposed several measures: internal improvements by the Federal government; Pease's state system for internal improvements, as the people did not want increased taxes and the resultant railroads might be sectional; the protective tariff; and the Texas Debt Bill, because the Federal government had no right to dictate the terms of payment. The only positive feature of Ward's presentation was a solid approval of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.<sup>46</sup> The Know-Nothing press tried to link Ward to the Texas and Pacific Railroad and the financial operations of Easterners who were enlisting foreign capital to build a Texas railroad.<sup>47</sup>

Because of illness that confined him during the first part of July and prevented his traveling for several days, Ward had been unable to conduct an extensive campaign, losing two-thirds of the crucial month of July. J. H. Reagan, later Postmaster General of the Confederacy, lamented in a letter from Palestine that Evans' friends were "moving heaven and earth," having the campaign almost entirely in their hands. Reagan, returning from a trip, feared that he was too late to help Ward, though he had answered Evans at Palestine and Crockett.<sup>48</sup>

State legislators and senators were to be elected in August, also, and Know-Nothing candidates were active. In Marshall, home of East Texas' most powerful Know-Nothing organization, Americans met and nominated three men to represent Harrison County in the legislature. Several "abler men" had been passed over, Democrats reported, as they were ex-Whigs, and Marshall Know-Nothings were trying to avoid the stigma of Whiggery.<sup>49</sup> Know-Nothings were said to be claiming eight hundred of Harrison County's eleven hundred votes.<sup>50</sup>

One of the Know-Nothing nominees, A. D. Burress, wrote a letter to the people in which he discussed state issues, illustrating the Know-Nothing attempt to avoid nativism and deal with state topics. Like most East Texans, Burress voiced his opposition to the state plan for internal improvements, criticizing it as a tax-raising idea "fraught with mischief." Neither did Burress condone the railroads being controlled by outsiders, wanting counties to build their own roads. Nor did Burress support the debt bill, writing that Texas should settle the debt in its own way, free from Federal interference.<sup>51</sup>

Because Know-Nothing candidates were in harmony with the people in their opinions on state issues, Democrats generally ignored state topics and tried to turn the campaign into a moral crusade. While Americans strove to trace origins to Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, Democrats sneeringly linked them to the Alien and Sedition Acts and the Hartford Convention.<sup>52</sup> While Americans sought to escape charges of religious intolerance, Democrats jeered them as bigots. While Americans called themselves Unionists seeking to heal sectional divisions, Democrats called attention to the fusion of Abolitionists and Know-Nothings in the North.

Democrats equated unionism with federalism, attacking both as antagonistic to states' rights. De Morse and Loughery, two of the most influential editors in East Texas, labeled the Know-Nothings federalists, Loughery calling the party "federalism in its most odious form." George Chilton, in yielding to Ward, interpreted the Know-Nothing movement as an attempt to establish federalism.<sup>53</sup> Democratic speakers echoed Chilton's allegation. The Texas hero J. P. Henderson, speaking in Marshall, castigated the Americans as a party based on a concentration of power in the Federal government at the cost of states' rights. To Henderson, the choice was between a party stemming from the Constitution and one attacking the sovereignty of the states.<sup>54</sup> Know-Nothing support of states' rights was ridiculed as an attempt to make the party palatable to the South.<sup>55</sup>

Adroitly, Democratic editors gave life to the Satanic Know-Nothing image they had helped create. Know-Nothings, Democrats stated, were disappointed office seekers, Whigs, Abolitionists, and disaffected Democrats joined in fragile alliance.<sup>56</sup> Know-Nothings running for state offices were attacked as bent on self-aggrandizement. Evans was consistently condemned as an "unreliable" who had an "inordinate thirst for office."<sup>57</sup>

The American Party, De Morse scoffed, was the "misnamed successor of the Spanish Inquisition." Not to be outdone, Loughery flayed the Know-Nothings as "the old, wrinkled caste of prostitutes of party, with no more pretension to piety than an unrepentant Magdalen."<sup>58</sup> Democratic spokesmen reduced issues to simple terms—Abolitionists, Free Soilers, and Know-Nothings of the North arrayed against national men of all parties and states. Issues were psychological: free, manly, independent, open discussion opposed by mystery, secrecy, oath-taking, and bigotry. The political duel was "a clear field and a fair contest between intolerance, federalism, and concealment, and deception . . . and open handed, free hearted, and straight-forward Republicanism."<sup>59</sup> Democrats were clearly in the will of God:

To do is to succeed—our fight  
Is wag'd in Heaven's approving sight—  
The smile of God is victory!<sup>60</sup>

Optimistic Democrats predicted victory, declaring that Ward would be elected over Evans by a majority of five thousand to six thousand votes, gaining the middle and southern counties, much of the Whig vote, and a large portion of the vote in the northern counties, where he had the support of the *Clarksville Standard* and the *Dallas Herald*.<sup>61</sup> De Morse, editor of the *Standard*, believed that Ward's home county, Cass, would vote Democratic, although Evans was the presiding judge there. Bowie, where Ward had first lived, was credited with being a Democratic county, but Ward's edge in Bowie County was offset by a predicted Know-Nothing majority in Fannin County, Evans' first home.<sup>62</sup> R. W. Loughery, editor of the *Texas Republican*, argued that Ward could not lose. The support of the entire Democratic press,<sup>63</sup> along with Ward's great personal popularity and the fact that in order to win Evans would have to poll the entire Whig vote as well as three thousand Democratic votes, assured Ward's victory.<sup>64</sup>

Democrats, said to make up a large part of the Know-Nothings, were reportedly deserting Know-Nothing ranks in large numbers in Marshall, Henderson, and Rusk. Senator T. J. Rusk, more than a month before the election, announced that he regarded the "battle with the Know-Nothings as over and the victory won." De Morse professed not a "particle of fear for the result," predicting that "the [Know-Nothing] animal will die, and his carcass be left to putrefy" shortly after the election.<sup>65</sup>

As election day neared, unusual excitement gripped Texans, seeming to amount "to almost a frenzy" with some, and voting was followed by confusion rampant with conflicting reports. "Never have we known in an election, so many incorrect returns set afloat," Loughery wrote.<sup>66</sup> People thirsted for news, the election barometer was jokingly said to be a stage driver from Jefferson. If he arrived in Marshall smiling, Evans' supporters rejoiced; if he came in frowning, Ward's enthusiasts celebrated. A story circulated about a Know-Nothing who wanted information concerning the voting in the counties along the Red River. Meeting a wagoner from Lamar, the Know-Nothing asked about the election in the upper counties. Solemnly assuring the Know-Nothing of his knowledge, the wagoner said that Evans had received a majority of seven hundred or seven thousand votes; he could not remember which.<sup>67</sup>

When an extra from the *Texas State Times* reached Marshall announcing Evans' victory by thirty-one votes, Marshall Americans lit their homes and the courthouse.

Candles were placed on telegraph wires and in trees. Boys with blazing turpentine balls scurried about the square, and "considerable power was burnt."<sup>68</sup>

Next, Loughery carried a story asserting that Ward, with a majority of 153 votes, had been issued a Certificate of Election. The votes from Liberty County, which had given Evans a majority, had been thrown out, Loughery reported, because they had been for M. L. Evans rather than L. D. Evans.<sup>69</sup> Counterbalancing the announcement of Ward's victory was the complaint in the next issue of the *Republican* that returns from Orange County left Ward with a margin of only fourteen votes, dimming hope of a Democratic victory in the East.<sup>70</sup>

Finally, Loughery published the "official vote." No returns were listed for Jefferson and Orange Counties, and no vote was given for Evans in Liberty County. Evans, Loughery announced, had carried the East by a majority of twenty-six votes.<sup>71</sup> Writing from Austin, Loughery reported that Evans had received the election certificate.<sup>72</sup>

The races for governor and lieutenant-governor form the best measures of Democratic and Know-Nothing powers in the East. Pease and Dickson, the gubernatorial candidates, were both West Texans. Of the counties from which returns were located,<sup>73</sup> Pease triumphed with 53 per cent of the vote to Dickson's 41 per cent. Pease carried twenty-two of the twenty-nine counties. Thus, in the election most detached from local prejudices and politics, the Democrats were overwhelmingly victorious.

Both candidates for lieutenant-governor were from East Texas. Runnels, the Democratic candidate, won 46 per cent of the vote to Jowers' 41 per cent. The personal nature of Texas politics was evident, Neill, a resident of upper East Texas, claimed more than 12 per cent of the vote, scoring heavily in the counties along the Red River and carrying Collin and Dallas Counties. The high vote for Neill in the counties near his residence indicates lack of loyalty to either party and a continued attachment to voting for the man.

In the election for land commissioner, Crosby, the Know-Nothing nominee, gained twenty-five counties to Fields' eleven, but the race lacked the excitement of the Evans-Ward struggle. While voters cast nearly 21,000 ballots in the race for Congress, they cast fewer than 18,000 in the race for land commissioner.<sup>74</sup> Both Evans and Crosby had denied Know-Nothing membership. Many Democrats, because of the confusion, were said to have voted for Crosby.

East Texas Know-Nothings elected to the state senate and legislature are difficult to determine, as the legislature organized without regard for party lines, but papers occasionally gave the party of elected representatives. A conservative figure suggests that, statewide, twenty Americans won seats in the legislature and five in the senate.<sup>75</sup> Know-Nothings swept Harrison County, sending A. D. Burress, Nathan Smith, and W. A. Tarlton to the legislature. Other East Texas Know-Nothings elected to the legislature include William Stedman (Rusk), W. B. Ochiltree (Nacogdoches), J. J. Dickson (Red River), and Joseph Martin (Henderson and Kaufman Counties). Elihu Williams (Panola, Shelby, and San Augustine Counties) was said to be an ex-Know-Nothing.<sup>76</sup> John H. Reagan wrote that Know-Nothings had won Anderson County, a victory which would have sent two more Americans to the legislature.<sup>77</sup> Know-Nothings elected to the senate from East Texas include J. W. Flanagan, the editor of the *Henderson Star Spangled Banner*, William M. Taylor, who represented Anderson and Houston Cities,<sup>78</sup> and Robert H. Taylor, who represented Fannin and Hunt Counties.<sup>79</sup>

Both Democrats and Know-Nothings had excuses for lost elections. Runnels and Fields, Marshall Americans claimed, were Know-Nothings who had drawn the votes of

many Americans, some of whom claimed Fields as their nominee.<sup>80</sup> Evans' denials of Know-Nothing membership was important, his claim to be a Democrat capturing a number of Democratic votes and his avowal of Know-Nothing principles luring Know-Nothings.<sup>81</sup> As Evans was considered a good Union man, Democrats reported, he had gained the upper counties. Ward, a States' Righter, had been denounced there.<sup>82</sup> Ward's limited campaign was a convenient excuse, scheduled speeches, such as the one in Tyler, had been cancelled. A pro-American letter Sam Houston had written was said to have been influential in gaining votes for the Know-Nothings.<sup>83</sup> Democrats gave importance to Know-Nothing activity in setting up lodges. Know-Nothings, De Morse claimed, had ordered out members while Democrats, insufficiently roused, had remained at home. Other Democrats had succumbed to the appeals of patriotism and Americanism.

R. W. Loughery laid the Democratic loss of Harrison County to a lack of party organization, urging as a remedy immediate organization and increased circulation of Democratic papers. In summing up the election, he stressed the lesson forced upon the Democracy. "It will," he wrote, "teach the party to be more active and industrious for the future."<sup>84</sup> Needing little urging, a thoroughly aroused Democracy began organizing in preparation for the 1856 elections. Party organization occurred in counties throughout East Texas. Democrats organized in Anderson County, which had been a Know-Nothing county in 1855.<sup>85</sup> At a "large and enthusiastic" meeting in Honey Grove, a town in Fannin County, Democrats plotted to overthrow the Know-Nothings.<sup>86</sup> Residents of Lamar County met at Paris to strengthen party organization and to select delegates to the State Convention.<sup>87</sup> Organization of county units paid early dividends, being the major factor in a Cherokee County election to fill a vacancy created by death. Democrats there registered an increase of forty-one votes.<sup>88</sup>

The introduction of the American Party into Texas quickened the pace of Texas politics and caused the formation of a formidable Democratic party, conservative in philosophy. In contrast to the 1855 State Democratic Convention, which had been attended by delegates from only twelve counties, the 1856 convention attracted delegates from almost every county in Texas. With strong county organizations supporting the work of the state convention, a united Democracy easily turned back the Know-Nothings in the 1856 state and Presidential elections. Thus, by the end of 1856, the Know-Nothing Party was powerless. Know-Nothing victories in 1855 were the only successes of which the Americans could boast.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, October 21, 1854.

<sup>2</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, February 24, 1855; Ernest William Winkler (ed.), *Platforms of Political Parties in Texas* (Austin, 1916), 61-63.

<sup>3</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; Winkler, *Platforms*, 63.

<sup>4</sup>Walter Prescott Webb et al. (eds.), *The Handbook of Texas* (Austin, 1952), I, 501.

<sup>5</sup>William Darrell Overdyke, *The Know-Nothing Party in the South* (Baton Rouge, 1950), 116-17; Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>6</sup>Webb, *Handbook*, I, 931, 438, 763-64; Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; Clarksville *Standard*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>7</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; Clarksville *Standard*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>8</sup>In 1850 Evans was a District Judge residing in Marshall. See microfilm copies of the 1850 census, Texas, Harrison County. Although W. B. Ochiltree, the Whig candidate, carried the East in the 1853 governor's race, Evans defeated the other four candidates, gaining 24 per cent of the ballots to Pease's 20 per cent. The Clarksville *Standard*, September 10, 1853, contains the election returns. Pease's poor showing demonstrated that Westerners met chilly reception in the East. Party labels were unimportant. A vote for Ochiltree was for the man and the section.

<sup>9</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, July 7, 1855; Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>10</sup>Winkler, *Platforms*, 64; Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; Know-Nothing secrecy and ritual was a matter seriously objectionable to non-members. Know-Nothing oath-taking and ritualistic accouterments were the most obvious and easily attacked of American characteristics. East Texas papers carried "exposés" of Know-Nothing eccentricities. The contents of a pamphlet supposedly obtained from a Know-Nothing "soft" appeared in the *Texas Republican*. According to the article (which was lifted from another paper), candidates for membership were to be proposed by loyal members, and if selected, to present themselves for the first oath. After swearing never to divulge any questions asked new recruits, to never give the names of members, or to even admit the order's existence, and to answer each query truthfully, aspirants answered a number of questions: (1) name (2) age (3) residence (4) religion (5) birthplace (6) parents' birthplaces (7) grandparents' birthplaces (8) grandparents' activities during the American Revolution (9) if he agreed to vote for native Americans against all aliens, foreigners, and Roman Catholics. If the initiate ever told any Know-Nothing secrets, he was to be excommunicated. After completing the first oath, the convert learned the signs and grips, and, if doing well for two weeks, was recommended for the second degree. A new oath bound the member to act with the majority in the selection of a candidate and reaffirmed his determination to oppose all foreign influence, Popery, Jesuitism, and Catholicism. After three months, party faithfuls were eligible for the third degree. Kneeling, with his left hand raised and his right hand clutching the American flag, the stalwart again emphasized his earlier commitments and swore to aid all members in distress. Marshall *Texas Republican*, October 7, 1854; September 18, 1855. For a highly emotional "complete exposure" of Know-Nothing oaths, see the Clarksville *Standard*, December 2, 1854. The third degree, as given in Overdyke, *Know-Nothing Party*, 42-43, was a solemn affirmation to support the Union against all attacks.

<sup>11</sup>The Comptroller's report for 1859 showed that one-fourth of Texas' counties, nearly all in the East and Southeast, were assessed for two-thirds of the state's wealth. *The Texas Almanac*, 1860, 204-207.

<sup>12</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, June 16, 1855; Francis Richard Lubbock, *Six Decades in Texas, or Memoirs of Francis Richard Lubbock, Governor of Texas in War Times, 1861-63*, ed. C. W. Raines (Austin, 1900), 196.

<sup>13</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855, quoting the *Nacogdoches Chronicle*.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, June 30, 1855; July 12, 1855; July 21, 1855.

<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, July 21, 1855; July 14, 1855; July 28, 1855.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, July 14, 1855; September 1, 1855; Winkler, *Platforms*, 64.

<sup>17</sup>Letter from John H. Reagan quoted in *Clarksville Standard*, August 18, 1855.

<sup>18</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 7, 1855, quoting the *Austin Texas State Gazette*.

<sup>19</sup>Overdyke, *Know-Nothing Party*, 117.

<sup>20</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; September 1, 1855; *Tyler Reporter*, November 17, 1855.

<sup>21</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, March 17, 1855; March 24, 1855; May 5, 1855; June 30, 1855.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, June 30, 1855; July 7, 1855.

<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, July 7, 1855; *Clarksville Standard*, July 21, 1855.

<sup>24</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, August 4, 1855, quoting from a summary of Evans' June 30 speech in Palestine as reported by the *Palestine Advocate*.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, July 28, 1855, from Evans' Marshall speech of July 25.

<sup>27</sup>*Ibid.*, quoting a Know-Nothing paper, the *Clarksville Messenger*, July 20, 1855. Because of the personal nature of Texas politics, the withdrawals of Chilton and Mills conceivably aided Evans. A citizen of Tarrant County remarked that Evans could carry that area as Chilton had withdrawn. *Clarksville Standard*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>28</sup>*Ibid.*, August 11, 1855, citing the *Palestine Advocate*. The *Washington Ranger* claimed that Evans had been in Washington-on-the-Brazos during the Know-Nothing convention and had denied Know-Nothing membership before nearly one thousand people. Article in the *Clarksville Standard*, August 18, 1855.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, August 18, 1855, quoting a letter from John H. Reagan dated July 29, 1855.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, June 30, 1855; July 28, 1855.

<sup>31</sup>Letter from Marshall, *Ibid.*, August 4, 1855.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, July 21, 1855.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, July 7, 1855; July 28, 1855; *Clarksville Standard*, July 7, 1855; July 14, 1855.

<sup>34</sup>Quote from *Palestine Advocate* in *Clarksville Standard*, August 11, 1855.

<sup>35</sup>This is not to say that Democratic editors were soft on Know-Nothingism once its surge into Texas became known. Loughery, who had established the *Texas Republican* in 1849, came out early against the Americans. He was not one to dodge a fight, recognizing that highly-emotional political issues were the editor's lifeblood. "What is a paper without party politics?" Loughery asked in 1854. Papers without politics, Loughery continued, were "a perfectly wishy washy affair, devoid of interest or merit." *Marshall Texas Republican*, November 18, 1854. Charles De Morse, editor of the *Clarksville Standard*, made no empty claim when he asserted that he was "unequivocally and unswervingly Democratic and opposed to all ultraism, including Know-Nothingism." *Clarksville Standard*, May 17, 1856. For summaries of the lives of Loughery and De Morse see *The Encyclopedia of the New West* (Marshall, Texas, 1881), 501-502, 260.

<sup>36</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, June 30, 1855.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, quoting the *Dallas Herald*.

<sup>38</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, June 30, 1855.

<sup>39</sup>*Ibid.*, July 14, 1855.

<sup>40</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>41</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, August 18, 1855.

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*, *Marshall Texas Republican*, June 30, 1855.

<sup>43</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, July 7, 1855. A week later De Morse spoke differently. Evans, De Morse wrote, was "of good mind, though erratic," and was "not practically useful." Ambition had caused him to stray from his principles. *Ibid.*, July 14, 1855.

<sup>44</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, June 30, 1855; July 7, 1855.

<sup>45</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>46</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, June 30, 1855.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, July 21, 1855, quoting the Know-Nothing paper the *Clarksville Messenger*; St. Clair Griffin Reed, *A History of Texas Railroads* (2d ed.; Houston, 1941), 99.

<sup>48</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, July 14, 1855; August 18, 1855; *Marshall Texas Republican*, June 30, 1855.

<sup>49</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, August 4, 1855.

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, June 30, 1855; August 11, 1855; March 10, 1855.

<sup>53</sup>*Clarksville Standard*, June 23, 1855; letter in *Marshall Texas Republican*, July 7, 1855.

<sup>54</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, August 4, 1855; May 19, 1855.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*, April 28, 1855.

<sup>56</sup>T. J. Rusk in *ibid.*, July 14, 1855; George H. Chilton in *ibid.*, July 7, 1855; J. P. Henderson, *ibid.*, May 19, 1855.

<sup>57</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, June 30, 1855; July 7, 1855.

<sup>58</sup>*Ibid.*, July 21, 1855; Marshall *Texas Republican*, March 17, 1855.

<sup>59</sup>Tyler *Reporter*, November 17, 1855; Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>60</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, July 21, 1855; Tyler *Reporter*, November 17, 1855.

<sup>61</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>62</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, August 4, 1855.

<sup>63</sup>East Texas Democratic papers known to support Ward in the election include the *Palestine Advocate*, established by A. E. McClure in 1855; the *Jefferson Herald*, with Ward Taylor publisher; the *Marshall Texas Republican*, started by R. W. Loughery in 1849; the *Nacogdoches Chronicle*, E. W. Cave editor; the *Clarksville Standard*, begun in 1842 by Charles De Morse; the *Henderson Democrat*, edited by M. D. Ector and James Estill; the *Tyler Reporter*, established in 1854 by James Estill, but published in 1855 by Jack Davis; the *Dallas Herald*, founded by J. W. Lattimer in 1849; the *Rusk Sentinel*; and the *Daingerfield Lamplighter*. Know-Nothing papers publishing in East Texas during the election were the *Marshall Meridian*, edited by Josiah Marshall; the *Clarksville Messenger*, published by \_\_\_\_ Thomas and \_\_\_\_ Darnell; and the *Henderson Star Spangled Banner*, published by J. W. Flanagan. Of the above publishers, M. D. Ector and Jack Davis were elected to the legislature in 1855, and J. W. Flanagan won a senate seat.

<sup>64</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855.

<sup>65</sup>*Ibid.*, July 21, 1855; July 14, 1855; Clarksville *Standard*, July 14, 1855; July 21, 1855.

<sup>66</sup>Marshall *Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; September 29, 1855.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, November 3, 1855.

<sup>68</sup>*Ibid.*, October 20, 1855.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, November 10, 1855, quoting the *Galveston News*.

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.*, November 17, 1855, quoting the *Texas State Gazette*.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, November 10, 1855. On November 6 Governor Pease issued Evans a Certificate of Election reading, "It appears that Lemuell D. Evans received the highest number of votes" in the Eastern Congressional District. File #2-13/324, Texas State Archives. An examination of the election returns in the State Archives found returns from Orange County and Evans' return from Liberty County. There were no returns from Jefferson County. The Orange and Liberty Counties votes, added to the official results as given by Loughery, gave Evans a majority of forty-four votes out of a total of 20,714.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.*, November 24, 1855. Of the twelve counties casting more than seven hundred ballots, Evans and Ward each carried six, with Evans averaging 61 per cent of the vote in the six he carried to Ward's 56.3 per cent average in his six counties. Evans' strength lay almost entirely in the populous upper half of the district.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*, September 1, 1855. Returns supplied by librarian, Texas State Archives. The returns from thirteen counties were not included; returns from four counties located in newspapers.

<sup>74</sup>Computed from figures in *ibid.*, November 10, 1855.

<sup>75</sup>Rupert Norvai Richardson, *Texas, the Lone Star State* (Englewood Cliffs, 1958), 129. Overdyke set the figures at thirty and nine. *Know-Nothing Party*, 117. Overdyke's numbers are closer to the figures of the Americans, who boasted of eleven Americans in the senate arrayed against twenty-two Democrats. *Marshall Texas Republican*, December 15, 1855. The names, but not the party, of Texans elected to the state legislature and senate in 1855 are listed in *Members of the Legislature of the State of Texas from 1846 to 1939*, ed. Tommy Yett (Austin, 1939), 22-25. Americans probably claimed some politicians who took an independent course. Jack Davis, for example, the Democratic editor of the *Tyler Reporter*, was charged with having consented to become a Know-Nothing mouthpiece. The accusation, Davis answered, was false, but he was devoted to principles, and would vote as he saw fit. *Marshall Texas Republican*, December 22, 1855. Senator Scott of Harrison County was said to have Know-Nothing leanings because he reportedly had voted for Dickson. *Ibid.*, March 14, 1857. J. S. Devereux, a wealthy Rusk County planter elected to the legislature, noted that Know-Nothings made a poor showing in securing positions in the legislature. Dorman H. Winfrey, *Julien Sidney Devereux and His Monte Verdi Plantation* (Waco, 1962), 111. A feeble and unsuccessful attempt to pass a nativistic resolution was the only partisan action of Know-Nothings in the legislature. Overdyke, *Know-Nothing Party*, 117.

Overdyke, *Know-Nothing Party*, 117.

<sup>76</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, October 11, 1855; *Marshall Texas Republican*, September 1, 1855; August 25, 1855.

<sup>77</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, August 11, 1855. As Taylor was an Anderson County Know-Nothing elected to the senate, there is a good chance that the two representatives, J. H. McClanahan and Benjamin Parker, were Know-Nothings also.

<sup>78</sup>Taylor re-entered the Democrats before the 1857 election. *Ibid.*, April 4, 1857.

<sup>79</sup>Winkler, *Platforms*, 69.

<sup>80</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, September 1, 1855.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.*; Clarksville *Standard*, August 11, 1855.

<sup>82</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, July 28, 1855; *Tyler Reporter*, November 17, 1855; Clarksville *Standard*, August 11, 1855.

<sup>83</sup>Lubbock, *Memoirs*, 196. Shortly before the election both Democratic and Know-Nothing papers had carried Houston's pro-American letter. In it he wrote that "whilst the triumph of American principles were reverberating throughout the Union, I was silent. When those principles are said to be in eclipse I come forward with cheerfulness and declare that I believe the salvation of my country is only to be secured by adherence to the principles of the American order." *Marshall Texas Republican*, August 11, 1855. See also Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker (eds.), *The Writings of Sam Houston of Texas* (Austin, 1942), VI, 192-99.

<sup>84</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, September 15, 1855; November 24, 1855.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*, October 20, 1855.

<sup>86</sup>Clarksville *Standard*, November 3, 1855.

<sup>87</sup>*Ibid.*, November 24, 1855.

<sup>88</sup>*Marshall Texas Republican*, December 22, 1855.

## A NACOGDOCHES COMPANY IN THE CONFEDERATE ARMY OF NEW MEXICO

by Martin Hardwick Hall

One of the first mounted companies to be raised for Confederate service in Nacogdoches County was that of John F. F. Doherty. From the time of muster through the New Mexico campaign, this unit had three company commanders, the last of whom was a university president.

Captain Doherty, the son of James H. and Mary (Foster) Doherty, was born in Cumberland County, Kentucky, on December 21, 1820. When four years old, Doherty moved with his parents to Illinois, then to Missouri, and next to Tennessee. At twenty-one, Doherty migrated to Texas. He arrived in the Lone Star State on May 9, 1842, and made his home on a farm in Nacogdoches County. While visiting in Tennessee, he married Elizabeth J. Maxwell on October 22, 1844.<sup>1</sup> The Census of 1850 lists Doherty as a farmer residing in Nacogdoches County with his wife and two children. His real estate was valued at \$150. Ten years later the census lists Doherty as a farmer living near Briley, Nacogdoches County, with his wife and six children. His real estate had increased to \$1,200, and his personal property was cited as \$457.<sup>2</sup> He apparently owned no slaves. Doherty enrolled his company in Nacogdoches, Nacogdoches County, on September 12. The unit was mustered into Confederate service for "the war" at Camp Sibley, near San Antonio, as Company H, 4th Regiment Texas Mounted Volunteers on September 29, 1861.

On October 12, eleven days before the company left Camp Sibley for El Paso, Doherty, because of illness, resigned his commission and returned to his home. Private Benjamin Livingston Rusk, the eldest of seven children born to famed Thomas Jefferson and Mary F. "Polly" (Cleveland) Rusk was subsequently elected captain.<sup>3</sup> Rusk was born in Clarksville, Habersham County, Georgia, on February 24, 1828. He arrived in Nacogdoches with his mother and two brothers about December 23, 1835, his father having preceded them that January. The Census of 1850 shows that Rusk was an unmarried farmer residing in the home of his parents near Nacogdoches. His real estate was valued at \$800. On August 25, 1850, he was initiated into Milam Lodge No. 2, A. F. & A. M. in Nacogdoches.<sup>4</sup> Three years later on April 7, 1853, he married Rachel A. Crain. The Census of 1860 records that Rusk was a farmer living near Nacogdoches with his wife and four children. His real estate was assessed at \$15,000, and his personal property at \$8,500. He was the owner of eight slaves.

Possibly because he proved unpopular with his men, Rusk resigned on February 3, 1862, while in New Mexico, and left for Nacogdoches. William Lee Alexander, who had previously transferred to the Regimental Artillery as a corporal, was elected commanding officer. Alexander, the fourth of the six children of William Julius and E. Catherine (Wilson) Alexander, was born in North Carolina (probably Mecklenburg County) on May 21, 1833. Alexander's family was one of prominence: his grandfather was a graduate of Princeton and his father, after graduating from the University of North Carolina in 1816, became a lawyer and Jacksonian politician. The latter served in the House of Commons from Mecklenburg County from 1826 until 1830 when he became Solicitor. He returned to the House and served as speaker from 1833 to 1835. President James K. Polk appointed him Superintendent of the Branch Mint at Charlotte in March, 1847. Upon leaving this post in July, 1849, he took his family to McDowell County where he engaged in the practice of law. The Census of 1850 shows that nineteen year-old William Lee Alexander was a student residing in the home of his parents.

---

*Martin Hardwick Hall is a Professor of History at the University of Texas at Arlington.*

Young Alexander enrolled in the University of North Carolina where his father was a trustee from 1827 to 1856. He was awarded the bachelor of arts degree in 1854, the highest of his class. After two years as an engineer with the Blue Ridge Rail Road of South Carolina, Alexander returned to his alma mater to fill the post of tutor of Latin.<sup>5</sup> In February, 1860, he arrived in Nacogdoches, Texas to accept the post of president of Nacogdoches University (the term began February 10). For one week Alexander resided in a hotel, during which time the census taker reported that he was an unmarried "College President" with personal property valued at \$1,000. He temporarily moved into the home of Dr. James Harper Starr, a trustee, until suitable quarters were ready at the university building. With the outbreak of the war, Alexander resigned the presidency and joined Captain Doherty's company as a private.

As part of General Henry Hopkins Sibley's Army of New Mexico, Company H took part in the battles of Valverde and Glorieta and the skirmish of Peralta. Of the eighty-three men on this roll, two resigned, one deserted, eight were discharged, and two transferred to the Regimental Artillery prior to leaving San Antonio for the West. On the eve of the invasion of New Mexico, one resigned, and two transferred to—while another returned from—the artillery, leaving Company H with sixty-eight effectives. During the campaign five were killed or died of wounds (three at Valverde and two at Glorieta), eight were wounded (six at Valverde and two at Glorieta), and seventeen were taken prisoner, including three who had been wounded. One prisoner was exchanged and two others were sent to Camp Douglas, Illinois. One of the wounded later died of disease, as did one of the prisoners. In addition, one died of disease during and four died after the disastrous campaign. One man who was left behind sick at El Paso was taken prisoner. With the return of the three men from the artillery, Company H arrived in San Antonio with no more than forty-three men fit for duty. After a period of rest and recuperation, Company H was to see extensive action in the Louisiana theatre of operations.

An asterisk (\*) indicates a soldier who joined shortly after the first muster roll of September 29, 1861 was drawn up.

John F. F. Doherty, Captain, 41 (resigned because of illness October 12, 1861)

William H. Harris, First Lieutenant, 24 (resigned October 14, 1861)

Francis M. Rainbolt, Second Lieutenant, 26 (treated at Doña Ana Hospital January 5-20; in El Paso Hospital with rubeolae June 6-17, 1862)

Giles B. Crain, Second Lieutenant, 22 (reported sick at El Paso May 31, 1862 by Captain Alexander)

Albert A. Nelson, First Sergeant, 47 (wounded at Glorieta and taken prisoner at Santa Fe Hospital; sick at Fort Union; paroled at Santa Fe Hospital August 19, 1862 and sent to Texas)

John H. McKnight, Second Sergeant, 29 (killed at Glorieta)

William H. Yarborough, Third Sergeant, 24 (detached to General Sibley's escort, n.d.)

Jesse Lee, Fourth Sergeant, 30 (promoted second sergeant March 29, 1862)

William H. Jones, First Corporal, 39

Thomas J. Hill, Second Corporal, 22

William Poe, Third Corporal, 23 (entered El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 20; died at San Felipe Springs July 11, 1862)

William L. Eddins, Fourth Corporal, 33 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)

Robert B. Johnson, Bugler, 22 (died at Doña Ana May 13, 1862)

**PRIVATES:**

- Acrey, Abner, 21 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)
- Alexander, William Lee, 28 (transferred to Regimental Artillery as corporal; elected captain February 4, 1862)
- Allen, Andrew Bennett, 20 (on extra duty as herder February 6-20; in El Paso Hospital with typhus and scorbutus May 4-June 1, 1862)
- Anderson, James M., 18 (discharged October, 1861)
- Basey, William, 19
- Boone, James R., 24
- Boykin, Henry B., 22
- Boykin, Thomas J., 24
- Brewer, William M., 22 (discharged October, 1861)
- Bruton, Rufus G., 17
- Burns, John R., 38 (transferred to Regimental Artillery as corporal February 4, 1862)
- Casey, Rufus M., 24 (left as attendant at Santa Fe Hospital and taken prisoner; paroled May 24, 1862 and sent to Mesilla)
- Castles, James R., 18 (wounded at Valverde)
- Cessna, Green K. Jr., 23 (left at Socorro Hospital and taken prisoner; paroled at Fort Craig April 23, 1862 and sent to Mesilla)
- Coats, Napoleon B., 23 (wounded at Valverde)
- Coon, Edwin F., 22
- Cooper, James G., 32 (taken prisoner; paroled from Santa Fe Hospital May 24, 1862 and sent to Mesilla)
- Dees, Andrew J., 34 (in El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 15-23, June 6-21; in El Paso Hospital with diarrhea June 30-July 2, 1862)
- Eddins, Andrew B., 31 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)
- Finley, Charles R., 30 (elected first lieutenant October 14, 1861; reported sick at El Paso on May 31, 1862 by Captain Alexander)
- Garrett, Charles R., 26 (died of disease at Fort Stockton June 29, 1862)
- Graham, Edward S., 18
- Graham, John G., 24
- Griffith, Alfred, 33
- Hardwick, William L., 25 (wounded at Valverde)
- Henson, William H., 18 (discharged October, 1861)
- Hotchkiss, Atanacio, 18 (deserted October, 1861)
- Johnson, John W., 22 (taken prisoner at Santa Fe and exchanged; entered El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 22, 1862)
- Jones, Jesse W., 18 (died in Santa Fe April 7, 1862 of wounds received at Glorieta)
- McCustian, William S., 28
- McIntosh, John W., 19 (detailed as teamster November 15-December 31, 1861)
- Millard, John J., 19
- Moore, Henry H., 24 (in El Paso Hospital with rubeolae June 6-11, 1862)
- Moore, Rufus C., 22 (promoted fifth sergeant February 8, 1862)

- Morgan, William H., 18
- Norvell, John E., 18
- Orton, Richard D. "Dick", 20
- Pitts, Thomas T., 28 (wounded at Valverde)
- Raguet, Charles Mansfield, 27 (promoted fifth sergeant n.d.; appointed acting second lieutenant of Regimental Artillery January 8, 1862)
- Rainbolt, Walter S., 22 (in El Paso Hospital with rheumatismus and bronchitis June 6-17, 1862)
- Richardson, Samuel T., — (discharged October, 1861)
- Rogers, Joseph C., 18 (wounded at Glorieta; left at Santa Fe Hospital and taken prisoner; paroled May 24, 1862 and sent to Mesilla)
- Rusk, Benjamin Livingston "Ben", 33 (elected captain October, 1861; resigned February 3, 1862 and immediately left for home)
- Rusk, Cicero, 26
- Russell, Marion, 25 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled at Santa Fe Hospital August 19, 1862 and sent to Texas)
- Russell, Moses W., 28 (lost an arm at Valverde and left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; died of disease at Santa Fe Hospital June 17, 1862)
- Scoggin, James I., 32 (left as attendant at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)
- Scoggin, Toliver S., 19 (left at Socorro Hospital and died February 27, 1862)
- Scoggin, William J., 35 (promoted fourth sergeant March 29; in El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 17-26; with diarrhea June 6-22, 1862)
- Sharp, Joseph H., 18 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)
- Starr, James Franklin, 18 (detached to Regimental Artillery; promoted first sergeant on February 24 and detailed as clerk in Adjutant General's office February 24-May 25, 1862)
- Stone, Samuel H., 23 (discharged October, 1861)
- Stode, James A., 19 (entered El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 15, 1862)
- Sutphen, David S., 23 (discharged October, 1861)
- Sutphen, George W., 21
- Tindall, Elisha J., 23 (wounded at Valverde and died at Socorro Hospital March 21, 1862)
- Tindall, William, 19 (entered El Paso Hospital with rubeolae and febris typhoides May 24, 1862)
- Wade, Henry H., 18 (discharged October, 1861)
- Walton, J. K. T., 20 (transferred from Company D, 5th Regiment September 10, 1861; killed at Valverde)
- Weatherly, Edward M., 26 (left at Santa Fe Hospital and died of pneumonia August 31 or September 15, 1862)
- Weatherly, Hiel, 23 (left at Santa Fe Hospital and taken prisoner April 15; paroled August 19; received at Gratiot Street Prison, St. Louis December 21, 1862; at Camp Douglas March 21, 1863; exchanged)
- Weaver, James A., 18

- Whitaker, Madison F., 19 (entered El Paso Hospital with rubeolae and ophthalmia May 22; with diarrhea June 6-22, 1862)
- White, Devreaux C., 25 (left at Socorro Hospital; taken prisoner at Albuquerque April 16; sent to Camp Douglas and exchanged at Vicksburg September 22, 1862)
- White, Hardy Nelson, 18 (wounded at Valverde and left at Socorro Hospital; taken prisoner; paroled at Fort Craig April 23, 1862 and sent to Mesilla)
- White, John T., 19 (left at Socorro Hospital; at Albuquerque Hospital May 11; paroled May 26 and sent to Mesilla May 29, 1862)
- Williams, James Thomas, 25 (killed at Valverde)
- Williamson, John, 30 (discharged October, 1861)
- Wisener, Richard P., 17 (admitted El Paso Hospital with typhoides erysipelas June 1 and died July 30, 1862)
- Wisener, William M., 18 (in El Paso Hospital with rubeolae May 22 and left behind; taken prisoner and paroled September 1, 1862)

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>*A Memorial and Biographical History of McLennan, Falls, Bell and Coryell Counties, Texas* (Chicago, 1893), 533-34.

<sup>2</sup>The Census of 1860 erroneously lists Doherty's birthplace as Tennessee, rather than Kentucky.

<sup>3</sup>In the Confederate Army the men of each company elected their commissioned and non-commissioned officers.

<sup>4</sup>Biographical data courtesy of Mr. W. C. Tipton, former Secretary of Milam Lodge No. 2, A. F. & A. M., Nacogdoches.

<sup>5</sup>Biographical data courtesy of Dr. William S. Powell and Mrs. Carolyn A. Wallace, The University of North Carolina Library.

<sup>6</sup>Biographical data courtesy of Mr. Forrest E. Bradberry, Jr., Palestine, Texas.

**"MORONS," MONKEYS AND MORALITY:  
REACTIONS TO THE SCOPES TRIAL IN TEXAS**

by Charles R. Wilson

During July of 1925 the state of Tennessee tried a young high school science teacher, John T. Scopes, for violation of its law prohibiting the teaching of evolution in the public schools. Although the Scopes trial occurred in the small town of Dayton, Tennessee, its significance was not limited to one community or even one state. The trial, with William Jennings Bryan as prosecuting attorney and Clarence Darrow as Scopes' defense lawyer, was front-page news throughout the United States and since then has been seen as the peak of the Fundamentalist movement of the 1920's.<sup>1</sup>

The Scopes trial occurred at a time when the Fundamentalist movement was strongest in Texas. An unsuccessful attempt to pass legislation similar to that in Tennessee had been tried in 1923 and again in February of 1925. Although the 1925 bill was favorably reported from the Committee on Educational Affairs it failed to pass both houses of the legislature.<sup>2</sup> More importantly, one of the leaders of the Fundamentalist movement, J. Frank Norris, was located in Texas as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Fort Worth. Since the early 1920's Norris had led in attempts to prevent the teaching of evolution at state-supported and denominationally-supported schools. He was successful in causing the dismissal of several professors, and bragged that he had removed "eight anthropoid apes," commonly known as professors, from Baylor University in Waco.<sup>3</sup> As a result the state was agitated over the evolution question intermittently throughout the decade.

The Scopes trial evoked comment from concerned Texas newspapers, religious leaders, and educators. An examination of these reactions during and shortly after the trial reveals that, like the legislative battle and the controversy in the universities, the trial simulated the discussion of science and religion in Texas. But the trial was even more important than that; it was to Texans symbolic of a clash of values and ways of life. Fundamentalists felt that evolution involved more than just monkeys. To many religious people evolution represented the worst of the modern world and its values, which threatened true morality. The Scopes trial touched more than just Fundamentalist fears, though. The defenders of evolution in Texas were themselves beset by fears. These people were afraid that their society was not changing rapidly enough to meet the challenges of the modern world. To these educated people the laughter of the outside world was more annoying than its morality. Both religious leaders and educators believed that they had much to lose, and this explains much of their defensiveness.

On a superficial level the trial at Dayton produced reactions one would expect from a front-page news item. The trial and the evolution issue were keynotes for numerous advertisements, including a Dallas department store, an Austin jewelry store, a Waco loan company, and a swimming supply company ("Don't Moneky Around and be Content to Just Paddle About"). These advertisements were typically accompanied by pictures of monkeys.<sup>4</sup> The utilization of the trial for such a purpose set the tone for many who failed to take it seriously. The same point seemed to emerge from the mock trials that occurred in several cities. A salesman's club in Sweetwater and the weekly San Antonio Optimist Club meeting used live monkeys in their mock trials, while in Fort Worth an Episcopal minister participated in a comical courtroom scene.<sup>5</sup>

Indeed, one cannot examine events in Texas connected with the Scopes trial without discovering humorous and unusual occurrences. The Negro pastor of a Dallas Baptist church lost his job because he told his congregation that they were descended from apes. The pastor was even taken to court to prevent such future teaching. "I may have come from an ape," said one member of the congregation, "but I want legal proof."<sup>6</sup> Estelle McClure of Dallas, who claimed to be the great-great niece of Jefferson Davis, was just as concerned. During the trial she announced the completion of a scenario for a motion picture dealing with evolution. The first part of the movie was to be a literal rendition of the book of Genesis, while the latter part would "indict the Darwinian hypothesis through broad allegory." Although she took her script to California, the movie industry, which was a frequent target of Fundamentalist attacks, evidently did not get beyond the first part of the scenario.<sup>7</sup>

Newspapers did more than just report such reactions. The Dayton trial was a popular topic for editors' comments in the summer of 1925, and editorial response was overwhelming in its dismissal of the trial's seriousness. The *Temple Daily Telegram* urged an early end to the "useless discussion." Its editorial "The Circus Comes to Dayton" noted than an inappropriate holiday atmosphere surrounded the trial.<sup>8</sup> The Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* agreed, finding the entire entertainment mood "repugnant." An editorial cartoon with the title "Playing It for All It's Worth," accurately conveyed the notion that the trial was an advertising venture concocted as much by local Dayton merchants as by Scopes and the state of Tennessee.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, after the trial was completed, the *Dallas Morning News* commented that it was "a spectacle for the delectation of the flippant and the consternation of the saints." Unfortunately, though, "it lacked a good deal of being Armageddon." All the principal figures of the trial, it felt, were disappointing.<sup>10</sup>

Newspapers sometimes commented on the trial through brief fillers on editorial pages. These generally were off-hand and humorous remarks about Dayton and the participants in its trial. For instance, one filler charged the city with trying to remove the "k" from "monkey," while another thanked it for chasing movie stars from the front pages.<sup>11</sup> George M. Bailey, who wrote fillers for the *Houston Post-Dispatch*, characterized the trial as a combination of "law, ballyhoo, religion and photography." He even composed a lyric for the Dayton court to sing: "The elephant now goes round and round/The band beings to play,/And the little boy near the monkey's cage/Had better keep away."<sup>12</sup> It was a bad song but it captured the carnival spirit of the trial as perceived by most newspapers and many other Texans.

Some editors felt that important issues were involved in the Scopes trial but that it was naive to think the trial could settle any of them. The *Galveston Daily News* concluded that America's refusal to take Dayton seriously was the most heartening aspect of the controversy. It would be depressing indeed, the editor observed, if a courtroom in a small town could decide issues of freedom of thought and religious faith.<sup>13</sup> The *Austin American* pointed out that most Americans did not see the trial as a real test of freedom of thought. "Unlearned though the public may be, it nevertheless has a sense of proportion," an editorial said. The trial was "too ridiculous for words" to most people; "truly in their eyes 'monkey business.'"<sup>14</sup>

A favorite target of editorial reaction was William Jennings Bryan. Some lampooned him with humor, as in the *Houston Post-Dispatch*, which said that Bryan would either score a hit in Dayton, or "get his base on bawls."<sup>15</sup> The Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* charged Bryan with bringing more contempt on religion than any scientist could. Indeed, one cartoon painted him closing the door on science.<sup>16</sup> Bryan was singled out, not only because he was prosecutor at the Scopes trial, but also because he was the best known Fundamentalist at the national level and because of his political reputation. Several

newspapers felt that Bryan was merely trying to regain the prominence he had once had. The *Austin American* charged, somewhat prophetically, that if Bryan could not have the spotlight his heart would fail to function. Three days after the trial Bryan died of a heart attack in Tennessee.<sup>17</sup>

Bryan's few defenders were among the small town weekly papers, which made little mention of the trial but which did carry articles on the death and burial of Bryan. They preferred to remember his past glories rather than his role as a Fundamentalist. "The world has been made better for his having lived," was the judgement of the *Granger News*, and a typical comment of the rural newspapers.<sup>18</sup> Of the daily papers the *Galveston Daily News* was Bryan's staunchest defender. It observed that the Commoner emerged from the trial as a more dignified figure than the agnostic Darrow. The paper felt that Darrow and many Northerners at the trial were contemptuous of all things Southern, especially the Southern religion.<sup>19</sup> This defensive attitude was prevalent elsewhere in Texas, but most newspapers were proud to disassociate themselves from what they considered to be anti-intellectual attempts to prevent the spread of science through "a little trial in a little backwoods court!"<sup>20</sup>

Texas newspapers generally dismissed the importance of the Scopes trial, but religious leaders and educators did not. They believed that the trial involved significant issues which when resolved could threaten them. In the religious world, the trial was the basis for many sermons and revivals. A San Angelo Baptist church advertised its coming revival as an attempt to collect a "menagerie of evolutionists," surround them with a spiritual environment, and sweat the devil out of them. "If you have been 'monkeying' with yourself, we want you in our cages."<sup>21</sup> Several summer encampments of Baptists expressed opposition to evolution, urging Baptist-supported schools to immediately dismiss any professors teaching evolution.<sup>22</sup> The Baptists were not the only ones noting the trial and its issues. The Seventh-Day Adventists held their annual South Texas Conference during July of 1925, and one of its organizers viewed the trial in prophetic terms, as indicating the approaching end of the world. "The present fight on evolution is the contest between Christ and anti-Christ referred to in the Bible."<sup>23</sup>

An integral part of religious leaders' rhetoric was the assurance that science was not on trial at Dayton because true science and religion could not conflict. D. C. Dove, editor of the *Baptist Progress* in Dallas, was explicit about his view of the role of science in the trial. Darrow, he said, was trying to make science the main issue, but "science is in no way involved in that trial. No scholar claims that evolution is a science. Science is founded on facts found, while evolution is at best only a very poor guess."<sup>24</sup> Another minister defined science as a systematized statement of the laws of nature and claimed that the *Origin of Species* did not fit this definition since it was an unproven hypothesis.<sup>25</sup>

W. F. Bryan, pastor of the First Methodist Church in Austin, believed that while science and religion were not contradictory, evolution and the Genesis account of creation were antithetical and irreconcilable. He centered his attacks on the lack of a missing link connecting one species to its predecessor in the evolutionary scale. To prove itself as a scientific fact, he said, evolution would have to "take a horse, lift it out of its species and make it a cow, bridging the gap between two species in development."<sup>26</sup> Arthur J. Drossaerts, bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of San Antonio, similarly emphasized that evolution was only a theory. He complained that those scientists who did believe in the validity of Darwin's theories were giving the uneducated the impression that evolution was a fact, when it was only an hypothesis with, he admitted, some evidence in its favor but not conclusive proof. "Science has nothing to say on this particular phase of the question," he insisted.<sup>27</sup>

The official vote of the Southern Baptist Convention in Texas was the *Baptist Standard*, published in Waco, and it, too, repeatedly denied that science was on trial at

Dayton. At the start of the trial it remarked that the only issue was whether the laws of Tennessee should be obeyed. The editor stated, with some exaggeration, that he did not know a single member of the Southern Baptist Convention who opposed science. Southern Baptists did oppose, the editor admitted, "the teaching of science, falsely so-called," but he felt there was "a vast difference between the established facts of science and unproven theories of philosophy and pseudo-science which are exploited and paraded in the name of science."<sup>28</sup>

This insistence that they did not oppose true science reflected a defensiveness on the part of these religious leaders. As the trial progressed, the *Baptist Standard* became ever more defensive, observing that opponents of the Bible at great expense had come to Dayton with the aim of questioning the authority of the Christian scriptures. "Along with a denial of the supernatural," the paper said, "has been shown a regrettable and surprising sectional feeling against and a contempt for, Southern ideals and institutions." The editor cautioned against bitterness toward these opponents of the "religious beliefs of the Southern people."<sup>29</sup>

One draws closer to the real significance of these attacks on evolution with the realization that many religious leaders thought of the doctrine more in religious terms than in scientific terms. They argued that since the Constitution prohibited the teaching of religious doctrines in schools, and since the teaching of Christianity was generally excluded from school curriculums, then evolution should also be excluded because it stated a creation story with religious overtones. Baptist minister H. C. Morrison wrote a column for an Austin newspaper in which he chastened the scientist for pronouncing on spiritual matters. This was "professing wisdom above his field."<sup>30</sup> Another minister remarked that Christian faith "destroyed in the name of Biology" was just as dead "as if it were destroyed in the name of Beelzebub."<sup>31</sup>

Although religious leaders insisted that science was not on trial in Dayton, they just as firmly maintained that the nation's morality was on trial. This was the real issue to the Fundamentalists. Acceptance of evolution was, they feared, the first step in a campaign that would weaken the morality of the young. R. W. Bailey, assistant pastor of a Dallas Baptist church, speaking on "The Ape Case in Dayton, Tennessee," observed that if Scopes was not convicted, within twenty years the nation would see a generation of infidels. "Evolution is a tool of the devil spewed up from out of the bottomless pit to destroy the Bible and drag God's people down to destruction," he said. Such a statement indicated no room for compromise. The claim of some to be able to harmonize the Bible with evolution he dismissed as only "anesthetic" so they could "swallow the dose more easily."<sup>32</sup> One Houstonian was just as upset; he felt evolution was a worse menace than alcohol, the great evil to most Southern Fundamentalists. He agreed that the "evolution theory itself is of the devil," because it broke the moral fiber of the young. By destroying their faith in the Bible's accuracy on evolution, it destroyed the young's faith in Christian moral teachings as well.<sup>33</sup>

Pierre B. Hill, pastor of First Presbyterian Church in San Antonio, wrote a book in 1925, *The Truth About Evolution*, in which he drew together these religious views of the roles of science and morality in the Dayton trial. Hill discussed science's role in the controversy, arguing that while science was not dangerous to religion the unsubstantiated assumptions of some scientists were destructive. Moreover, the tendency of evolution was upward, indicating that humanity and the universe were improving, and this conflicted with the idea of the fall of man.<sup>34</sup>

But Hill's strongest remarks were reserved for evolution's effects on the life of the young. He attributed the change in morals during the 1920's to evolution's effects. If you teach man that he is an animal, the minister wrote, then he will act like an animal. Along with the teaching of Darwin's theory in schools and universities had come

a marked deterioration in the morals of youth. A disregard for conventionalities; a lack of sense of shame evidenced in the undue exposure of the body; dances changed from the conservative and rhythmic types to those borrowed from the lowest tribes of Africa, Argentina and the Orient. The names given these dances, for example, the Turkey Trot, the Bunny Hug, the Grizzly Bear, the Camel Walk, the Flea Hop, and others all give evidence of the degrading effect of evolutionary teaching upon the life and character of youth.<sup>35</sup>

Hill felt Darwinism was responsible for the spirit of the age, justifying the sensualist in his degradation, Prussian militarism in its violence, and Bolshevism in its anarchy. He reflected the defensiveness of many religious people, remarking that he resented the implication that those who opposed evolution were "absolutely devoid of observation and human intelligence."<sup>36</sup>

Hill voiced Fundamentalist concerns but the real leader of the movement in Texas was J. Frank Norris. Norris had been permanently expelled from membership in the Southern Baptist Convention in 1924 because of his divisive tactics, but he had power stemming from his position as pastor of one of the largest churches in the country. He spoke to a different audience than the *Baptist Standard*, which held a moderate position. A large part of Norris' appeal was his showmanship. A typical performance was his appearance before a large crowd in a circus tent at an Arlington revival shortly after the Scopes trial. Moving around the platform, with a Bible in one hand and a newspaper in the other, he had been known to use live monkeys to dramatize his remarks on evolution, but at this meeting he limited himself to defining evolution, praising Bryan, and challenging Darrow to a series of debates in which he vowed to "skin the skunk's hide from him from one end of the country to the other."<sup>37</sup>

Norris did not miss any opportunity to campaign against evolution. Earlier in 1925, when the state legislature was considering a bill to outlaw the teaching of evolution, Norris appeared before the House and declared that he would never remain silent when evolutionists tried to "ram down the throats of Southern Baptists that hell-born, Bible-destroying, deity-of-Christ-denying, German rationalism known as evolution."<sup>38</sup> His appeal obviously was not to a calm consideration of the issues, but that was probably one reason for his effectiveness. He was a propagandist and a very active one. The week before the Scopes trial he was in Seattle at the Northern Baptist Convention trying to organize an attempt to expel modernists from the main body of the church. After saying that he planned to go to Dayton to observe the trial, Norris made these comments on the theory of evolution:

The scientists say now that everything came from the amoeba and that it would take a man 250,000 years to count a pile of them the size of a pinhead. After billions and trillions and quadrillions of years some of them put on scales and some of them developed fins and osme [sic] of them feathers and some of them feet and tails, and then went swinging in the branches of the trees.

And some of the little ones got cheated out of the trees and went and hid in the caves and lost their hair and got bald-headed. And then they put on clothes and became professors at the University of Chicago.<sup>39</sup>

Norris evidently did not see the trial as a blow for the Fundamentalist movement, despite the death of Bryan. He invited the official stenographer of the trial to his church in order to give an account of the trial.<sup>40</sup> For Norris the Scopes trial was only one event in his continuous battle against evolution in Texas.

One of the weaknesses of the Fundamentalist movement was the lack of unity among its members. For instance, Norris' extremism alienated many people, including

James B. Cranfill, who was the elder statesman of the movement in the twenties. Already famous as the vice-presidential candidate on the Prohibition ticket in 1892 and as editor of the *Baptist Standard* at the turn of the century, Cranfill was at age sixty-seven still actively opposing the teaching of evolution. During the trial he even challenged an out-of-state minister who had been critical of Bryan to a debate on evolution.<sup>41</sup> Several months after the Scopes trial Cranfill wrote to a friend that it was time for every person of prominence to declare in unequivocal terms a position on evolution. "All of this pseudo-scientific stuff is plain rot to me," he said. "I do not believe we are descended from brutes, nor do I believe that these pseudo-scientists know any more about how the world came into being than a deaf and dumb rabbit."<sup>42</sup> He too could see no compromise, for if evolution was a scientific fact it would undermine the Bible, the concept of revealed religion, and the miracles in the Bible. As a result he said he was "unalterably, eternally and unqualifiedly opposed to Darwinian evolution."<sup>43</sup>

Not all ministers, of course, rejected evolution. Liberal Christians were an important force in opposing Fundamentalist attempts to prevent the teaching of evolution in schools. Sometimes moderate churchmen pointed out the shortcomings of both extreme Fundamentalists and scientists, as did a San Antonio Presbyterian minister who preached a sermon on "Foolish Fundamentalists" one week and discussed "Senseless Scientists" the next.<sup>44</sup> Another minister attacked the "shallow enemies of science" as well as the "insectile gadflies and barnacles" who engaged in "prejudicial warfare" against religion.<sup>45</sup>

Other liberal ministers went even further and endorsed evolution. Unitarian pastor Edward Day of San Antonio argued that evolution broadened man's view of the Divine Being and provided a basis for hope about the universe. He believed that evolution could lead to a "nobler conception of God than the anthropomorphic one described in the second chapter of Genesis." Significantly, he recognized that one had to accept evolution if he wanted to be known as a modern man.<sup>46</sup> Frank Atkinson, of the First Congregational Church in Houston, felt that the discovery of mankind's birth through evolution was refreshing and not destructive of religious faith. He made a quaint analogy between this discovery of mankind's true origins and a man's recognition that he did not come from the stork. When a child realizes the stork story is a myth he merely has to make an adjustment. "Of course 'God made man'; and a mature understanding of what that means is like a mature understanding of what it means to say 'God made me.'" All that had to be surrendered was mankind's misinterpretation.<sup>47</sup>

Liberal ministers had much in common with educators on the evolution issue. But educators as a group responded less to the issues raised by the Scopes trial than did religious leaders. Many must have felt like Lee R. Tag, a young student at Southwestern University in Georgetown. He went back to his hometown of Cameron for the summer of 1925, and while there observed that everyone was, to use his word, "agog" over the evolution issue. Moreover, in his community, like other small towns, "the drug store theologians and garage high financiers are the ones that know it all." He complained that the college educated were dubbed "cranks and smart alecks," and related that someone told him to crawl off and die if he believed in evolution. One old lady even accosted him on the street and questioned him about what he was learning at Southwestern. Tag considered himself an educated man and was defensive about, as well as proud of, his acceptance of evolution.<sup>48</sup>

The *Daily Texan* of the University of Texas was similarly defensive, observing that the Fundamentalists had "thrown down the gauntlet in formal challenge to the school of biological science which is attempting to explain the evolution of the higher and specialized order of living organisms . . ." The *Texan* quarrelled with Bryan's claim that the trial was a duel to the death. Such a decisive clash between opposing ideas, it

said, had to be fought out in the spirit of inquiring minds. That criteria automatically excluded Bryan.<sup>49</sup>

The Scopes trial prompted a Childress public school teacher, Dan Mowrey, to write a letter castigating those preachers who condemned the evolution theory, even though they knew no more about it than he did. Mowrey confessed that he had never taught evolution but since the theory was accepted by many educated men he felt it should not be quickly dismissed. To do so would be "the most absurd and ridiculous thing I can think of."<sup>50</sup>

Not many public school teachers responded to the trial, but several college professors did. John Granbery, Professor of sociology at Southwestern University, had already made his stand as a staunch civil libertarian and opponent of the Fundamentalists. In 1922 he had resigned in anger as head of the departments of history and economics at Baylor College in Belton because he was required to answer a questionnaire about his religious beliefs. Granbery was a religious man who published articles in Nashville's *Christian Advocate*, one of the best-known religious papers in the South, but he felt it was "absurd" to belittle science, which provided mankind with a generally accurate picture of the objective world. Of course such a picture was not the complete one and had to be supplemented by religious insights, but science could not be ignored.<sup>51</sup>

Another professor, Carl Hartman, zoology teacher at the University of Texas, was not an active opponent of the Fundamentalists, but did respond to the trial in a speech to the Austin Young Men's Business League. He defended scientists, saying that they were not like Bryan, "able to get by with statements which contain but a modicum of truth." Evolution, to Hartman, was simply a tool, a useful way to classify facts. "It is part of our business to knock theories into cocked hats, and we would willingly knock the evolution theory into a cocked hat, if we could find a better one to take its place."<sup>52</sup>

Not all educated people took the Dayton trial seriously; for instance, J. W. Calhoun, mathematics teacher at the University of Texas, argued in a humorous speech that all Tennesseans did not believe in a flat earth. He said that since man constantly engaged in "monkey business" man, but not woman, was descended from the chimpanzees.<sup>53</sup> He did not explain why women failed to ape the men's behavior.

However, the most detailed and incisive critique by an educator of the issues raised at the time of the Scopes trial came from a teacher who was a strongly religious man. Frederick Eby, former professor at the University of Chicago and Baylor University, was in 1925 Dean of the School of Education at the University of Texas and was in charge of the summer school classes there during 1925. On July 10, the day the Scopes trial started, Eby made a speech before the Austin Lions Club, in which he labelled the trial "a war of morons" between church bigots and scientific determinists. The intellectual life of the American people was on trial in Dayton and if the "church bigots" won then "we will revert to ancient standards of living in the Dark Ages." Church interference in educational affairs was to him the "most diabolical and damnable enemy of mankind." In response to that statement his audience applauded for almost a minute.<sup>54</sup>

Eby did not view the trial as a harmless prank, but approached it in the same spirit as many religious leaders. However, whereas religious leaders believed that America's civilization could not survive the destruction of morality stemming from acceptance of evolution as fact, Eby and other educators felt that America's civilization was in danger due to the curtailment of academic freedom. Eby was especially critical of Bryan, noting sarcastically that one could have sympathy for a man who, with such an extensive vocabulary, could not imagine his own evolution from "an animal which has only twelve noises for a vocabulary."<sup>55</sup>

The Austin educator, who the week before the speech had taught his usual Bible class at a Baptist church, was no uncritical defender of science. As well as attacking the Fundamentalists, he indicted the "morons who are teaching biology without seeing God." Nevertheless, he felt that the greatest danger came from the Fundamentalists. If evolution was not taught, then academic freedom would be abolished and intellectual progress would halt. The real issue was an ominous one. "If biology is attacked, all sciences are attacked," he concluded. Science did not always conform to a literal interpretation of the Bible, and if biology was undermined then astronomy, which had been curtailed in the past, would be next to be censored. He maintained that the Fundamentalists were needlessly raising a false issue, for a correct interpretation of evolution did not conflict with a correct reading of the genesis account of creation.<sup>58</sup>

What was the importance of the Scopes trial in Texas? In the area of legislation there was little effect. State senator J. D. Parnell of Wichita Falls predicted that an anti-evolution bill would be introduced in the legislature in 1926 and he insisted that he would oppose it. Another state senator, W. S. Moore of Gainesville, similarly argued against adoption of an evolution law. He saw no need for one since religion was in no danger from scientific ideas. "Truth and fact," he wrote, "is eternal and is in conflict with no true religion and always benefits humankind."<sup>57</sup> As it turned out no bill was introduced until 1929 and it failed to pass then.

However, a law against the teaching of evolution was not really needed to accomplish the goals of the Fundamentalists since such teaching had been effectively eliminated from Texas schools in October, 1925, less than three months after the close of the Scopes trial. A resolution adopted on October 15 by the Texas State Textbook Commission stated "that all objectionable features in science texts shall be revised or eliminated to the satisfaction of the revision committee . . ."<sup>58</sup> In effect this meant that references to evolution were to be deleted from books adopted for use in public schools. The book *New Essentials for Biology*, which was the textbook that Scopes had used in Tennessee, was offered to the Commission but it refused altogether to accept that book. One book which was adopted was Truman J. Moon's *Biology for Beginners*, but the Commission ordered the deletion of three chapters dealing with evolution. In other books particular phrases were excised, although entire chapters were not removed. The term "evolution" itself was disturbing to the Commission so "development" was substituted for it. One pious member of the Commission even urged that the word "evolution" be taken from the dictionary, but the board decided that the dictionary was not really a state textbook. Publishers reacted to the ruling by putting out two editions of their textbooks, one for Texas and other Southern states and the other for the rest of the country.<sup>59</sup>

Litter adverse reaction to this action was heard in the state. When questioned about the order, superintendent of the San Antonio schools Marshall Johnson said that he did not object because he approved of the "old-time religion."<sup>60</sup> But to a few the Commission's decision seemed to be a coup on an unsuspecting public. One Dallasite was concerned that not a single politician, teacher or office-holder had raised a complaint against the ruling. "We are a helpless, disorganized army," he observed, "and as long as we continue to drag along as we have, we shall be defeated in every contest."<sup>61</sup> The *El Paso Herald* was one of few newspapers to comment on the situation. It felt that young Texans would not be deterred from the truth by this act of censorship. "Progressive Texas fears no dark ages and only asks that Texas clowns be not taken seriously."<sup>62</sup>

Governor Miriam Ferguson was the chairwoman of the Texas Textbook Commission and the leading force in adoption of the ruling. She had been elected in 1924, despite opposition to her by the Fundamentalists, but in Texas Fundamentalists and fundamentalists could agree on the evil of evolution, if nothing else. *Ferguson's Forum*,

the weekly newspaper published in Temple by Miriam's husband, ex-governor James E. Ferguson, printed stories and letters critical of evolution, as well as weekly columns of moral instruction by the Governor.<sup>63</sup> Miriam did not consider herself an enemy of education; indeed, on the day of the Commission's ruling she proclaimed the observance of education week throughout Texas. "The age of ignorance is forever past," she declared, "and the light of education continues to dispel from every corner of the Nation the hindrances of unenlightenment. Progressive civilization depends upon progressive education."<sup>64</sup> But evolution was to have no part in progressive education. Concerning the material excluded from the textbooks, she said, "I'm a Christian mother . . . and I am not going to let that kind of rot go into Texas textbooks."<sup>65</sup> Miriam Ferguson was known throughout the state as Ma Ferguson.

The exclusion of evolution material from textbooks was a tangible effect of the renewed discussion of evolution at the time of the Scopes trial. It suggests, moreover, that one cannot argue arbitrarily that the trial marked the high point of the Fundamentalist movement. The trial was a dramatic and symbolic high point, but that should not obscure the fact that the controversy continued at the local level in varying degrees of intensities. For instance, the year after the trial, the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting in Houston, voted to ban the teaching of evolution at denominationally-supported schools.<sup>66</sup>

At any rate, many observers have noted that the trial's real significance was less tangible than influencing textbook commissions. Rather, the trial was important in stimulating the discussion of science, a discussion which destroyed the Fundamentalists. The evidence in Texas indicates that this was partially true. Several libraries reported a rise of interest in books on evolution. A Fort Worth reporter made a survey of book sellers in that city and discovered that, judging by sales, the most popular book was *Origin of Species*. The same reporter examined books on evolution in the public library and observed that nearly all were well thumbed and had marginal notes.<sup>67</sup> Some perceptive observers realized that the trial would have the effect of stirring interest in evolution and science. A columnist for the *Dallas Morning News* decided that the effect of Dayton would be to bring "the subject of evolution into the light of day. Heretofore it has lurked in laboratories and chattered in conventions of scientists . . . Men will now be somewhat less ashamed to say they originated in lower forms of life and graduated through apedom."<sup>68</sup> The *San Antonio Express* agreed that one result of the trial would be "a general revival of popular interest in Charles Darwin and his works."<sup>69</sup>

Even so, such an education in science could have only a long-range effect. Judging by the textbook committee ruling and the continuation of Norris' efforts in Texas, science was not suddenly popularized nor was evolution made acceptable to the people who had opposed it before the trial. For one thing, the same libraries that reported the popularity of science books also noticed an equal vogue for theology books. As the *Temple Daily Telegram* remarked, the Scopes trial made people think about the Bible as well as science. Moreover, much of the discussion of evolution was conducted by religious people, whose goal was to discredit the theory. Thus, when the Young Man's Bible class at an Austin Presbyterian church announced it was meeting to study evolution, that did not necessarily mean that evolution was better understood after the meeting than before.<sup>70</sup>

The Scopes trial did increase the discussion of science but that did not automatically mean Fundamentalists were crippled by such a discussion. The implication that increased discussion of evolution would dissipate its opposition was an incorrect one. Individuals who listened to Fundamentalist leaders such as Norris tended to be poorly educated; they were not likely to be interested in or affected by the spread of information on science. Those better-educated people, such as Cranfill, who also were

Fundamentalists, had already read Darwin before the trial and still did not accept his ideas. They perceived a very real threat to their literal interpretation of the Bible. They believed that morality was the real issue of the Scopes trial, and that was more important than scientific ideas. Certainly, the re-emergence of anti-evolution forces in the last decade indicates that forty more years of the popularization of science and evolution has not resolved the issue. In truth, the decline of the organized Fundamentalist movement of the 1920's was due to several factors—Bryan's death and the loss of a national leader, the renewal of interest in the Prohibition issue in 1926, the concern over social issues with the coming of the Depression.<sup>71</sup> More enlightenment on evolution and science by itself could not have undermined the movement.

In Texas the Scopes trial was only one of a number of events during the 1920's that stirred interest in evolution and caused attempts to circumscribe the teaching of evolution to the young. Perceptions of the trial varied with the degree of importance one attached to the issues involved. While newspapers contemptuously dismissed the trial, religious leaders and educators ironically were united in believing it important. Fear was the basis of their agreement; newspapers did not share these fears and this explains their attitude toward the trial. The controversy was never really resolved; it simply faded from the forefront of popular concern as Fundamentalists became exhausted from the dissipation of their energies on a number of different issues and Texas and the nation became preoccupied with other interests.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Louis Gasper, *The Fundamentalist Movement* (Paris, 1963), 18; Donald F. Brod, "The Scopes Trial: A Look at Press Coverage After Forty Years," *Journalism Quarterly*, XLII (Spring, 1965), 219; John Thomas Scopes, "Reflections—Forty Years After" in *D-Day at Dayton*, ed. Jerry R. Tompkins (Baton Rouge, 1965), 30; Blake Smith, "The Evolutionary Controversy: Remembrance and Reflection," in *Darwinism in Texas*, ed. Thomas F. Glick (Austin, 1972), 36.

<sup>2</sup>*Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas*, 39th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Austin, 1925), 386, 682, 1787.

<sup>3</sup>J. Frank Norris, *Inside History of First Baptist Church, Fort Worth, and Temple Baptist Church, Detroit: Life Story of Dr. J. Frank Norris* ([Fort Worth? 1938?]), 159.

<sup>4</sup>Austin *American Statesman*, July 26, 1925, 3, July 31, 1925, 5; Dallas *Morning News*, July 19, 1925, Sect. 1, 3; Waco *Times-Herald*, July 19, 1925, 3; Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 26, 1925, 7; San Antonio *Express*, July 19, 1925, 7. Unless otherwise noted, future newspaper references are to 1925.

<sup>5</sup>Sweetwater *Daily Reporter*, July 14, 4; San Antonio *Express*, July 2, 22; Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 28, 4.

<sup>6</sup>Austin *American*, July 12, 1.

<sup>7</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 26, Sect. 3, 7.

<sup>8</sup>Temple *Daily Telegram*, July 15, 4, July 4, 4, July 7, 4.

<sup>9</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 4, 4, July 18, 4; Dallas *Morning News*, July 8, 1.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, July 23, 14.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, July 12, Sect. 3, 4, July 16, 14; Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 16, 6. See also San Antonio *Express*, July 15, 12; Galveston *Daily News*, July 17, 4. After Bryan remarked that the trial was a duel to the death between evolution and religion, a filler in the Dallas *Morning News* asked "will the loser be a good sport and play dead?" After the trial the same paper noted, "Now that the battle to the death is over, who's dead?" Dallas *Morning News*, July 24, 14, July 10, 14.

<sup>12</sup>Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 12, Edit. Sect., 6, July 15, 6.

<sup>13</sup>Galveston *Daily News*, July 11, 4.

<sup>14</sup>Austin *American*, July 2, 4.

<sup>15</sup>Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 13, 6. The trial was in July, the middle of baseball season. The ubiquitous Tennessee monkey even appeared in a sports cartoon. Dallas *Morning News*, July 19, Sect. 2, 1.

<sup>16</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 26, 4; Dallas *Morning News*, July 13, 1.

<sup>17</sup>Austin *American*, July 9, 4, July 14, 3; Sweetwater *Daily Reporter*, July 13, 2.

<sup>18</sup>Granger *News*, August 6, 4. See also Naples *Monitor*, July 31, 1.

<sup>19</sup>Galveston *Daily News*, July 22, 4.

<sup>20</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 24, 8. Texas newspaper reaction was in line with other papers nationally. Darrow complained that "most of the newspapers treated the whole case as a farce instead of a tragedy." Darrow, *The Story of My Life* (New York, 1932), 249.

<sup>21</sup>San Angelo *Daily Standard*, July 26, Sect. 1, 3.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, July 12, Sect. 1, 9; *Baptist Standard* (Waco), July 30, 9, 20.

<sup>23</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 30, 13; also Waco *Times-Herald*, July 25, 7.

<sup>24</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 16, 14.

<sup>25</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 29, 8.

<sup>26</sup>Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 22, 11; Austin *American-Statesman*, July 26, Sect. 2, 5; *Daily Texas* (Austin), July 12, 4; Austin *American*, July 13, 2. Bryan preached a sermon entitled "Clarence Darrow, the Most Dangerous Man in America."

<sup>27</sup>San Angelo *Express*, July 12, 8.

<sup>28</sup>*Baptist Standard*, July 9, 6, September 3, 7.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, July 23, 6.

<sup>30</sup>Austin *American*, July 19, Sect. 2, 2.

<sup>31</sup>Pierre B. Hill, *The Truth About Evolution* (San Antonio, 1925), 34. Also see *Baptist Standard*, July 16, 17.

<sup>32</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 18, 7, July 20, 7.

<sup>33</sup>*Baptist Standard*, August 20, 12.

<sup>34</sup>Hill, *The Truth About Evolution*, 2, 27.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>36</sup>San Antonio *Express*, July 18, 2.

<sup>37</sup>Maynard Shipley, *The War on Modern Science* (New York, 1927), 179; C. Allyn Russell, "J. Frank Norris: Violent Fundamentalist," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, LXXV (January, 1972), 281.

<sup>38</sup>Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, 171-172.

<sup>39</sup>Waco *Times-Herald*, July 4, 1.

<sup>40</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 25, 10.

<sup>41</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 11, 14.

<sup>42</sup>Letter to George W. Truett, February 16, 1926, Cranfill Papers, Barker Texas History Center.

<sup>43</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 27, 8.

<sup>44</sup>San Antonio *Express*, July 11, 4.

<sup>45</sup>Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 13, 7. See also Big Spring *Herald*, August 7, 3.

<sup>46</sup>San Antonio *Express*, July 30, 5.

<sup>47</sup>Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 12, Edit. Sect., 6.

<sup>48</sup>Letter from Tag to John Granbery, August 16, 1925, Granbery Papers, Barker Texas History Center.

<sup>49</sup>*Daily Texan*, July 8, 2.

<sup>50</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 16, 8.

<sup>51</sup>Letter from Granbery to G. Watts Cunningham, October 21, 1926, Granbery Papers; "The Passing of Materialism," Packet #2P391, Granbery Papers.

<sup>52</sup>*Austin American*, July 18, 3.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, July 25, 1, July 28, 1.

<sup>54</sup>*Austin American*, July 10, 1-3.

<sup>55</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>57</sup>Waco *Times-Herald*, July 7, 1; Dallas *Morning News*, July 23, 14.

<sup>58</sup>*Austin American*, October 15, 1.

<sup>59</sup>Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, 172-174; Maynard Shipley, "Growth of the Anti-Evolution Movement," *Current History and Forum*, XXXII (May, 1930), 330-332.

<sup>60</sup>Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, 174.

<sup>61</sup>*Ibid.*, 174-175.

<sup>62</sup>*Ibid.*, 175.

<sup>63</sup>See, for instance, *Ferguson's Forum*, August 20, 8, September 24, 5.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, October 15, 2.

<sup>65</sup>Shipley, *The War on Modern Science*, 174.

<sup>66</sup>*Ibid.*, 179-180. S. P. Brooks, president of Baylor University, said he "would die and rot in my grave before I would sign the Houston resolution."

<sup>67</sup>Fort Worth *Star-Telegram*, July 9, 19; Houston *Post-Dispatch*, July 12, 9.

<sup>68</sup>Dallas *Morning News*, July 12, Sect. 3, 4.

<sup>69</sup>San Antonio *Express*, July 21, 10.

<sup>70</sup>Waco *Times-Herald*, July 11, 6; Temple *Daily Telegram*, July 15, 4.

<sup>71</sup>For the best discussion of Southern religion, see Kenneth K. Bailey, *Southern White Protestantism in the Twentieth Century* (New York, 1964).

EAST TEXAS HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
THE PAPERS OF THE TEXAS REVOLUTION,  
1835-1836: AN APPRAISAL

by Archie P. McDonald

"Rich folks and libraries," a colleague commented when he saw the *Papers of the Texas Revolution* sprawled upon my desk. The litter of brown wrapping paper lay on the desk, cascaded to the floor, and bulged from the waste can in testimony to an eagerness to be at the books as soon as they arrived. The reality of his comment was obvious—ten such exquisitely printed and bound volumes, since they would have to be obtained as a set for usefulness, would limit the purchasers to the interested persons and institutions with \$115.00 in their book budget. Hopefully, every public and many private libraries will stock this magnificent collection. It is conceivable that some future paperback edition will bring the price to a point of feasibility for all interested students of the period, but in the meantime it is hoped that they will at least have access to a set because it is obviously the most important publication on Texas history of its kind in years, perhaps ever. Indeed, it is a source of some curiosity just why this was not done long ago, and a good guess is that it took the unique chemistry of a Jay Matthews and a John Jenkins coming together with all factors being just right to make it happen.

These men are not strangers to those who follow Texas historical publications. Brigadier General Jay A. Matthews has been for years associated with a journal devoted to the subject for which it was named, *Texas Military History*, now called *Military History of Texas and the Southwest*, which was a literary arm of the Texas National Guard Association. It began publishing in 1961 as a slender, blue-backed journal and has grown into a handsome, well-edited quarterly which more than adequately serves the subject area it staked out for itself. And John Holmes Jenkins is on its board of editors.

Jenkins entered the field of Texas letters in 1958 when he edited *Recollections of Early Texas, The Memoirs of John Holland Jenkins*, which was published by the University of Texas Press and it is presently in its third printing. In the years since he has been responsible for producing a rich bibliography of Texana through his imprint identification, The Pemberton Press, and is a national leader in the used book business through the Jenkins Company, headquartered in Austin. They have gotten together on this project, Matthews as publisher under the auspices of the Presidial Press and Jenkins as General Editor. Matthews promises that other works on Texas military history will be published by Presidial, but it will be hard to surpass this initial offering.

The project was a long time in the making—six years—but it has justified the efforts of publisher and editor. It may not be as complete and exhaustive as the *War of the Rebellion: The Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, but it performs the same service for the Texas Revolution as that weighty collection did for the American Civil War. That war was longer, involved literally several million more people, and its records were kept in a more orderly, history-conscious fashion. Without the OR'S, as they are familiarly known, modern scholars would be unimaginably hindered in their study. Until now this has been the unfortunate condition for students of the Texas Revolution, at least partially. That qualification is necessary because some of the material in the *Papers of the Texas Revolution* was drawn from previously published collections. But even if all the items reproduced here had been carefully preserved over the last fourteen decades in environmentally protective archives, which they certainly were not, that is not to say they were "available" in the complete definition of the word. Many were housed in Austin in the University of Texas Archives or in the Archives Division of the Texas State Library, but because of Texas' geography they were hard for

many people to get at, even if they happened to be residents of Texas. In this form the archives can go to any public or private institution or individual who wishes to acquire them.

The idea for this project grew out of a conversation between the publisher and James Day when the latter was serving as Archivist for the Texas State Library. As is often the case, the scope changed with its own momentum as the work progressed, but either way it is to Day's credit that he found and encouraged a publisher to undertake an endeavor of this magnitude. The addition of Jenkins as General Editor and of Maj. Gen. Thomas S. Bishop, Dorman H. Winfrey, Malcolm D. McClean, Robert Cotner, Robert Weddle, Charles Corkan, Richard Santos, John Kinney, and of course Day as advisory editors brought in men of energy and significance to insure that the work would not only be done but done well. These are familiar names to those who deal with archives and history in Texas.

Jenkins' contribution is obviously the most significant. He has combined here the love of a native son, the skill of a good historian, the astuteness of a good businessman. He realized both the importance and the limitations of the work, knew when to go on and when to quit. After all, in the name of completeness he could have taken another twenty years to get it out and denied the availability of these papers to potential users for that long; happily he has come into print with the work as complete as circumstance and six years work can make it, and is realistic enough to know that there are other items still in the limbo of private hands, yet romantic enough to hope that this work will bring them out for the rest of us to see. Jenkins believes that the work will prove useful because it prints several thousand letters and documents on the Texas Revolution which have never been published previously in any form, it reprints hundreds of others that were printed during the revolutionary period but have been subsequently lost for research purposes due to rarity of the original publication or obscurity of its location, and because it includes material from modern works, combining for the first time a nearly complete primary source collection on the revolution. The end dates for inclusion were January 1, 1835, and October 22, 1836, Sam Houston's inaugural date as President of the Republic of Texas.

The editors included everything for the period that was known to them with the exception of letters and documents of a personal or business nature not related to the revolution itself, and we will have to trust their judgment on this. They claim to have been as liberal as possible in this selection, considering most letters and documents pertinent if they were written in Texas or by a Texas military figure. The entries are of three varieties, including material printed in full, material printed in part, and citations of material not printed. Some were presented in part because major portions of the letter were not relevant to military history or because the entire letter was not available either in the original or a previously printed form. Nineteenth century newspaper accounts of the revolution have a lot of the latter in them, and often this is the only available testimony that the letter existed. William B. Travis letters are particularly in this condition. Notes are provided but they do not attempt a definitive commentary on all letters. The method of citation will be discussed later. Suffice it here to say that they cite the original manuscript whenever possible, give information relative to published versions when they exist, and give first names and proper spellings when necessary for clarity. Original spellings and grammar are retained however, and when possible printing is from the original.

The principal sources, as is to be expected, are the archival holdings of the Texas State Library and the University of Texas. Both were being reorganized during the period of research, but because of the leadership of Chester Kielman at the university and John Kinney at the state library, the present locations of the quoted documents will

remain permanent and available. Previously published papers of Texas' prominent revolutionaries were also utilized, particularly *The Austin Papers*, edited by Eugene C. Barker and published by the American Historical Association and the University of Texas Press, 1924-1928; *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, edited by Charles A. Gulick and others, published by the Texas State Library, 1940-1945; *The Writings of Sam Houston*, edited by Amelia Williams and Eugene C. Barker, published by the University of Texas Press, 1938; and the *Official Correspondence of the Texan Revolution*, edited by William C. Binckley and published by the American Historical Association, 1936. Unpublished manuscript collections contributed significant materials, especially the Thomas J. Rusk Papers and the Texas Archives, from the University of Texas Archives, and the Nacogdoches Archives, housed in the Texas State Library. But Jenkins' greatest "find" was in the Andrew Jackson Houston Collection. Through the good offices of Houston Daniel and Price Daniel, Sr., the latter especially noted for his interest in both making and appreciating the history of Texas, Jenkins was able to see what precious few historians have ever been permitted to see--the Sam Houston letter file spanning nearly his whole career. Nearly five hundred entries in the work at hand came from this single source. And their value is multiplied because they are for the most part unutilized. We all start fresh with them.

Because of a long standing personal project, it was natural that the Travis items would be of great interest to the present writer. A look at a familiar Travis piece will serve as a good example of the kind of material to be found in these volumes and will illustrate the editor's method. In volume 1 on page 209 there is a letter from William B. Travis to Governor Henry Smith, a part of a rich and voluminous correspondence between the two which began in Travis' years in San Felipe and continued until his death. It is listed as item [337], [TRAVIS to SMITH], and the text of the letter, a preliminary report to Smith on Travis' leading a group of men to Anahuac for the purpose of taking the town from the Mexican commander, Antonio Tenorio follows. Turning to the back of the book, one finds a Key to Location Symbols, for instance Tx would mean an item is to be found in the Texas State Library, Archives Division; TxU-A means it would be in the Library of the University of Texas, Archives Division; TxGR means it would be in the Rosenberg Library, Galveston, and so forth. With that information any item may be located in its original form or at least in the form that Jenkins had to work with. In the case of the letter from Travis to Smith, it was quoted from Brown's *Life of Henry Smith*.

This format is followed through eight and one-third volumes and 4,361 items. In volume nine five revolutionary accounts are reproduced. They include Joseph E. Field, *Three Years in Texas, Including a View of the Texan Revolution . . .*, published in 1836 in Greenefield, Massachusetts by Justin Jones; *Texas, A Brief Account of the Origin, Progress and Present State of the Colonial Settlements of Texas; Together With an Exposition of the Causes Which Have Induced The Existing War With Mexico*, published in 1836 in Nashville by S. Nye & Company; *Journals of the Consultation Held at San Felipe De Austin, October 16, 1835*, published by order of Congress at Houston in 1838; *Journals of the Convention of 1836 at Washington, March 1-17*, published in Houston in 1838; and finally, *Ordinance and Decrees of the Consultation, Provisional Government of Texas and the Convention Which Assembled at Washington March 1, 1836*, also published at Houston in 1838.

Volume ten is the one that makes it all work. It contains a master key to symbols, an extensive bibliography, and a magnificent index done by Matthews. In the index the references are to item numbers, rather than to volume and page, but this should not cause much pain. Longer entries are fortunately divided for convenience into Letters From (LF), Letters To (LT), and Mentioned (M).

When you add it up it is a fine package indeed. In his publisher's foreword, Matthews anticipated that the publication of these *Papers of the Texas Revolution* would bring about important new discoveries, or would be instrumental in resurrecting still missing or unknown items. It need only be added that with tools like this the whole history of Texas must be nurtured.

## EAST TEXAS COLLOQUY

by Bobby H. Johnson

Gathering historical news in East Texas can be an erratic experience. Our Spring 1974 issue was full of newsworthy events, but the correspondence has been sparse for this issue. We repeat our request for news bearing on the East Texas scene and history in general. Please remember our deadlines: March 1 for the Spring issue, and October 1 for the Fall issue.

Among the recent items to cross our desk are several dealing with the efforts of the Texas State Library to establish regional depositories. Largely concerned with preserving local records, this program is designed to collect and house the historical treasures that might otherwise go unheeded. Non-current local records of cities, counties, and other government agencies are being placed in depositories in colleges throughout the state. Since East Texas contains several state colleges, our region is blessed with several such depositories.

Last fall the TSL announced that a regional Library and Research Center is being built at Liberty, thanks to the generosity of former Governor and Mrs. Price Daniel. The Daniels gave 100 acres of land for this purpose. The library will be named after Sam Houston, who was the great-great grandfather of Mrs. Daniel. The main building is to be constructed with some \$350,000 in private funds from foundations and interested citizens. The Liberty Center has been designated as the official depository for Liberty, Chambers, Jefferson, Hardin, Tyler, Polk, and San Jacinto counties. Other counties may be added in the future, according to Dr. Dorman H. Winfrey, director of the TSL.

An example of the type of material gathered under this system is the recent acquisition of Smith County records by the Regional Historical Resource Depository at East Texas State University. Of particular interest to researchers are civil minutes dealing with bankruptcy proceedings of Jay Gould and the Great Northern Railroad. Other records include depositions, annual reports, Tyler financial reports, jury lists, voter lists, applications for law license, and witness books.

---

The American Association for State and Local History has presented five awards of merit in the field of local history of Texas.

The awards, announced late last year, went to the Historic Waco Foundation, the Rosenberg Library Association in Galveston, former Governor Price Daniel, Dr. Nancy Barker of the University of Texas at Austin, and Dr. Felix Almaraz of the University of Texas at San Antonio.

The citation to the Waco group recognized "excellence in writing and publishing local history and preserving historic structures." The Rosenberg library award honored that group for making available an outstanding collection of Texas manuscript and printed materials. Former Governor Daniel was cited for his role in preserving historical records and writing Texas history. Dr. Barker was honored for her work, *The French Legation in Texas*, while Dr. Almaraz for his book, *Tragic Cavalier*.

Texans should feel honored that the AASLH chose Austin for its 1974 meeting in September.

---

Speaking of the American Association for State and Local History, we are impressed by the variety of services performed by this organization. In addition to boosting local

history in general, the AASLH also offers a variety of publications designed to aid the historian on the local level. Among the recent offerings are *The Care of Historical Collections: A Conservation Handbook for the Nonspecialist*, *Oral History for the Local Historical Society*, *The Management of Small History Museums*, *A Handbook on the Care of Paintings*, and *A Manual on the Printing of Newsletters*. A large series of technical leaflets is also available. Interested persons should write the AASLH at 1315 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tennessee, 37203.

---

Another service for historians is furnished by our own Institute of Texan Cultures at San Antonio. Of particular interest are the slide shows and filmstrips dealing with various Texas history topics. Selections include "Spanish Ranching in Texas," "What is a Texan?," and "The Indian Texans." Taped narrations are also available. Orders should be sent to: Institute of Texan Cultures, Box 1226, San Antonio, Texas, 78294.

---

Several interesting aids to the study of our area have come in the mails recently. Some may be interested in *Magazine of Bibliographies*, published at 1209 Clover Lane in Fort Worth. Those desiring information on Texas towns will be interested in Father F. Stanley's new *Texas Town Series*. The Arthur H. Clark Company informs us that the first three booklets are now ready for distribution. They are *The Signal Hill Story*, *The Isom Story*, and *The Plemons Story*. Other booklets will be issued regularly in the future. The price is \$1 a book, and they may be ordered from the Clark Company at 1264 South Central Ave., Glendale, California, 91204.

Old Maps of the Southwest is offering a facsimile series of historically significant early maps and charts. Their first issue is the Walker Map of 1842, which portrays the status of discovery and settlement of the southwestern quadrant of the United States as of 1842. Future issues will include several other maps of the area. Interested persons may inquire by writing L. M. Buttery at Old Maps of the Southwest, 407 West First Street, Lampasas, Texas 76550.

---

As usual, we are happy to report the activities of county historical survey committees. From the appearance of its bulletin, the Harrison County group is hard at work depicting the history of that county. The inaugural issue of the *Harrison County Historical Herald* (January, 1974) is a handsomely printed bulletin, complete with pictures and interesting stories on the Marshall area. Our congratulations to this committee on its contributions to local history. Jerry Arnold is the editor.

---

Dr. Joe B. Frantz, a well-known Texas historian, has agreed to write the volume on Texas in the forthcoming Bicentennial book series, *The States and the Nation*.

His volume will be an interpretive essay, characterizing the people of Texas historically. It will be part of a 51-volume series, covering every state plus the District of Columbia.

A graduate of the University of Texas, Dr. Frantz is director of the Texas State Historical Association and professor of history at the University at Austin.

---

Interest in the Bicentennial is beginning to pick up around the East Texas region. Several cities are already making plans for the celebration of our nation's two-hundredth

birthday. In Nacogdoches, the city commission and Chamber of Commerce have appointed a Bicentennial committee of 26 members. Jack Matthews and John Anderson are serving as co-chairmen of this group, which has already proposed a beautification program and bicycle path along the LaNana Creek.

---

Saratoga—not New York, but Texas—was the site of the 1974 Spring meeting of the Association. In honor of the surroundings, the sessions were devoted to the Big Thicket and forestry, and from all indications it was a successful venture. Approximately 100 persons attended, proving that not even an energy crisis can detain historians. President Robert S. Maxwell, who also served as program chairman, is to be commended for his efforts.

The first session, chaired by Dr. James L. Nichols, featured two papers on forestry topics. James E. Fickle of Memphis State University spoke on "Conservation and the Southern Pine Association," while Robert D. Baker of the forestry school at Stephen F. Austin State University spoke on "Tracing the Changing Countryside through Aerial Photography."

Maury Darst presided over the second session, which focused on the Big Thicket. Pete Gunter of North Texas State University offered some interesting insights in his paper entitled "The Fight for the Big Thicket Reserve." A panel on "Hog Hunting in the Big Thicket" offered another view of Thicket life. Mrs. Maxine Johnston led the panel, which included Bill Brett and Bowen Taylor.

Dr. Francis E. Abernathy of Stephen F. Austin State University concluded the meeting with a luncheon address on "The Big Thicket: A Way of Life." Our appreciation goes to the Big Thicket Museum for hosting this meeting.

---

The following books were received for noting:

*The Golden Years: The First Half Century of Stephen F. Austin State University.* By Bettye Herrington Craddock. Waco, (Privately printed), 1973. Illustrations. P. 102. \$7.95.

The fiftieth anniversary of Stephen F. Austin State University is celebrated by this interesting volume. Originally a Master's thesis at the University, it is now reproduced in book form for wider distribution. Ms. Craddock begins her narrative with the legislative process which created the state normal system and eventually produced SFA. One chapter concentrates on the early trials of President A. W. Birdwell to get the University started, another on the struggle for survival featuring the presidency of Paul L. Boynton, and another entitled "Making of a University" deals with the coming of age of the University in the administration of Ralph W. Steen. One interesting chapter, "Setting the Woods on Fire," deals with athletics at SFA. Most purchasers will be interested in the sixty-five photographs which illustrate the growth of SFA from the "Shack" to a multi-unit University.

*Nacogdoches—Gateway to Texas, A Biographical Directory, 1773-1849.* By Carolyn Reeves Ericson. Foreword by Joe E. Ericson. Fort Worth, (Arrow-Curtis Printing Company), 1974. P. 248. Illustrations, maps, and index. \$20.00.

The history of Nacogdoches can be viewed from at least one viewpoint as resembling an hour glass. The more time that runs through it, the more it seems to focus on a smaller area and a more concentrated if more modern perspective. Before the coming of many

Anglos to Texas, Nacogdoches district covered just about everything east of Bexar; but the arrival of those Anglos and other immigrants gradually whittled down the size of the district as other communities were established and began to grow. While this was going on a lot of people poured through the funnel of Nacogdoches; many left records of some sort or another before going to other places. For the interested genealogist, sociologist, historian, or other variety of social scientist, much can be learned from the scant records they left if they only know where and for whom to look. Carolyn Reeves Ericson's *Nacogdoches Gateway to Texas* will help clear a little of the mystery from the task.

The book has many interesting features. Its bulk is a lengthy biographical directory of 5,000 settlers abstracted from the Spanish census records of 1792-1809, the Mexican Census of 1828-1835, the Texas state census of 1847, tax lists of 1837, 1839, 1840, and 1845, marriage records of 1835, Board of Land Commissioners minutes for 1838, citizenship applications, the roster for Milam Lodge No. 2, A. F. and A. M., muster rolls for the army present at San Jacinto, from the militia, and finally from the index to deeds for 1836-1849 from Nacogdoches County. Some entries are lengthy, indicating public involvement, others sketchy for obvious reasons. The author has reproduced a number of interesting documents in an Appendix, including a number of things that are often read about, if not read themselves because they are not easily available. These include several early declarations of independence and the entertaining and interesting Y'Barbo Criminal Code for Nacogdoches, among others. Joe E. Ericson's Foreword lends a good historical perspective to the immigration trends, and the map section illustrate the division/growth of the various counties created from the Nacogdoches district.

Mrs. Ericson is presently at work on a subsequent volume which will commence with 1850 and carry the biographies further. Users of this present volume will hope that it is as good as the one at hand.

*A Narrative of The Life of David Crockett of the State of Tennessee.* By David Crockett. A Facsimile Edition with Annotations and an Introduction by James A. Shackford and Stanley J. Folmsbee. Knoxville (The University of Tennessee Press), 1973. \$7.95.

One of the most interesting books this writer has ever read is the autobiography of the Tennessee marvel, David Crockett. Although his Texas period is brief it is probably the most celebrated time in his life. There are towns, streets, statues and who knows what all dedicated to his memory about the state. Much of his fabled pre-Texas years—he was already a legend when he arrived—are rooted in his Tennessee time, and the best place to get this Crockett is first-hand, as he told it, hair and all, in his autobiography. The University of Tennessee Press has now published a most useful edition of the latter. There is a fine introduction which puts Crockett's writing into the perspective of other historian's work. A most useful feature is the placing of explanatory notes in the margins of the rather generous sized pages next to a reproduction of the original text.

*The Concise Illustrated History of the Civil War.* By James I. Robertson. Art selected by Frederic Ray. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, (Stackpole Books), 1971. Illustrations, index. P. 126. \$4.95.

“One of every five participants in the Civil War died in service.” This sentence heads the concluding section of this small volume, a section entitled “The Heritage of a Civil War,” which movingly attempts to explain how the nation's wounds have healed in the past one hundred or so years since the end of the brother's war to make this country the greatest on earth. The preceding chapters explain the destruction and trials that inflicted those wounds. Robertson begins with a brief description of what divided the sections in 1860, and then concentrates exclusively on the military aspects of the war which resulted.

His organization helps to sort out the various theaters, campaigns and actions. The first year in which there is fighting, 1861, is treated in a single chapter, but subsequent chapters divide the war into East and West for the remaining years, plus a unit on the war at sea. Through it all there are hundreds of illustrations, both line drawings and photographs, which illustrate the text.

*The Confederate Soldier.* By LeGrand J. Wilson. Edited by James W. Silver, Foreword by Bell I. Wiley. Memphis, Tennessee, (Memphis State University Press), 1973. Illustrations. P. 232. \$7.00.

Some of the best literature on the American Civil War is found in the diaries, journals, and reminiscences written by its participants. Such writings provide a richness of color, drama, and hard fact, as well as a time-sense, that is unavailable elsewhere. This reissue of Dr. LeGrand J. Wilson's memoirs of service with a Mississippi unit serving in both major theaters of the war is a good example of the type. Wilson conceived the idea of this book in 1901 after attending a veteran's meeting. He wanted to write about the common soldier in the war, about his life in camp, on the march, and in battle. Wilson's style is antiquated, but his point comes across. His description of the "battle of leaving home"—the hardest of the war—moves to his service with his regiment at Fort Donelson, his escape from capture there, reassignment to the Virginia front, his visit to Pennsylvania during the Gettysburg action, and the final months of the war, and through it all is extremely interesting. Among the more memorable, and shocking, subjects with which he deals are the medical details of treating wounds and the horrible deaths of soldiers. James Silver's editing is commendable and restrained, and his notes are well done and informative, but unfortunately they are placed at the end of the book. Unforgivably, there is no index, that necessary tool which makes such works usable.

*Ecology and Our Forests.* By Laurence C. Walker. South Brunswick and New York, (A. S. Barnes and Co.), 1972. Illustrations, glossary, index. P. 175. \$7.95.

In the spotlight of environmental awareness, a number of books have appeared by preservationists which attempt to draw public attention to private and corporate abuse of the land and its resources, including forests. Now, Laurence C. Walker, Dean of the School of Forestry at Stephen F. Austin State University, has written a multiple-use book to gently plead the case for his profession in the management of the nation's forests. Ostensibly a volume devoted to the ecology of forests, the forester and his work are never far from the reader's attention. Walker points out that "ecology" and "economy" both procede from the same word-base, and implies that the future will have to blend the two again for the greatest good of all Americans. The book is organized around the trees themselves—there are chapters on the natural growth of Douglas-fir, redwood, bristlecone pines, giant sequoias, baldcypress, white pine, aspens, junipers, willows, longleaf pines and others—and they are the obvious heroes of his story. The text is written for a lay audience, and the necessary use of technical terminology is eased by a glossary. Walker's claim (p. 29) that "Foresters simply endeavor to imitate nature" sums his professional defense and his creed.

*Outdoor Survival Skills.* By Larry Dean Olsen. With technical assistance on plants from Fred Bohman. Provo, Utah, (Brigham Young University Press), 1973. Illustrations, index. P. 188.

This well illustrated book attempts to provide information for those who might find themselves stranded in the wilderness. It is more than a manuel of survival, although its general appearance might seem to indicate that. There are chapters which carefully

instruct the uninitiated in the techniques of finding or erecting shelter, in how to find materials and start a fire, how to locate usable sources of water, what plants can be used and what should be avoided, and how to trap or obtain animals, all with the basic idea of surviving. A section of color plates on plants is especially attractive as well as useful. A sample from the Introduction indicates why it is more than a manual; indeed it seems almost a book of philosophy: "Survival studies have shown that those who adapt successfully in a stress situation share some common attributes which set them apart from those who don't. A survivor possesses determination, a positive degree of stubbornness, well-defined values, self-direction, and a belief in the goodness of mankind. . . . Time is life, and where existence is reduced to a hand-to-mouth level, comfort must take a second seat. In survival terms we might say that comfort only gets in the way. In a literal sense a strong man may die of exposure if he neglects himself, but he may also die if he babies himself." Even if you don't expect to be lost in the wilderness, much of this book makes good reading.

*Silver San Juan, The Rio Grande Southern Railroad.* By Mallory Hope Ferrell. Boulder, Colorado (Puret Publishing Company), 1973. Maps, illustrations, bibliography, index. \$19.95.

Some readers may question why a book on a Colorado railroad is being noted in a journal devoted to Texas history. The answer is simple enough: most Texans are interested in all of western history, a lot of them like trains and will want to know about such publications, some of them will remember that a good part of Colorado was claimed by Texas until 1850, and as for the rest, if you have ever been in Colorado in the summer-time you know that over half the people there are showing TEXAS license plates. This is really a train-buff's book, anyway, and they know few geographical boundrys. It is the most liberally illustrated book on trains this writer has seen, and those who like pictures of trains or of the beautiful Colorado scenery will enjoy the historic photographs and artists' drawings—some in color—as well as the construction designs of engines, boxcars, and cabooses. The Rio Grande Southern, like many other historic western railroads, was a narrow gauge line, and as the fellow said, you can't hardly get that kind any more.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Man Who Led Columbus to America.* By Paul H. Chapman. Atlanta, Georgia (Judson Press), 1973. P. 180. Illustrations, appendix, notes, and index. \$6.00.

You historians who are fond of repeating the following phrase to your classes, should stop doing it: "Columbus did not know where he was going, when he got there he did not know where he was, and when he returned he did not know where he'd been." According to the author of this interesting study, "Repeating this catchy phrase does no credit to such historians and reveals their ignorance of the facts." (p. 19)

What are "the facts"? Circumstantial evidence seems to show that Columbus really did know where he was going because he had a "plan." That plan, according to Chapman, came from St. Brendan, "The Navigator," whose trans-Atlantic hop was taken in four stages *circa* 564 A.D. Accompanied by fourteen fellow monks, Brendan made his fabulous journey in a skin-covered Irish boat called a currach, which was propelled alternately by sail and oars.

Chapman has taken the Carl Selmer edition of Brendan's *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis* (Notre Dame Press, 1959) and checked the narration by actual measurement of distances, currents and winds in various areas of the Atlantic. Then he superimposes this route with the one taken by Columbus during his four crossings of the sea.

The results are plausible. Brendan sailed northwest from Ireland until he reached a point at sea where the winds and currents drove him south toward the Azores. From thence his currach caught the Canaries Current and the North Equatorial Current toward Barbados. From Barbados the monks journeyed north to Barbuda and then west to Great Inagua in the Bahamas. The homeward journey took advantage of the Gulf Stream past the iceberg floes to Iceland. The final leg of the voyage to the southeast found the party back in Ireland.

Chapman claims that Columbus hid the Brendan account from his contemporaries because he wanted his sovereigns—Ferdinand and Isabella—to recognize his discovery as a totally new one. Columbus even attributed his plan to Pliny, rather than Brendan. Chapman rejects other hypotheses in favor of the Brendan one in easy-to-follow rational fashion. Unfortunately, as with many writers attempting to "prove" a point, he rejects all evidence which does not support his thesis. Moreover, some of his interpretations are open to question. In the map on p. 113, for example, he states that "Y de S. Bo" is Spanish for Isle of St. Brendan. But the map has "S. B." which is Spanish for San Bernardo, St. Bernard.

I rather agree, with Samuel Eliot Morison's appraisal of Brendan: "No, here is not a discovery of a New World, but a captivating tale which led men of later centuries to sail into the unknown, hoping to find Brendan's islands, confident that God would watch over them." (*The European Discovery of America*, p. 25). Still, Chapman has made us pause a moment before rejecting the hypothesis. It is plausible, and may well have been the precursor of Columbus' voyage.

Jack D. L. Holmes  
University of Alabama in Birmingham

*Wilderness Manhunt: The Spanish Search for La Salle.* By Robert S. Weddle. Austin (University of Texas Press), 1973. P. xiv-219. \$8.50.

Robert S. Weddle has persuasively reinforced the standard interpretation that the La Salle colonizing expedition to the coast of the Gulf of Mexico stimulated Spanish interest in that region from 1685. Improved geographical knowledge and later colonizing and missionary activities in Texas and Florida owe a debt to "the Spanish search for La

Salle." Beyond confirming this point, Weddle has provided exhaustive descriptions of the various land and sea expeditions sent after the elusive Frenchman and rectified a number of details related to them.

Weddle perceives his topic in a strictly regional way and fails to place it satisfactorily in a broad, imperial framework. Despite periodic references to European conflicts and the dates of war and peace, the whole episode is not firmly rooted in time. For actions occurring during what is commonly considered the nadir of Spanish rule, the expeditions and administrative routine accompanying them proceeded with a smoothness that begs for explanation.

The limited perspective and emphasis upon narrative rather than analysis reflect the bibliography. The unpublished materials at the core of this study derive principally from transcripts of documents in one *legajo* of the General Archives of the Indies (Seville). Personal investigation of related *legajos* would have increased the author's breadth of vision. The use of recent scholarship that deals with a region larger than the borderlands, for example John Lynch's *Spain Under the Habsburgs*, vol. II, also would have helped him to appreciate the broader implications of the Spanish expeditions he described so thoroughly.

On several "mechanical" matters the University of Texas Press deserves criticism. A blanket statement that the archival documents cited are transcripts is an inadequate substitute for full footnotes. If the purpose of notes is to inform the reader where the document actually used is to be found, reference should be to the Dunn Transcripts rather than to the original document listed under a filing system discarded years ago. The utility of the map provided would have been greater had the important places mentioned in the text been given more emphasis. Illustrations detailing the expeditions also would have been useful.

*Wilderness Manhunt*, despite its defects, doubtless will be the definitive treatment of "the Spanish search for La Salle." The topic itself, however, deserved only an article.

Mark A. Burkholder  
University of Missouri-St. Louis

*Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now*. By Jesse Burt and Robert B. Ferguson. Nashville, Tennessee (Abingdon Press), 1973. P. 271. Appendixes, bibliography, index. \$7.95.

*Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now* is a general, smooth flowing account of the life style and history of the American Indians who inhabited the Southeastern United States. The term "Southeast", as defined in the book, incorporates in totality or partiality the present states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Tennessee. After briefly discussing the origin and prehistoric existence of the Indians, the authors describe the food, housing, dances, music, religious ceremonies, recreations, and other aspects of native culture. Next follows an account of the white man's encounter with the Southeastern Indians, resulting ultimately in removal of many of the natives west of the Mississippi River. Finally the authors delineate the situation of the Indians in the Southeastern United States today with emphasis on the aspirations and goals of today's Indians and their progress toward them.

*Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now* is definitely a sympathetic treatment of the Southeastern Indians. The authors show great appreciation of the native cultures and genuinely delight in the Indians' present day progress toward organization and education. However, the book is not designed for the specialist. Much of the account of Indian life is based on early journals and travel accounts. There is no attempt to evaluate these sources, compare one against the other, or relate them to possibly disagreeing sources. In the

selected bibliography the authors state that they have included "non-specialist items" while excluding some technical and hard to obtain material which they used in preparing the book. The bibliography is annotated, and, as admitted by the authors, does not contain some of the more scholarly material although bibliographies are listed in which these can be located. The bibliography represents clearly the authors' view of the Southeastern Indians and includes recent works as well as older sources.

As a book designed for the young and general reader, *Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now* has merit. It portrays the culture of the Indians, the impact of white "civilization" on that culture, and the contributions of the natives to the United States. It also develops an understanding of the Indians' present day struggle to assume a proper and recognized place in American society and history. For the trained anthropologist, historian, and other specialist, however, the book presents little new. On the other hand, the general reader would appreciate, besides the content and easily readable style, three aspects of the book—an excellent photographic section, a list of present day places relating to Indian culture and history, and a glossary of terms. For the non-scholar *Indians of the Southeast: Then and Now* has a lot to offer.

Marietta LeBreton  
Northwestern State University  
Natchitoches, Louisiana

*The Sign of the Eagle: A View of Mexico—1830 to 1855.* Foreword and Commentary by Richard F. Pourade. A Copley Book commissioned by James S. Copley. San Diego, California, (Union-Tribune Publishing Company), 1970. P. xiv, 168. \$14.50.

*The Sign of the Eagle* is the result of skillful merging of two very different kinds of information about the early Mexican republic. The text is the edited letters of Lieutenant John James Peck of New York, a young officer who participated in the Mexican War. Accompanying his letters are some fifty color lithographs of maps, charts, sketches and paintings of aspects of the war and scenes of the Mexico of that time. There is a helpful foreword and conclusion and a biographical sketch of John Peck.

Peck took part in the invasion of Northern Mexico and the capture of Monterrey. He went with the contingent transferred to Scott's command for the invasion of Veracruz and the capture of Mexico City. Thus, Lieutenant Peck took part in every major action of the war except Buena Vista. His letters reveal many things besides his often perceptive observations of day-to-day operations. One can detect Peck's ambivalence to Mexico—he finds much to wonder at and his mental horizons were perceptibly broadened, yet his Protestant and Anglo-Saxon background warred against his receptiveness. Peck reveals himself as a likable and fairminded observer of this forgotten little war. He is generous in his praise of the bravery of the Mexican soldier while condemning the ineptness of his leadership. His letters provide glimpses of the politics of the era and of how the army itself viewed the colorful generals Taylor and Scott. Marginal notes added by the editor provide an overview of the strategy and high politics of the events Peck writes about, a valuable contrast to his purely personal and local view.

The pictures are the real attraction of this book, however. They were chosen to complement the text so that one has the feeling of viewing what Peck himself might have seen as he wrote. Maps and paintings of battles and troop movements are interspersed with selections illustrating the life of the inhabitants, the cities, and the beauty of the land through which the armies fought. The lithographs will be appreciated by the scholar as well as the traveler and the romantic for in addition to their attractiveness they accurately portray cities, buildings and clothing styles of the age. Some selections are by foreigners from the pre-war years, some by military artists with the U. S. forces, and still others by Mexicans who knew and loved the scenes of their native land.

The book lends itself to some confusion concerning its purpose. It is a legitimate historical source, of value to specialists in both texts and pictures. On the other hand, its format, cost, and general appearance would seem to class the book in the "coffee-table" or "gift book" category. Perhaps it is a tribute to the unknown editors that the book can serve both these functions.

D. S. Chandler  
Miami University (Ohio)

*Texas in Revolt.* By Jerry J. Gaddy. Ft. Collins, Colo. (Old Army Press), 1973. P. 139. Illustrations. \$10.00.

Jerry J. Gaddy has combined his interest in the Texas Revolution with his hobby of collecting old newspapers to produce this book. Searching through newspapers dating from the summer of 1835 to the fall of 1836, he has selected news stories that reflect events in Texas and reaction to those events on the part of the United States. These stories he groups under seven headings, each dealing with a phase of the revolution.

Gaddy offers the items without comment. Only a brief listing at the beginning of each group suggests the major events. Thus, readers unfamiliar with the revolution will have trouble separating fact from rumor and may find themselves uncertain as to what actually occurred. For example, one "Late and Important!" bulletin reports that David Crocket did not die at the Alamo. Instead he "was lying quite ill but gradually though slowly recovering from his wounds" in a private home.

Specialists in the field will be dissatisfied with the book for another reason. Although the items are presented in roughly chronological order, the specific dates of the newspapers are not given, a circumstance that impairs the use of the book as a scholarly reference work. The specialist will also question artist Joseph Hefter's depiction of the flags that flew over the Alamo.

Nevertheless Hefter's six color paintings brighten the volume, and the book offers a fresh approach to a familiar subject. The collected items further suggest the basis for many news stories of the era—letters, visitors' accounts, and rumor. The historian is thus afforded a case study on the perils of using journalistic accounts as source material.

Marilyn McAdams Sibley  
Houston Baptist College

*Arms for Texas. A Study of the Weapons of the Republic of Texas.* By Michael J. Koury with J. Jetter as illustrator. Fort Collins, Colo. (The Old Army Press), 1973. P. 66. Appendices and bibliography. \$7.50.

This is a pleasant book: informative, interesting, and attractive. Its scope is limited to the shoulder and hand weapons officially used or considered by the armed forces of the Republic, presented in some context of American and particularly Texas military affairs. The photographs are good, the drawings perhaps a bit curious (in facial expressions; and why, in a book mainly about the infantry, is only one infantryman depicted, along with three marines and one cavalryman?). The book is well printed, with illustrations in sepia, the text in reddish brown.

Many of the arms issued to Texans during the Revolution and for several years afterwards were of British manufacture. Some were rifled weapons, others muskets, such as the 600 which fell into army hands as a result of San Jacinto and were subsequently issued to troops. These appear to have been a model of the famous Brown Bess with a fascinating pedigree. It was the post-1809 East India pattern, marked with the Mexican eagle and serpent. This was the type the British manufactured exclusively in the last years of their war with Napoleon but had since superseded.

The vigorous military policy of President Lamar saw the purchase of what Koury calls the "standard arm" of the infantry. This was a musket, model 1816, manufactured in Philadelphia by "Tryon Son & Co", a firm which remained in the arms business until 1964. It was ordered in 1839, a time when many countries were adopting breechloading percussion weapons. Why? Koury, observing that "it is not known whether resistance to innovation is born into all ordnance officers, or is merely acquired with the job," credits Chief of Ordnance Col. George W. Hockley. Hockley had a number of objections to replacing "flint and steel" with percussion caps. First, he believed that too often they failed to fire. Second, "I object generally to very quick firing in action"! He felt this would lead to a decline in marksmanship. Third, rapid fire would overheat the barrel. There were additional objections. Still, Koury generally respects Col. Hockley.

The army subsequently purchased 100 Colt revolving cylinder rifles and the navy 120 Colt revolving cylinder carbines and 120 pistols. A number of the navy pistols found their way on the Santa Fe Expedition, where most were deliberately damaged prior to being surrendered. One Colt pistol of undoubted official Texas issuance is preserved.

In one way Col. Hockley showed flair. He recommended using another British weapon of the Napoleonic era: the Congreve rocket. Noting their effect upon U.S. militia in the War of 1812, he believed that the rockets, used against the Indians "if found in a body," would "excite terror and probably confusion if within their vision—and probably render them victims to the previous arrangement of the commanding officer."

There are a few oversights, such as an occasional use of the possessive for the plural form of a name. But it's a good book, reasonably priced, and is a natural for a gift.

John Osburn

Central State University, Oklahoma

*A Long Long Day For November.* By Moffitt Sinclair Henderson. Charlotte, North Carolina (Delmar Companies), 1972. P. 350. Notes and bibliography. \$6.95.

Samuel Price Carson joined that stream of near-legendary men, prominent in their home regions, who came to Texas from the United States in the mid-1830's and there participated in the significant events associated with Texas' separation from Mexico and emergence as a republic. Of Irish stock, Carson carried on a long family tradition of public service. He represented his mountainous region of western North Carolina in the state's General Assembly and then in the United States House of Representatives (1825-1833) until defeated because of his pro-"nullifier" stand in the tariff controversy. His popularity continued, however, as he was elected to another term in the North Carolina General Assembly and to service in the convention rewriting the North Carolina Constitution.

Meanwhile, he had purchased land on the Red River in Arkansas near the present Texas boundary. In 1835 he moved there, bringing an entourage of over 100 persons on the long trek. Barely getting his wife and two daughters and household personnel settled on his land, he was elected as one of several delegates of the Pecan Point region to the revolutionary convention meeting at Washington-on-the-Brazos on March 1, 1836. He was allowed to sign the declaration of independence, though arriving late, and took a lead in writing the constitution because of his ability and previous experience. Defeated as president ad-interim of Texas, he was elected secretary of state, a post he served briefly before being commissioned to proceed to Washington and New York to work in behalf of Texas. His health declining since 1827, Carson was finally driven to seek recuperation at Hot Springs, Arkansas, where he died in November, 1838, at the age of 40.

Mrs. Henderson has woven a biographical novel into this basic framework. Utilizing local histories and family memories and papers, she has evoked something of the atmosphere and life styles in which Carson worked and loved. Family connections—clans

and kinship groups—appear as strong factors. I suspect that the only really “novelized” part of the story is in the direct dialogue and the introspective thoughts of the protagonists. There are end-notes to explain important points and a bibliography suggesting the sources. The basic biographical data appear accurate. About three-fourths of the book deals with Carson’s North Carolina-related experiences.

The title derives from two important events in Carson’s life. One occurred in November 1827, when he fought a duel in which he killed a friend. The cause had grown out of a political campaign. His sense of guilt and remorse was so strong that Mrs. Henderson signals the beginning of his physical decline with that event. The other November, of course, marked his death eleven years later.

David M. Vigness  
Texas Tech University

*Republic of Texas: Poll Lists for 1846.* By Marion Day Mullins. Baltimore (Genealogical Publishing Company, Inc.), 1974. P. 189. \$15.00.

The last Mexican census for Texas was taken in 1836 and the first United States census in 1850, thus leaving Texas without a complete census for the intervening fourteen years. However, Poll lists, such as these compiled by Marion Day Mullins, can be used to fill this void, at least in a partial fashion. These 1846 lists serve as a partial roster of property owners living in Texas when it joined the Union. Unfortunately it does not contain the names of many of those who immigrated during the latter days of the Republic of Texas, such as those who came with Peter’s Colony. Thus the researcher seeking information on his family should not be discouraged if the name in question fails to appear in the *Poll Lists for 1846*. The lists give the surnames in alphabetical order with their county of residence. Occasionally a property owner with land in two or more counties appears on each county list.

*Poll Lists for 1846* by Marion Day Mullins is a significant contribution to the published records of the Republic of Texas. This work should be included in every Texana Collection and in every Texas library.

Carolyn R. Ericson  
Curator, Stone Fort Museum  
S.F.A.S.U.

*Sam Houston’s Texas.* By Sue Flanagan. Austin (The University of Texas Press), 1973. P. 194. Index. \$12.50.

Whether viewed as an example of the coffee-table type book or as a concise study, *Sam Houston’s Texas* is a delightful work with no exact counterpart, that I am aware of, in the writing of Texas history. The author, Sue Flanagan, currently serves as director of the Sam Houston Memorial Museum in Huntsville and is a skillful photographer as well as a gifted writer. Seeking to depict the Texas Houston knew from the time of his arrival in 1832 until his death in 1863, Miss Flanagan has employed “Old Sam’s” own words against a backdrop of various scenes linked to his career in Texas.

Employing a year by year narrative approach, the author has made judicious use of private correspondence to and from her subject to portray the era before the Revolution, the period of the Republic, Houston’s United States Senate career, and the drift to secession. Perhaps because it is not usually emphasized in biographies of Houston, the author’s account of the gubernatorial contests of 1857 and 1859 made for particularly interesting reading. The text and accompanying photographs seem to catch the flavor of those campaigns; constant buggy travel on hot, dusty, roads; a never-ending succession of

barbeques and speeches, and friendships strained almost to the breaking point by the poisonous question of union or secession. In this respect, Houston's relationship with his Senate colleague, Thomas Jefferson Rusk, and his observation on the principal cause of the latter's suicide provide an insight into that tragic figure in Texas history. Equally poignant was the sketch of Houston in forced political retirement, out of step with the mood of Civil War Texas and in declining health. His death on July 26, 1863, strikes the reader as a kind of welcome release.

Previous reviewers of this book have referred to Miss Flanagan's creation as "superb" and a "jewel." I can only heartily agree. Both the author and her publisher, the University of Texas Press, are to be applauded for a job very well done.

Stanley E. Siegel  
University of Houston

*Historic Sites of Texas.* By June Rayfield Welch. Dallas (GLA Press), 1972. P. 184. Bibliography, index. \$10.95.

June Rayfield Welch undertook an ambitious project when he set out to photograph the state's 254 courthouses. From this expedition, combined with a desire to make Texas history more vibrantly alive and relative to all inhabitants of Texas, he gave the project a new twist and decided to photograph and write about sites which ordinarily do not make the pages of a conventional Texas History textbook. The successful result was *Historic Sites of Texas* with another volume in the making to complete the project.

This 184-page hardback volume contains 72 black and white, captioned photographs, all skillfully executed to co-ordinate and complement the chronological narrative which accompanies them. The narrative itself is an excellent, concise presentation of Texas history at its finest. Well researched, the prolific use of original sources makes the reading more delightful as well as authentic. Texas is presented from the dinosaur age to the present in both scholarly historical writing as well as modern photography. From pirates to presidents, men that have contributed to Texas history are presented on the pages of this volume, with the author's weaving in legend along with facts to confirm the reader's impressions that this mighty state has a fascinating history and that history is to be found in every nook and cranny of this giant once-republic. Such famous names as O. Henry, Francis Scott Key and the Wright brothers, not ordinarily associated with Texas History, are presented as making their contribution to Texas' colorful past. Homesites, monuments and memorials marking the sites where former great Texans dedicated their talents and lives to make Texas what it is today, comprise the majority of the 72 photographs. Portraits of several men and women are included, some being sketches where photographs were not possible.

The major portion of the book is devoted to early Texas history, with no balance being attempted as there is a follow-up volume but it was well tied together, beginning and ending with the dinosaur, the earlier being the ones which actually walked upon the bountiful land of Texas and the latter being part of a massive modern-day advertising campaign of Sinclair Oil Company, but it served to tie the book into a complete unit.

The volume is alphabetically indexed and includes the extensive bibliography which testifies to the fact that Mr. Welch consulted many sources, unearthed many new bits of information and traveled many miles in writing and photographing this volume. It will be a welcomed addition to the libraries of many Texas History teachers.

Carolyn Parker  
Henderson, Texas

*Stagecoach Inns of Texas*. By Kathryn Turner Carter. Waco (Texian Press), 1972. P. 122. Index and notes. \$10.00.

This book was written to record information on as many of the old stagecoach inns in Texas as possible. It is not confined to those still standing, but includes a few which have been demolished.

The two introductory chapters are very informative. The first details the architecture and furnishings of some of the inns, together with their fare. The second discusses stagecoach travel. It gives a description of various stagecoaches and the perils of traveling on them. It also gives typical times for some of the trips. It lists those stagecoach lines which are known, together with Star Bids and mail stage lines. This chapter advances the thesis that the coming of the railroads doomed the stage coach lines. I believe a map of the location of these stagecoach lines would be most beneficial.

The book is written with pages for each inn listed, giving its early history, ownership, present status, etc. A photograph or drawing is included for each inn—including those which have been demolished.

The names of several towns shown on the list of stagecoach routes are misspelled, including:

Melrose (Nacogdoches County)	Mellrose
Douglass (Nacogdoches County)	Douglas
Hempstead (Walker County)	Hemstead (in one place)
Panna Maria (Karnes County)	Pano Maria
Sabinetown (Sabine County)	Sabine City

This is a relatively minor point, indicative of a need for closer proofreading on the part of the publisher, the author, or perhaps the *Texas Almanac* of 1875 which originally published the list.

Deep East Texas is conspicuous for its nearly complete absence, and for one inn being located in the wrong county. In *The History of Nacogdoches County* (1880), Richard Haltom writes concerning this county and its lack of railroads: "We have nothing to boast of in the way of steam transportation. The nearest railroad point is Henderson in Rusk County, distant a little over forty miles northward." Surely, there must have been some stagecoach inns in Nacogdoches, Douglass, Melrose, Alto, Tyler, Henderson, Groesbeck, Palestine, Jasper, Lufkin, etc.

In *Two Centuries in East Texas*, Dr. George Louis Crockett writes: "Still further down the Attoyac was Nathaniel Hunt, whose house was one of the stations on the mail route from Houston to San Augustine under the Republic." I believe Mr. Hunt lived in the Broaddus-Macune area of San Augustine County.

The one item in this book which I find most disappointing refers to the Halfway House. Another name given to it is Midway House. This inn is listed as being near Chireno, San Augustine County. Chireno is a good 5-6 miles west of Attoyac Bayou, the boundary between Nacogdoches County on the west and San Augustine County on the east. This reviewer has known Mrs. Dixie Branch and Mrs. Pearl Taylor (who live in the inn) and their sister, Mrs. Link Daniel, for some thirty-five years. To the author's credit, this is the only stagecoach inn which she places in the wrong county.

This review is not intended to completely carve up the book. On the contrary, the majority of the information, both written and pictorial, is excellent.

Charles G. James  
San Antonio, Texas

*Santiago Vidaurri and the Southern Confederacy.* By Ronnie C. Tyler. Austin (Texas State Historical Association), 1973. P. 196. \$8.00.

Ronnie Tyler's book is a study of the powerful north Mexican *caudillo*, Santiago Vidaurri, and his relations with Texas and the Confederacy during the late 1850's and the Civil War. His research is extensive and thorough, making excellent use of Texas and northern Mexican newspapers and memoirs, the Texas State Archives, the United States consular dispatches for north Mexico, important Mexican manuscript collections located in Monterrey, and the Records of the Confederate States of America. Tyler draws most heavily upon this latter collection which he mistakenly refers to as the Pickett Papers. (John T. Pickett sold a large manuscript collection, including his personal archives and those official Confederate archives in his possession, to the Library of Congress. Later, Pickett's few personal papers were separated out and formed into the John T. Pickett Papers and the large body of remaining papers, including all those cited by Tyler, were renamed the Records of the Confederate States of America.) The narrative based upon this firm foundation is impressive and stimulating. The detailed discussion of Texas-Mexican border relations will enlighten historians, giving them their most complete description of this fascinating area during the Civil War years. In this context, Tyler perceptively recognizes the major interest of the Confederacy, both Mexican factions—liberals and conservatives—and the French forces in keeping trade and revenue flowing no matter which of these forces controlled the frontier (pp. 148, 151). Even the Union forces had a major negative interest in the frontier—stopping Confederate trade.

Unfortunately two significant weaknesses limit the value of Tyler's monograph. First, he, his readers, and his editors permitted the manuscript to retain chronological confusion and other editorial weaknesses. On too many occasions without obvious or explicit grounds the description of an incident or a series of incidents are not chronologically ordered (see particularly chapter III). More distracting is the appearance of unresolved contradictory statements. For example, Tyler refers to Vidaurri as indifferent to the Confederacy (p. 151) and then labels him "a warm friend of the South" (p. 153), or he states that "the Richmond government hardly considered any trade with Mexico until the Union ships blockaded its ports" (p. 108), while noting that in fact Quintero and the Confederacy expressed great interest in and sought Mexican trade in 1861 and 1862 (pp. 49, 52-55, 127). Second, the major weakness of the monograph derives from Tyler's inability to come to grips with Vidaurri's place in history. At various times he asserts Vidaurri was a Liberal (pp. 25, 39), an opponent of liberalism (pp. 34, 155-156), a Federalist (p. 30), a regionalist (pp. 38, 155), a self-interested individual (pp. 39, 156), an opportunistic power seeker (pp. 154-156), and eventually a high official in Maximilian's government and an apparent conservative (pp. 153-156). Tyler offers no explanation or analysis of the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies in Vidaurri's behavior, thus leaving the reader with the difficult task of attempting to interpret Vidaurri. This reviewer judges Vidaurri essentially an opportunistic power-seeker; it would be interesting to know Tyler's opinion.

In sum, Tyler's book has weaknesses in its conceptual and analytic framework. However, the research is so thorough and the resulting descriptive narrative is so authoritative and detailed that it will long remain an essential, indeed very likely the foundation study of Mexican-Confederate relations along their common frontier.

Thomas Schoonover  
University of Southwestern Louisiana

*Make Me a Map of the Valley: The Civil War Journal of Stonewall Jackson's Topographer.* By Archie P. McDonald (ed.). Dallas (Southern Methodist University Press), 1973. P. xxxvii-352. \$12.50.

In the Foreword of this volume, Pulitzer-Prize-winning historian T. Harry Williams says that it is one of the superior Civil War diaries, possibly one of the superior American personal records. That the book does indeed live up to the impressive compliment is immediately evident to the reader. McDonald provides a wealth of material in presenting the diary of Jedediah Hotchkiss—Stonewall Jackson's topographer—from March 10, 1862, through April 18, 1865. The introduction is a concise and interesting biographical sketch of Hotchkiss, and the notes contain detailed information on each character, event, or place as it appears in the journal. The book is attractive with an intriguing cover which depicts a sketch by Hotchkiss of the battles of Chancellorsville, Salem Church and Fredericksburg. Further embellishments include two additional maps by Hotchkiss, a photograph of Hotchkiss, a serviceable index, an impressive bibliography, a table of contents, and a preface which explains the choice of time covered as well as the problems of identification.

"I want you to make me a map of the Valley, from Harper's Ferry to Lexington, showing all the points of offense and defense in those places." (p. 10) Such were the instructions Hotchkiss received from General Thomas Jonathan Jackson on March 26, 1862, which launched his career as Topographical Engineer of the Valley District of the Department of Northern Virginia and subsequently Topographical Engineer of the Second Corps of the Army of Northern Virginia. The day-by-day account of the war as Hotchkiss experienced it provides, as T. Harry Williams says, "a mine of information about many persons and events—Jackson and Lee, the problem of command, the battles of Virginia, and last but very important, the work of a heretofore unrecognized but necessary man in the Civil War machine." (p. xi.)

Jedediah Hotchkiss had a unique place in the Confederacy, for he became the foremost mapper of the Confederacy and perhaps could be considered the foremost mapper of the war according to Dr. Williams. Since both sides started the war with no reliable maps of the area where they would do battle, securing maps became crucial. That Hotchkiss did his job well is evidenced in the *Atlas of the Official Records*, for at least half of all the Confederate maps in the Atlas were made by him.

McDonald's editing and annotation of the journal which Hotchkiss kept on a day-to-day basis provides a very readable record of the war in this area during the aforementioned dates. His great service is the documented notes which are invaluable for research purposes as well as for further information and identification. For instance, as the Stonewall Brigade is mentioned in the diary, McDonald supplies a fascinating footnote which gives information concerning the vital statistics of the Brigade as well as the feeling of unit identification expressed in the lines of John Esten Cooke:

And men will tell their children  
Tho' all other memories fade,  
How they fought with Stonewall Jackson  
In the old "Stonewall Brigade." (301 n 4.)

Also adding to the book's readability are the unique chapter headings which are quoted from sentences to be found in the individual chapters. For instance, Chapter Seven is entitled from General Jackson's funeral sermon in Hotchkiss' entry of Sunday, May 17, 1863. (p. 144.)

I am a fan of historical diaries, for I find that nowhere can a reader get the flavor of a period any better than from a day-to-day account by someone who experienced it. The additional bonus of a wealth of research material further enhances this particular volume.

Mrs. Betty Davis  
Longview, Texas

*The Captain Departs: Ulysses S. Grant's Last Campaign.* By Thomas M. Pitkin and foreword by John Y. Simon. Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois (Southern Illinois University Press), 1973. P. 139. Notes, bibliographical note, and index. \$6.95.

"General Grant never fought as well as he fights now." (66). So one newspaper proclaimed, as Ulysses S. Grant gallantly completed his memoirs during the final pain-wracked months of his life. Pitkin's book on Grant's last year—a time of drama, triumph, and tragedy after a period of relative calm and obscurity—grew out of a governmental report on the Grant cottage at Mount McGregor, New York. From the mass of meticulous detail, one sees clearly and touchingly how the Civil War's great battle captain achieved a second moment of quintessential triumph. The able editor of his papers, John Simon, says of Grant in the foreword that "resilience, resistance to outside pressure, and receptivity to innovation—common traits carried to their heights—were the marks of his generalship." (xiii). In a sense, the same qualities applied to Grant's literary endeavors.

Grant became a writer only through financial necessity. Unquestionably honest himself, Grant the civilian never seemed able to avoid unscrupulous associates. Swindled, penniless, and feeling disgraced, he yielded finally to long-resisted pressures that he prepare articles for the *Century* magazine so that he might provide security for his family. His first effort was poor, little more than a dull rehash of official reports, but perseveringly he learned to rewrite and to revise, and in the process he grew prolific and competent.

Many persons played roles in Grant's literary development; two deserve special mention: Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain) and Adam Badeau. Clemens provided warm and sustaining friendship, encouragement, technical help—even proofing and correcting copy, and published the completed memoirs through his own company (which ultimately paid Mrs. Grant nearly one-half million dollars in royalties). Badeau, Grant's friend and biographer, worked closely with the general for a time, revising and sometimes adding his own comments. But Grant realized how important it was that the memoirs be his own work and later parted with Badeau.

The great struggle at the end, before Grant finally succumbed to cancer of the throat, was not to finish composing the memoirs but to complete their revision. Grant could not resist indulging in the process and no doubt this superior effort infused the memoirs with their high degree of quality. The whole nation waited in respect and watched with admiration. Reporters did their utmost to provide the thirsty public with news—"one even made love to a chambermaid across the street to get a good window" (34) in front of Grant's house. Later, when Grant sought refuge at a mountain retreat, the Grand Army of the Republic provided a ceremonial guard to help ensure privacy.

Pitkin's book is a study in historical microcosm, possessing a mixture of positive and negative attributes. The chief fault lies in its prose: cumbersome, marred by a gross overuse of "was," infelicitous variations in tense, and split-infinitive verb forms. Yet one can find elements to praise, such as the logical chapter development and good transition one to another. With sources relatively scant and widely scattered, the research is impressive, perhaps remarkable. To a select audience of specialists and enthusiasts, the book should prove pleasing. It fulfills its purpose. And yet, in places it tells more than most readers probably need, or want, to know.

Herman Hattaway  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

*Life on the Texas Range.* By Erwin E. Smith and J. Evetts Haley. Austin (University of Texas Press), 1973. P. 112. \$12.50.

If you agree with the saying that "one picture is worth 10,000 words," then *Life on the Texas Range* is multi-volumed in content. As the "outstanding cowboy photographer of the West," Erwin E. Smith has captured life on the open range. In fact, with the help of historian-cattleman J. Evetts Haley and the University of Texas Press, this work graphically illustrates what Smith wanted to record—that the cowboy, "a proud man on horseback," performed "hard, skillful, and dangerous, . . . hence intriguing, work." (pp. 21-22).

With a choice from approximately 2,000 captivating Smith photographs Haley has selected those which best typified the Cattle Kingdom. Beginning with "Chuck Wagon on the Move" and "Pitching Camp," (pp. 33-34) he moves to "The Drive" and "Working the Roundup." (pp. 46, 51). In turn, he shows the cowboy at work in such pictures as "Dragging Him to the Fire," "Strung Out," "Catching a Matador Outlaw," and "Range Branding." (pp. 56, 61, 95, 103). He even illustrates several methods of range relaxation in "Shoot in' Craps," "Mumble-Peg," and "Settling the Dust." (pp. 88, 90, 93). Overall, Haley depicts the cowboy's life style—combating a hostile yet satisfying environment, dealing with mean and ornery cattle, indeed fighting to endure the everyday perils of a lonely existence.

*Life on the Texas Range* is therefore a most worthwhile publication to those who are interested in the American West. Through such genius with a camera Smith has recorded what life was really like in West Texas and eastern New Mexico during the early 1900's. In interesting, succinct prose Haley has provided the reader with a short biographical sketch of Smith as well as helpful explanations regarding eighty pictures. And the University of Texas Press has produced an attractive book at a reasonable price.

Ben Procter  
Texas Christian University

*George W. Brackenridge: Maverick Philanthropist.* By Marilyn McAdams Sibley. Austin (University of Texas Press), 1973. Pp. 256. Bibliography, index, map, illus. \$8.50.

George W. Brackenridge (1832-1920) was undoubtedly a maverick as he often defied the conventional and orthodox during his long career in Texas as a banker, civic leader, and philanthropist. He was born in Indiana, came to Texas with his family in 1853 and settled near the old town of Texana in Jackson County. A Unionist during the Texas secession controversy, he fled the state with the outbreak of war only to return as a special agent of the United States Treasury during the Federal occupation of the Brownsville area. With profits gained from the wartime cotton trade, Brackenridge moved to San Antonio after the war. There he launched a career as a banker and civic leader which guided the development of the Alamo city from a postwar population of 10,000 to one of over 120,000 at Brackenridge's death in 1920. As a Republican, a Prohibitionist, an active, albeit somewhat paternalistic, sponsor of racial equality, and an advocate of the women's suffrage movement, Brackenridge was often at odds with the prevailing community mores. Yet, the resources of his San Antonio National Bank, the city's dominant financial institution, were time after time used unselfishly to help support municipal improvements and expansion.

In his later years Brackenridge's activities as a philanthropist over-shadowed his business activities. During his long service of over twenty-five years as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Texas, he played a key role in molding a provincial institution into one of genuine university status. This was accomplished not only through his substantial financial contributions but also through his strong stands protecting academic independence from interference at the hands of state officials.

In the main the author has made a commendable effort in revealing the complexities of Brackenridge's personality. Her research, particularly through her access to the Brackenridge Papers, is thorough. The book is well organized and written with style and wit. The author makes a particular contribution in her efforts to unravel the confused and illicit practices accompanying the Civil War cotton trade in Texas. The book also contains some interesting and germane illustrations although the reader will probably wish for more maps—especially of the Civil War Rio Grande Valley area and of San Antonio during the Brackenridge era. But again, Professor Sibley has made another substantial contribution to Texas history.

John O. King  
University of Houston

*Recollections of a Long Life.* By Rev. Elijah L. Shettles. Archie P. McDonald, editor. Nashville (Blue and Gray Press), 1973. P. 199. Index. \$7.95.

Those of us who are not professionally trained in history and archives may take heart that there may be hope for us from the example of Elijah Leroy Shettles, expert bibliophile and historian, as well as pastor. For he was for twenty years a professional gambler, for thirty years an active Methodist pastor, and, lastly, for twenty years a collector of rare books and pamphlets on Texas and Southern history, and on Methodist history, especially in Texas.

The autobiography of Mr. Shettles was written in the 1930's, and he "whittled it up for articles in such magazines as *The Southwestern Advocate*, but it was principally published . . . in the *Pontotoc (Mississippi) Progress*, with installments appearing [in] 1935 and . . . 1936," writes Professor Archie P. McDonald of Stephen F. Austin University in the Introduction. This edition is the first publication in book form.

Mr. Shettles is an interesting autobiographer. He tells well the story of his childhood and youth in Mississippi, just before and during the Civil War. He reports that his parents "were poor, honest, hardworking good folks, belonging to that class called by some slaveholders and many negroes, by way of distinction, 'poor white trash.'" He adds that he felt a lingering "sting and feeling of resentment for the contempt shown for my sort of people because they were poor and had to work hard in order to live."

In order to get out of this cycle of poverty he first left home when only eighteen with little formal education. He did rather poorly in his first jobs, and soon turned to gambling, adding to this the usual habit of drinking. But the twenty years of gambling was a succession of short stays in various cities and towns—St. Louis, Little Rock, Hot Springs, Fort Smith, Muskogee, Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, Houston, El Paso, and Jackson, Mississippi.

There are frequent accounts similar to this in his story: "I at once entered into the sport [gambling] that was running high and lasted about three days before whiskey, cards, and other forms of sport had me stripped to my last dollar. I had to get out of town . . ." He once told J. Frank Dobie (who reports this in a eulogy at Shettles' funeral, printed in the book as a foreword) that "despite the fictionizing of gamblers, there was never a professional who did not play tricks or cheat."

Converted in 1891, he entered the Methodist ministry that fall, and for thirty years he served small and large churches and was twice presiding elder. In his earlier years as pastor he was unhappy at several appointments, but as a whole he felt his ministry was worthwhile. He retired in 1921, and moved the next year to Austin where he entered what he called "the out-of-print book business as an employment."

Mr. Shettles had already been dealing in out-of-print books before he retired—ever since 1895 when, as a pastor in Austin, he got acquainted with Judge W. C. Raines, who

published the next year his *Bibliography of Texas* literature; Dr. George P. Garrison, history professor at the University of Texas; and Mr. H. P. N. Gammel, a dealer in old books. Gradually his interest and activity widened, as he had opportunities to secure materials in Waco, Dallas, Houston, Austin, San Antonio, and Fort Worth.

Eventually he traveled more widely, securing books on Methodism, the Civil War, Texas, and Southern history. He became the authorized agent to secure materials for the Littlefield Southern History Collection at the University of Texas. He donated his collection of Wesleyana to Southern Methodist University in 1917, and, he writes, "in that collection may be found some of the rarest materials on the early activities of the Methodist people in America." He provided important acquisitions also to the Texas State Library, the Rosenberg Library (Galveston), the San Antonio libraries, and Sam Houston State University (Huntsville). For a few years he was employed by the Methodist Publishing House in Dallas, and in that relationship he also spent his time traveling and collecting pamphlets and books.

Mr. Shettles made significant contributions to the historical interests of Methodism in Texas. He helped organize a Texas Methodist Historical Society, which produced seven issues of the *Texas Methodist Historical Quarterly*. He provided much of the material that enabled Macum Phelan to write his two-volume *History of Methodism in Texas*, and he was the publisher of *The Texas Colonists and Religion* by William Stuart Red.

The life of E. L. Shettles was varied; it was colorful; it was fruitful. What more can one desire?

Walter N. Vernon  
Nashville, Tennessee

*Water For The Southwest: Historical Survey and Guide to Historic Sites.* By Lindsay T. Baker, Steven R. Rae, Joseph E. Minor, Seymour V. Connor. New York (ASCE), 1973. P. 135. Bibliography and index. \$5.00.

Dams, canals, tanks, pumps punctuate the chapters of man's struggle for water—for survival—in the Southwest. *Water for the Southwest*, done in the manner of the National Park Service's successful series of thematic guide books, tells the story through descriptions of sixty significant sites.

Prepared at Texas Tech University, with support from the National Park Service and the American Society of Civil Engineers, the volume devotes a bare twenty-five pages, including illustrations, to a chronicle of the development of water systems in the Southwest (the states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado) from the ancient Hohokam Indians, through Spanish endeavors, to twentieth century agricultural, industrial, and community water supply projects. The majority of the book is given to necessarily brief notes about specific significant sites, most of which offer a visitor physical remains to view, some even the original construction still in operation. Each note provides a historical summary of that site, a statement of its significance, a paragraph on its present state of preservation and accessibility, and a list of references. The references lead to a bibliography twice the length of the introductory matter, which obviously goes well beyond support for the narratives, yet which is neither annotated nor comprehensive.

As a guide book, however, *Water for the Southwest* serves admirably, for it presents a highly useful survey of water engineering achievements in the region, up to shortly after the turn of the century and thus before the development of modern pump irrigation systems on the High Plains. Included among the sites, five of which are National Historic Civil Engineering Landmarks designated by the American Society of Civil Engineers, are the Roosevelt Dam in Arizona, the first multipurpose project of the U.S. Reclamation Service and the largest masonry dam in the world at the time of completion in 1911, the

Ames Power Plant in Colorado which first generated (with water power) and transmitted high voltage, alternating current for commercial use (1891), the largest roll crest dam in the country, an operating canoa (log flume) in New Mexico, an acequia in use in San Antonio for almost 250 years, and several interesting municipal and railroad water supply systems.

*Water for the Southwest* is, in balance, a necessary and useful first step in recording our heritage in water engineering in the Southwest.

David B. Gracy II  
Georgia State University

*The Last Boom.* By James A. Clark and Michel T. Halbouty. New York (Random House), 1972. P. 292. Illustrations, appendix, and index. \$8.95.

Reading this book about the largest oil field in the United States has proved to be an exercise in irony. Here I sit, some forty or so miles from the Black Giant's discovery well, which still produces a few barrels a day, wondering if I will be able to buy (or afford) enough gasoline to get me through next week. And yet, less than 45 years ago, oil was selling for a dime a barrel in East Texas, and they were producing more than the nation could absorb. As an historian I should not be surprised by the changes wrought by time, but the sheer enormity of this anomaly is almost overwhelming. In short, the oil business has changed a great deal in less than half a century, and the authors of this entertaining book have done a good job in describing an earlier era of abundance.

Clark and Halbouty approached the subject with both practical and scholarly credentials. Both were on the scene during the great East Texas boom—Clark as a working newsman and Halbouty as a geologist and engineer. Since then, they have produced a book on Spindletop and now they have combined again to record the history of what they choose to call "the last boom." Their efforts should not go unnoticed in a day of international concern over petroleum resources.

Beginning with the exploits of Columbus Marion Joiner, himself a case study of the American speculator, Clark and Halbouty proceed to show how Joiner's discovery not only changed the face of East Texas but led to modern methods of oil conservation. Dividing their work into three books—*The Believers*, *The Exploiters*, and *The Aftermath*—the authors carefully weave human and technical elements into a rich tapestry, much as a modern weaving machine might combine cotton and petroleum-based synthetics into useful material. Indeed, one of the main strengths of this work is the careful attention to colorful personalities. "Old Man Joiner" comes to life as he travels the East Texas countryside cajoling money from dirt-poor farmers, gullible widows, and depression-wracked businessmen. He was a man with a dream, and it came true when he struck oil on Daisy Miller's Rusk County farm in October, 1930. The resulting boom brought a steady flow of oil and humanity to East Texas, forever changing that small corner of the Old South. Other colorful characters include the legendary H. L. Hunt, who really struck it big in East Texas; "Doc" Lloyd, the self-proclaimed and unscientific geologist whose efforts outperformed the "pros" of the major companies; F. W. (Big Fish) Fischer, who defended hot oil runners all the way to the Supreme Court; and Judge R. T. Brown, the East Texas jurist who had to listen to thousands of legal disputes, many of them precipitated by "kinfolks" who came out of the woods when the smell of oil grew strong.

Equally impressive are the author's efforts to show the technical side of the East Texas Oil Field. A tremendous reservoir of oil, it covered more than 140,000 acres in Rusk, Gregg, Upshur, Smith, and Cherokee counties. The Woodbine formation which contained the oil was not especially difficult to drill, but it presented problems because of the abundance of salt water. Wide-open production—so characteristic of an oil

boom—threatened to ruin future recovery, and to glut the market with cheap oil. Both problems invited governmental intervention by the state Railroad Commission and later the federal government. The intricate story of proration is admirably recounted, and one cannot help but respect the efforts of Railroad Commissioner Ernest O. Thompson to bring some order to the scene, despite the nasty political and bureaucratic bungling that accompanied the government's action. An estimated 100,000,000 barrels of "hot oil" (produced in excess of proration) flowed from the field before the Connally Hot Oil Act finally plugged the holes in 1935. The net effect of the East Texas experience was to bring modern conservation techniques to the petroleum industry, but not before major and independent operators leveled charges and counter-charges against one another.

Other interesting parts of the book deal with the field's role in fueling the Allied side in World War II, the New London school explosion, and the slant-hole controversy of the early 1960's. In all, it is a fascinating account of the mineral frontier and its impact on Texas and the nation.

Careful scholars may be distracted by the absence of footnotes and the brief bibliography which is simply titled "an acknowledgment." Surely it would have been proper to print the list of 200 persons interviewed, since their comments obviously furnished much of the material for the book. Perhaps this work will whet the interest of historians in this aspect of the American frontier, although it will be difficult to produce a more readable account of the "Black Giant."

Bobby H. Johnson

Stephen F. Austin State University

*Texas Cities and the Great Depression.* By Willena C. Adams, editor. Austin (The Texas Memorial Museum), 1973. P. 207. Index. \$3.95.

At the risk of boring you with the first sentence, you need to know, nonetheless, that this book covers: Temple, 1929-1933; Taylor, 1929-1931; San Marcos, 1932-1933; San Antonio, 1929-1936; Midland, 1929-1933; Kilgore, 1930-1931; Dallas, 1929-1933; Galveston, 1929-1933; Houston, 1929-1933; San Angelo, 1933-1936; and Austin, 1929-1936. Since there are other Texas cities, and because the depression persisted for a decade, the volume, obviously, lacks comprehension despite the title. However, to steal a line from an old Spencer Tracy movie, "What is there, is choice."

Written by various graduate students and assembled by Professor Robert Cotner of the University of Texas the chapters are well-constructed and researched in a professional manner. The illustrations, including cartoons, paintings, and photographs, are excellent, and the authors deserve praise for their work. Although they often record depression hardship with unemotional statistics concerning welfare, government expenditure, and charity agencies, once in a while human feeling glimmers through the hard-rock of the text. Robert Ozment comments, for example, about his family's rent-free home in Temple: "I remember this house well because it had no coverings on the splintery old floors. My one pair of shoes had to be saved for winter use, and during the summer my feet were constantly bandaged from the thrust of splinters." (page 2).

The book could use a summation chapter to compare the experience of these various towns. Taylor, Midland, Kilgore, and Dallas, for instance, enjoyed an oil boom while Austin, Galveston, and San Antonio possessed governmental institutions all of which served to soften the cruel impact of the depression. In the cities, moreover, local governments and charity groups worked hard with only partial success to prevent abject deprivation. Yet no government collapsed; there was no revolt; the banking structure, with losses, survived; and most cities welcomed the relief of the New Deal. Perhaps, Professor Cotner can provide such a summation in a separate book.

There exists an additional editorial quirk that deserves comment. Footnote numbers are included in the text, but for reasons of economy, the footnotes themselves have been left out. Since this study will appeal largely to professional historians who like to read such items, this situation will create frustration. Dr. Cotner in his introduction offers to supply citations when requested. I hope that he is flooded with inquiries—it will, at least, prove the popularity of this worthwhile book.

David McComb  
Colorado State University

*Impressions of the Big Thicket.* By William A. Owens and paintings by Michael Frary. Austin (University of Texas Press), 1973. P. 112. \$15.00.

This handsomely-designed book is a fascinating chance to view this unique region through the eyes of two who obviously have a deep affection for it.

Though it is largely a picture book, the text by William A. Owens gives a sensitive portrayal of the area that makes an effective counterpoint to Michael Frary's bold and dashing watercolors. Especially helpful is Owens' description of the people of the Big Thicket. He writes sensitively of their history, their attitudes, their songs and their mannerisms, sometimes with humor but always with affection and respect. One comes away with the feeling that rugged independence of the people is a part of what should be preserved in the Thicket.

Owens is currently a Professor of English at Columbia University, but is a native of Texas. He first visited the Big Thicket in 1933. Many trips have followed over the years, some in the line of duty as a teacher at Texas A&M and at the University of Texas, some purely for pleasure. His text bears out his claim that the book is a record of a 40-year "love affair" with the Big Thicket.

Granting the effectiveness and beauty of Owens' text, the book still largely belongs to Michael Frary. Seventy of the 112 pages are devoted to full page reproductions of his paintings. Thirty-six of them are stunningly reproduced in full color. In addition, there are numerous sketches decorating the ample margins of the text.

The paintings are direct, on-the-spot works rather than studio paintings. They are neither careful copies of nature nor calculated designs. Rather, they are records of a perceptive eye and a trained hand translating a scene into watercolor with joy and spontaneity. The most effective ones are those that strike a proper balance between a degree of descriptive realism and an effective display of a fluid, sparkling, watercolor quality. Some perhaps can be faulted for exploiting one of these attributes at the expense of the other. They are all stamped with Frary's intense and individual style.

Frary's qualifications for the book are impressive. A native of California, he received the Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Fine Arts degrees from the University of Southern California. Since 1952 he has taught at the University of Texas. He has exhibited widely and has many awards and one-man exhibitions to his credit. John Palmer Leeper writes in his introduction to the book:

"Other artists of the area have dwelt on its pensive and nostalgic aspects. None, however, have caught its excitement and splendor so forcefully."

The book recounts the long struggles to preserve the Big Thicket and to create a National Park or National Monument of the area. Its appeal, however, is not to the intellect so much as to the senses. Simply by inviting you to share their intense love for the Thicket, the authors make a very effective appeal for its preservation. The book is elegantly produced, without being ostentatious. It is one that invites frequent leisurely perusal.

Reese Kennedy  
Stephen F. Austin State University

*The Big Thicket.* By Edmond E. Talbot. Austin (Little House Press), 1973. P. 98. \$5.95.

This chronicle of the Neal family's exodus westward during the Civil War no doubt will bring memories of family stories passed down to many of us of an era from which we are only a few generations removed. Many of us of the Big Thicket area were born here because our great-grandfathers were Tobe or Ed Neal's counterpart. Although the Big Thicket is mentioned numerous times, the setting is not Big Thicket and the title may at first appear to be a misnomer. Only near the end of the story does any of the action take place in the Big Thicket, but as Pete Gunter points out in the foreword, the goal of the two Neal brothers was this "jungle-like wilderness" and the rest of the family wanted "a new start on the rich prairie land of Texas" even though they never got farther than the Cane River of Louisiana.

This novel is an engrossing bit of history of our fratricidal war, ending in an episode of unforgettable horror of brother killing brother. Talbot seems to have an intimate knowledge and understanding of the life of this period. His characters are very realistic and the plot moves dramatically to the climax except in chapter six which seems to be more of an essay covering the situation prevailing at the time of the Battle of Port Gibson, Grant's success at Bayou Pierre and Big Black which "put Grant into Vicksburg through the back door". We think this information might have been better integrated into the story. It does seem that the author would have done well to have had the runaway slave Orin found by some other means than through "enquirin' amongst the niggers" for if there is one trait that we have found among black people, it is that they will never tell the whereabouts of a black brother no matter how harmless it might be to do so. There are many folksy expressions and sayings typical of those times. One word, "whicker" of English provincial origin did not come to Texas to stay. (The words "whinney" and "nicker" are used instead.) But all of these are reminiscent of an era past. There are a few typographical errors.

We think that Talbot is an excellent storyteller and might well have stretched his plot over three-hundred pages instead of a thin ninety-eight, but on the other hand, he has packed it with action and it is an easy evening of reading.

Lois Williams Parker  
Beaumont, Texas

*The Politics of Massive Resistance.* By Francis M. Wilhoit. New York (George Braziller, Inc.), 1973. P. 283. Appendix and tables, notes and references, epilogue, and index. \$8.95, cloth—\$3.95, paper.

Works by a number of journalists and historians have analyzed southern "massive resistance" to the *Brown* decision. Such journalistic accounts as Benjamin Muse's *Ten Years of Prelude* and Reed Sarratt's *The Ordeal of Desegregation* and in a more scholarly vein such efforts as Neil R. McMillen's *The Citizens' Council* and the reviewer's *The Rise of Massive Resistance* have not only mined similar materials but have approached their subjects from broadly similar assumptions. These studies have generally seen black culture as essentially American culture and have visualized assimilation as the solution to the race problem. Written mainly by "white southern liberals," they have been friendly toward national power and, at least by implication, distrustful of community control. Although some of the books have strongly reflected the stability-continuity thesis advanced by Wilbur J. Cash, they all approached their subject within the broad framework structured in the writings of C. Vann Woodward, V. O. Key and Dewey Grantham (two of the studies mentioned above were written by Grantham students), which viewed race as something of a spurious political issue that upstaged the "natural" alliance of poor blacks and whites.

Since many of these assumptions are increasingly open to question, further analysis of the dynamics of massive resistance within an innovative theoretical framework might well produce rewarding insights. And it is in this context that Francis M. Wilhoit's *The Politics of Massive Resistance* is so disappointing. The work is curiously dated, perhaps because it originated as a Harvard University doctoral dissertation presented in 1958. Although Wilhoit offers in the concluding section of the book an "interpretive explanation" stressing political, economic, psycho-cultural and religious factors that offer interesting approaches to the study of the massive resistance movement, none of these hypotheses are tested in the study itself. Instead, the author structures his analysis loosely around a struggle between "the equalitarian revolution" and the massive resistance "counterrevolutionaries," a design so general and vague that it obscures more than it illuminates.

Wilhoit's research is not impressive; the book rests heavily upon the standard coverage of *Southern School News*. As one of numerous examples, the author seems not to have consulted Marshall Frady's significant biography of George C. Wallace in formulating his shallow discussion of the Alabamian. Indeed, Wilhoit's topology of southern political leaders (tutelary, charismatic demagogues, pragmatic self-aggrandizers, intellectual ideologues) is astonishing; he lumps into the "pragmatic self-aggrandizers" of massive resistance Senator William Fullbright of Arkansas and Governors James Folsom of Alabama, Haydon Burns of Florida and Luther Hodges of North Carolina, characterizing these disparate gentlemen as examples of "the architects of the new status quo" (91-92).

At best, Wilhoit's concluding "interpretive explanation" might serve as a starting point for future and more adequate studies of massive resistance.

Numan Bartlet  
University of Georgia

*The Year They Threw the Rascals Out.* By Charles Deaton. Austin (Shoal Creek Publishers, Inc.), 1973. P. 244. Bibliography, appendices, and index. \$2.75.

The year referred to in Deaton's title is 1972 and the "rascals" are those Texas politicians who felt the wrath of Texas voters in the wake of the Sharpstown and related scandals. The genre is political history mixed with some analysis of the events reported; the style leans more in the direction of the journalistic than the academic giving this study wider appeal than many political histories. The author's credentials are more than satisfactory: native East Texan; resident in West Texas, Central Texas and South Texas; political reporter in Austin; and student and teacher of government, history and business.

Deaton's story begins with events surrounding the Sixty-second Legislature (1971) and ends with an analysis of the events of the Sixty-third (1973). Along the way he recounts the developments in the 1972 primaries and general election as well as the "reform legislature" of 1973. Through it all, the author's purpose is to help the Texas citizen-voter "determine the difference between true reform and surface change" and to point the way for him when he decides "to do something about it all," but "don't know where to begin".

After following carefully the trail of the Frank Sharp story, the effort of the Sharpstown scandals on the elections of 1972 and the fight for reform in the Sixty-third Legislature, Deaton offers some perceptive conclusions. He suggests that some of the new legislators elected in 1972 quickly established the same type of voting records as those they replaced and that the reform laws actually passed in 1973 are yet to be tested in action. He detects three major agents of change in 1972: the Sharpstown Scandals, the

advent of single-member legislative districts in urban areas, and the new reform rules adopted by the Democratic Party. Of the three, Deaton concludes that single-member districts will be the most significant and long lasting.

Throughout the book, Deaton focuses attention on the parties, personalities and voting records in the political "free-for-all" that was 1972 in Texas. Highly recommended for all who are interested in contemporary Texas politics—readable, factual—all in all, a real contribution to Texas political history.

Joe E. Ericson  
Stephen F. Austin State University

*My Blood's Country: Studies in Southwestern Literature.* By William T. Pilkington. Fort Worth (Texas Christian University Press), 1973. P. 197. Notes and index. \$3.50.

This collection of essays about Southwest writers by William T. Pilkington is a useful addition to the growing body of scholarship regarding writing in the area. As Pilkington points out in his final essay, there is a revival of interest in regional literature, as evidenced by such things as the establishment of the Southwest American Literature Association with its journal and its bibliography of Southwest writers which is now at the publisher.

Since this collection is composed of essays which Pilkington published over a period of about five years ending in 1969, it makes no pretence of being any more than an assortment of pieces covering, for the most part, minor figures. The first and the final essays attempt to put the others into the perspective of the Southwest literary and cultural scene. The comments in the final essay are worth reading, if only because they enumerate questions most students of Southwest writing have seen as ones that must be dealt with if writers in the area are to deal forthrightly with contemporary Southwest life.

Pilkington says that these essays have been reprinted in their original form. While one can understand that extensive revision would have been arduous, some of the essays would have profited by revision. Most particularly, the entire text of the pamphlet which Pilkington wrote on William A. Owens for the Southwest Writers Series is reproduced. This gives an imbalance to the book, since it places Owens in the position of getting about twice as much attention as some other writers whom Pilkington seemingly rates more highly, especially Harvey Fergusson.

Pilkington's judgments of such writers as Edwin Corle, Paul Horgan, Edward Abbey, and Frank Waters are by and large good ones, except that he is somewhat guilty of the very accusation he makes concerning enthusiasts for regional literature; he admits that most of these people are minor figures, but he insists that they are worthy of attention because they have treated the Southwest scene.

Even though this collection can be faulted in some ways, it still has its values. In the revival of interest in regional writing, any intelligent view of writers of the region is welcome. With the plethora of publications in our day (mayhap the paper shortage will curtail many of the avenues for publication of scholarly, semi-scholarly, and pseudo-scholarly effusions), it is easy to welcome any collection of articles on a topic of interest.

Ernest Speck  
Sul Ross State University

*The Whig Party of Louisiana.* By William H. Adams. Lafayette (University of Southwestern Louisiana Press), 1973. P. 122. Bibliography, index. \$6.00.

The sixth publication of the USL History Series published by the University of Southwestern Louisiana, *The Whig Party of Louisiana*, makes available in the offset process a study of the political manifestations of the rise and fall of the Whig Party in Louisiana. First attracted to national issues by the elections of 1824, Louisiana voters betrayed loose party affiliations throughout the ante-bellum era. Not unlike twentieth century voters, Louisiana voters before the Civil War had a habit of voting for one party on local-state offices and for another on national offices. Ethnic conflicts, rural-urban hostilities, the Negro, sugar, cotton, tariffs, business, banking, internal improvements, and personality cults provided the seemingly ever-constant ingredients of Louisiana politics during the days of whiggery.

The Louisiana Whig party, an integral part of the national party, evolved from the National Republican party in 1834. Louisiana Whigs supported protective tariffs, the Bank of the United States, and federally financed internal improvements. Henry Clay was unmistakably the "godfather" of the Louisiana Whigs. Outstanding state leaders included such men as Judah P. Benjamin, Alexander Porter, and Edward Douglas White. From 1834 to 1842, Louisiana Whigs controlled the state, but thereafter went into a slow decline, only to suddenly evaporate after having won control of the state constitutional convention of 1853.

A host of factors contributed to the decline of the party. Andrew Jackson's local popularity competed with whiggish sentiments. Texas Annexation, John Tyler, the slavery controversy, nativist sentiments and the more whiggish program of the Louisiana Democratic party in the 1850s contributed to the decline of Whig strength. The study is intensive, state-oriented, and generally informative. There are some distracting, but minor errors in the text and notes and the overall composition is somewhat disjointed. There is considerable attention to voting detail and little attention to the hard economic data depicting the trade, manufacturing, and banking structures in New Orleans, and the sugar interests in the interior, which provided the foundation of Louisiana Whig strength. The bibliography is impressive and useful. Complementary studies include Louis M. Norton's unpublished dissertation, "The Whig Party in Louisiana," (1940); and that of Joseph G. Tregle, Jr., "Louisiana in the Age of Jackson," (1953); and Wendell H. Stephenson, *Alexander Porter; Whig Planter of the Old South*. The absence of Whig references and citations in standard Texas histories, suggests on the one hand the nominal influence of the party in Texas, and on the other argues for further historical investigation.

Henry C. Dethloff  
Texas A&M University



2063  
207  
10