Political Patriarch: David B. Culberson and the Politics of Railroad Building, Tariff Reform, and Silver Coinage in Post-Civil War America

Leonard Schlup
David B. Culberson (1830-1900) was a prominent political figure in late nineteenth-century East Texas history. A Democrat who served in the United States House of Representatives from 1875 to 1897, Culberson epitomized the Southern politician who championed party loyalty, worked to preserve the Solid South for the Democracy, sought to resolve sectional tensions, and promoted national harmony. A versatile, honest, and warm-hearted gentleman who possessed a masterful command of the English language, he intertwined the fortune of his party with his own destiny while endeavoring to ease the transition from the politics of the pre-Civil War era to that of the Gilded Age, the period between 1877 and 1900.

Generally overlooked by historians who have mentioned his name only briefly, if at all, in books on Texas, Culberson merits attention for the role he played in national politics. He remains an enigma largely because of the paucity of personal papers and the tendency of scholars to concentrate on the lives of his illustrious contemporaries, including Senator and Governor Samuel Houston, Governor and Senator Richard Coke, Senator Samuel B. Maxey, Senator John H. Reagan, Senator Roger Q. Mills, Congressman and United States Marshal Thomas P. Ochiltree, Governor James S. Hogg, and Culberson's son, Charles A. Culberson, an attorney general of Texas (1890-1894) who served as governor of the state from 1895 to 1899 and United States senator from 1899 to 1923.1 Letters that do exist, combined with Congressman Culberson's speeches in the Congressional Record, reveal several qualities about the Texan that deserve recognition. Culberson's historical importance is tied directly to his public policies and actions, and an examination of this conduct helps to assess his influence as a politician.2

Culberson lived during exciting and turbulent times in Texas and American history. He was six years of age when the Battle of the Alamo occurred and fifteen when the Republic of Texas joined the Union. His twenty-two years of continuous service in Congress coincided with a generation of change that transformed the political, economic, and social order of the United States. The country was converting from a rural, agricultural, and homogeneous society into an urban, industrial, and heterogeneous nation. The rise of big-business enterprise, new tides of diplomatic adventures, growing interstate commerce, tariff duties, railroad building, and currency legislation, among others, occupied Culberson's attention.3 These changes and issues impacted Texas, and Culberson represented his constituency during a period characterized by postwar readjustment, the advance of the cattlemen's frontier, and agricultural ascendency in which the currency cauldron, railroad rates, and tariff taxes assumed crucial importance.
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Born in Georgia, the son of a Baptist preacher and grandson of an Oglethorpe County planter, Culberson read law in the office of William P. Chilton, chief justice of the supreme court of Alabama and prominent Cotton Whig leader. After gaining admittance to the bar in 1856, Culberson relocated to Upshur County, Texas, where he practiced law and held a seat in the lower house of the state legislature in 1859. A Whig raised in the Hamiltonian school of thought, Culberson favored a broad constructive interpretation of the Constitution and wide use of legislative power to enact laws necessary and proper for the common welfare. Following the disintegration of the Whig Party, Culberson in 1860 voted for John Bell, presidential nominee of the Constitutional Union party. The election that year of Abraham Lincoln as president resulted in the exodus of Southern states from the Union. Firmly opposed to secession, Culberson, cognizant that his constituents disagreed with him on this matter, resigned his position in the legislature in 1861 and moved to Jefferson, a city in Marion County, which became his permanent home.

The Civil War marked a turning point for Culberson that propelled him into a political career. During that conflict, he enlisted in the Confederate army as a private but rose to the rank of colonel of the Eighteenth Texas Infantry, where Culberson earned a reputation for courage and resourcefulness. In 1863, Governor Pendleton Murrah appointed him adjutant general of Texas, but the following year he took his seat in the Texas legislature. The defeat of the Confederacy in 1865 convinced Culberson to return to his law practice. A successful trial lawyer, he easily won election to the state senate in 1873 and to the United States House of Representatives in 1874, the year of a Democratic congressional triumph.

Several factors characterized Culberson's years in the House. First, as a frequent chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he acquired valuable expertise on constitutional law and matters pertaining to judicial reform. Second, although he seldom delivered speeches on the House floor, Culberson was a fine speaker who tempered his remarks and arguments with clear expressions, factual data, substantiating evidence, and a brilliant display of diction. Third, Culberson introduced in the lower chamber the antitrust bill of 1890 and supported the measure to curb giant monopolies and combinations in restraint of trade. Fourth, the Texas congressman endorsed federal regulation of railways and assistance in their construction. Fifth, he fought for the principle of a tariff for revenue only, thereby distancing himself from the protectionist elements within the Democratic Party. Finally, while not a leading spokesman for silver, Culberson advocated the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of "16 to 1" with gold, and he entreated his colleagues to act reasonably on that volatile quagmire. In this respect, he voted for the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 and the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890 as conservative steps to encourage bimetallism. Turning against President Grover Cleveland, a sound-money Democrat, Culberson in 1893 opposed the repeal of the 1890 act.

Of all the major issues with which he had to deal as a legislator, Culberson particularly excelled in the areas of railroad development, tariff reform, and currency expansion. All three were important to him; they were
national issues to which he devoted much time and on which he prepared some of his best speeches for the edification of his colleagues and the public.

With regard to railroad development in the Gilded Age, Culberson paid considerable attention to the growth of the Texas and Pacific Railway Company. Organized in 1871, this company resulted from the consolidation of three companies that owned trackage and maintained franchise rights, including a charter from Congress to build a southern route at the thirty-second parallel to California to meet the tracks of the Southern Pacific Railroad. The line opened from Longview to Dallas in 1873, but the Panic of 1873, with an ensuing economic slowdown, halted its westward expansion. The railroad finally reached Fort Worth in 1876, after which there occurred still more delay until Grenville M. Dodge, a prominent Iowan and political figure who had built the Union Pacific, headed the construction effort.

On May 3, 1876, during the impedimental period, Culberson addressed the House of Representatives on the subject of the Texas and Pacific Railroad. Urging Congress to come to the aid of this construction, Culberson pleaded with his cohorts in both parties to accept with amendments the elaborate bill introduced by Representative John Atkins, a Tennessee Democrat, to assist in the building of the Texas and Pacific Railway. After outlining the provisions of this measure, Culberson, in true Hamiltonian fashion, pointed out that Congress possessed the power to regulate commerce and promote welfare and so could engage in this enterprise, and he quoted Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, John C. Calhoun, and Henry Clay, among other political predecessors, to substantiate his position. Culberson contended that one transcontinental line farther north was inadequate to meet either the needs of the government or the commerce of the country. The southern route through Texas, he noted, would benefit the nation and the region. Praising his state’s “virgin soil,” its freedom from “snow blockades” and the “perils of mountain ranges,” and the suitable climate in the South for agricultural products, Culberson reminded the audience that the population of Texas was growing and that lands were increasing in value. “There will be no lack of demand for Texas lands,” he predicted.

The main thrust of Culberson’s speech revolved around the weak economy and how railroads could contribute to economic improvement. He painted a bleak picture of the suffering, destitution, and other problems of the recession that plagued the country. “The cry is for work; the demand for labor is too small,” he explained, adding that the “great industries of the country are paralyzed. The fires have burned to ashes in the furnaces of factories, founderies, and mills. The spade and shovel are silent along great lines of work which gave labor to thousands and bread to many more. The bone and sinew of the country, outside of agricultural districts, are without employment, and states, cities, and towns are appealed to for work for the unemployed that starvation may be averted.” Believing that this bill would give “life and activity” to America’s great industries as well as bestow “the prospect of other blessings,” Culberson demanded that nonpartisan action be taken immediately rather than postpone consideration of the measure until after the presidential and congressional elections of 1876. He concluded:
The Government needs the road, the people need it, and this company, owning a charter over the route desired, proposes to build it on the conditions named. . . . The completion of this road will redeem the South from the thralldom of poverty. I enter no plea in behalf of her blighted fields, her destroyed industries, desolated homes, and broken fortunes. . . . She is not what she once was. . . . The war closed, and peace found us broken in fortune and without much hope for the future. The energy of her people has been severely taxed, but the waste places are being built up and the bruises on her limbs are healing. Her people are striving together to restore it to its former agricultural beauty and power. Politics and partisan spirit have delayed the work of restoration. . . . Over all these hangs the blight of offended power and a feeling of constraint broods over the land. No enterprise, no token of national kindness, no emblem of sectional reconciliation could do more to rehabilitate the South and arouse her paralyzed industries than the adoption of this measure and the completion of this grand work. It would be an earnest from the heart and power of the nation that whatever of the past should be forgotten, and that in fact, as in theory, we are a brotherhood of States, and whatever of prosperity, glory, and renown may come to us in the future, the same shall be the common property of all.

In addition to railroad development, Culberson expressed interest in reforming the tariff, a schedule of duties imposed by the government on imports. This issue surfaced as an important matter during the Gilded Age. Since the adoption of the Morrill Tariff of 1861, Republicans generally had favored a high tariff to protect American industries from foreign competition. Democrats, on the other hand, endorsed the concept of a tariff only for government revenue. Culberson supported the Democratic theory that no more money should be collected than that which public purposes required under an economical administration and that the burden of the tax should be in proportion to the ability of the taxpayer to bear the cost.

Culberson outlined his ideas on the tariff in a speech before his House colleagues on April 30, 1884, the last year of the presidency of Chester A. Arthur. The occasion was to announce his support of the Morrison bill, a measure introduced by Representative William R. Morrison, a prominent Illinois lawyer and Democrat who served in Congress from 1873 to 1887. Morrison's purpose was to revise the Tariff of 1883, which lowered schedules five percent but retained the protectionist principle. Culberson contended that the sentiment of the majority of the people demanded a reduction in the rates of tariff taxation and that it was the responsibility of the House, under the Constitution, to comply with this request, which fell within the legitimate sphere of the taxing power of the national government.

Cognizant that manufacturing industries were not in satisfactory condition, Culberson conceded that "wise and wholesome legislation upon the tariff must be based upon existing conditions to which it relates." He thought that the Morrison bill offered a conservative approach toward a tariff for revenue that would relieve those individuals burdened by exorbitant prices. Denouncing protectionism as an oppressive, imperial, and iniquitous system of taxation, Culberson warned that "its tendency is to centralize wealth, to build up classes by forced contributions upon the people at large, to foster monopolies, and to create an aristocracy of wealth. It degrades labor instead of
elevating it.... Monopoly and servitude go in pairs, and both are the legitimate offsprings of a system which robs the public to aggrandize the few.... The burden of the tax falls heavier upon the shoulders of the poor than upon those of the rich.... It is the offspring of greed.... Self-interest always rebels against open robbery, but fraud, robed in a patriotic garb, deceives while it plunders.... Wealth is enthroned in palatial residences that shelter the bounty-fed barons of protection.... There is no factor in American politics or policies that has contributed more to centralize the wealth of the country, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, than the system of protection."11

Continuing with his theme that the wealth of the country acquired under the protective system was divided unevenly, Culberson sought to remedy the situation by lowering the taxes. He complained about the "long role of banks and bankers fattening day by day upon the spoils gathered from the people by the favor of class legislation" and "the costly public buildings more fit for the scarlet henchmen of royalty to dwell in than the servants of a republican people." He warned that a "plethoric or overflowing" treasury invites "legislative spoliation and encourages wasteful extravagance." According to Culberson, when the outcome of any governmental legislation produces "unblushing tyranny" and "gross oppression," then the government has committed "an unpardonable crime against humanity." The Texan suggested that tariff reform would not only return the nation to prosperity but also would complete the work of Reconstruction. He said:

The Democratic party makes no war upon capital, but is now and always has been the champion of the rights of the people against the encroachment of power and unjust exactions. It has always battled for a pure and honest administration of Government. It has stood by the people throughout the long war which monopoly and centralized wealth have made upon their income and property. It has been the avowed foe of all class legislation. It has struggled to bestow the blessings and benefits of Government on all alike and to apportion its burdens among all the people. Time and time again it has gone down in defeat, overwhelmed by the combined elements of protection, monopoly, and centralized wealth. But undaunted by defeat, inspired by the great cause of the people against all opposing elements, it will ever be true to its principles and traditions in adversity or prosperity.12

Another significant issue that concerned Culberson was the money question, a matter that had long troubled politicians.13 The Coinage Act of 1873 had demonetized silver by omitting the standard silver dollar from the coinage, despite an increase in United States silver production resulting from new discoveries in the West.14 Culberson postulated that demonetization constituted a link in the chain by which "the brain and muscle of the people were held in slavish servitude to the kingly power of gold." A friend of silver who wanted it on the same plane with gold, Culberson referred to the 1873 law as a "crime," declaring that "the will of the people seems powerless to enforce respect for the money of the people."15 Although never insisting that the public debt be paid only in silver, he did demand that no impairment or abridgment by legislative action or executive "despotism" exist to deny the option to pay in either metal. Culberson thus joined the chorus of other silver proponents who charged that a gold conspiracy sought to remove silver from its proper
place as a circulating medium. This explosive issue engendered class, sectional, and political divisions. For champions of the white metal, silver became not only a symbol but also an economic remedy to cure the nation’s ills and a sacred dogma.

In a speech in the House on March 27, 1886, during Cleveland’s first administration, Culberson addressed the issue of coinage. His speech was a plea for fair play for silver as well as for honest dealing with the American people. Professing that free and unlimited coinage of silver would help to correct economic evils in society, the Texas congressman predicted that a new era of prosperity would dawn upon the country. Culberson also denounced “the rapacious triumvirate of bondholders, banks, and syndicates of wealth” who contemplated a raid upon the value of money “for the purpose of exalting the value of gold.” He labeled this autocratic action as an “unhallowed scheme” foisted upon the “toiling millions” by an organized and disciplined aristocracy of wealth whose “sycophantic exhibitions of friendship” for the poor were disgusting. He mentioned that this greedy group, following the paths of “outrage and wrong” paved by Republican Party legislation, were analogous to the lion being the friend of the lamb and the spider posing as an ally of the fly until “the unsuspecting victim” fell powerless before its superior prey.16

Culberson saw an “irrepressible conflict” between the financial policy of the Democratic and Republican parties. Under the GOP monetary plan and presidential rule from 1869 to the 1880s, “a decade of spoliation and wrong,” according to the Jefferson, Texas, Democrat, many problems connected with ill-conceived and unjust financial legislation plagued the nation. The results were “withering” and “faltering” enterprises and “furnaces burned to ashes.” Culberson remarked:

Thousands of happy homes, where thrift and comfort once abounded, became the dwelling places of hunger and despair; labor looked down upon its rage and begged for bread; values perished in the fearful financial blight and property shifted into the hands of the fortunate possessors of gold and gold mortgages at gold prices.... The reign of the Republican party ... had destroyed the volume of money and filled the land with panic and bankruptcy. It had covered into the strong boxes of wealth nearly a billion dollars wrung from tax-payers without consideration.... It had fastened the fangs of an infamous system of taxation in the vitals of the earnings of the people to provide coin to pay bonds which the people had reserved the right to pay in currency. It had severed empires from the public domain, God’s gift to the homeless, and donated them to corporations already fattened upon the spoils of financial legislation. It had made prosperity for the rich and despire for the poor by legislation.17

In addition to his assailment of Republican policies, Culberson attacked the concept of allowing the secretary of the treasury wide discretion in interpreting laws. He cited the Bland-Allison Act of 1878 as one example. This measure, passed by Congress over President Ruther B. Hayes' veto, required the treasury secretary to make monthly purchases of between $2 and $4 million worth of silver at the market price and convert such purchases into standard dollars. Although pleased with the partial restoration of silver,
Culberson complained, first, that unlimited purchase and coinage had not been attained, and second, that the treasury head had too much latitude in his discretionary powers and conservative use of them, making only minimum monthly purchases authorized by law. Culberson also chastized an act in 1881 that authorized the secretary of the treasury to apply so much of the government's surplus from time to time to the reduction of the public debt "as he may consider proper." Culberson queried his cohorts about the will of the people when one non-elected official possessed such extraordinary power.18

Culberson wanted the law changed to forbid these judgmental practices. He contended that the public welfare should not be dependent upon the knowledge of any one departmental head, for he could exercise his rights in such a manner as to defeat the will of the people, dwarf the volume of money, and plunge businesses into financial distress. Culberson proposed that this power be withdrawn and "the stern command of law substituted in its stead." He insisted that "the love of the great popular heart can only be maintained and cherished by fair treatment and equal laws."19

Culberson's pronouncements on currency often bordered on presenting images of chaos channeled by various groups hostile to the well-being of the average citizen. He virtually incarcerated these individuals without hope of redemption in speeches tailored to attract agrarian support in his eastern Texas constituency. Many of his ideas and terms later came to fruition in 1896 with the presidential candidacy of William Jennings Bryan, a Nebraska Democrat who campaigned on a free silver platform. Without question the currency issue was complex and vexatious. Some of Culberson's contemporaries, such as Vice President Adlai E. Stevenson, found themselves paralyzed by competing political sensitivities on the money issue, and their positions were buffeted by the breezes of public opinion and their own sagging spirits. In this respect, Culberson never wavered in his support of free silver and found himself more at home with the agrarian elements in his party than those representing eastern, conservative business interests.

Friends expected Culberson to seek a Senate seat in 1896 upon his retirement from the House. Instead, he stepped aside to permit his son, Governor Charles A. Culberson, to serve in that capacity and bring even greater recognition to their family name in Texas. In 1897, President William McKinley, a sound-money Republican from Ohio, appointed the elder Culberson to serve on the commission to codify the laws of the United States. Culberson died in Jefferson, Texas, while still participating in this endeavor.

Culberson was a man of absolute integrity and a decent public servant during the Gilded Age. A gentleman of the old school and a politician of principle, he held an elective position in a time of intense professional partisanship and rapid change that characterized the distended society of late nineteenth-century America. As a representative from an agrarian Texas constituency, he fought for economic justice, reduced taxation, and a more flexible currency. Culberson, a family patriarch and knight of the Texas vanguard, battled for his vision of democracy – an idealistic mixture of informed citizenry and enlightened public servants combining to produce a politically, economically, and socially acceptable environment.
Culberson’s reputation as a politician centered both in his devotion to the constitutional system and his fluent appeal to his constituents and colleagues to believe in their institutions. Nobody ever persuaded him to act against his own basic instincts. At times he was too moralizing in his pronouncements of political characterization in an age of excess and far too unyielding in his determination to avoid compromising on certain issues. The evils of a gold standard, for instance, were not as he imagined, and he overlooked the benefits that sensible tariff protectionism afforded several Texas products from foreign competition. While he condemned Republicans for “unblushing tyranny” and “gross oppression” with regard to their tariff and currency policies, Culberson ignored the high-tariff protectionists and sound-money advocates within his own party.

The Congressman’s pragmatism on some matters clashed with his idealism on others. He also showed a strangely incongruous espousal of both Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian ideals. Moreover, Culberson revealed a growing frustration with the lax political morality of the period, especially with regard to railroad investments, and the incumbents’ abuse of their privileges. He scolded legislators who disregarded the general good in favor of personal or selfish interests, a common complaint against late twentieth-century American politicians as well. Despite his shortcomings, Culberson was a dedicated and competent government official and a fascinating figure in Texas history. His years of service earned for him a place of honor in the finest traditions of American political life.
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