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Joshua Louis Hicks (1857-1921) worked hard all of his life. He spent over half of his working life investing hard labor and reaping the sparse rewards of a late nineteenth-century American farm laborer and farmer, the condition made worse by being in the South, most especially East Texas. He occupied his last two decades as a print shop worker and typesetter. The day he died, he was a dues-paid-up-card-carrying member of the Waco Typographical Union, No. 188, a local within the International Typographical Union.

As a 23-year-old farmer, Hicks found his voice in 1880, writing columns, editorials, and letters published in local and regional newspapers, usually in defense of Prohibition. The rate of these contributions increased as his interests shifted to the Farmers Alliance, Populist and Socialist parties and his writings appeared in the pages of the organs of those movements. At various times he wrote regular editorials and features for the Dallas Laborer, the Dallas Craftsman, the West Texas Sentinel, the Farmers' Journal, the Dallas Pitchfork and the Texarkana Socialist.

Kyle Wilkison is a Professor of History at Collin College and the immediate Past President of the East Texas Historical Association. His article is an adaptation of his Presidential Address delivered in Nacogdoches on October 14, 2016.
He contributed reports, poems, features, and letters to the Christian Advocate, the Advocate-Advance, Hopkins County Echo, the Abilene Reporter, the Dallas News, the Waco Times Herald, the Waco Tribune, the Union Advance and the Sulphur Springs Gazette, and others.

His writings reveal the passion of an idealist, often at odds with the cruel vagaries of the world and his own culture. They also reveal the questing mind of a voracious reader. Hick's willingness to question all sorts of authority supplied a tempering skepticism that led him to re-examine beliefs throughout his life and adjust his conclusions over time. Hicks began his writing life as a zealous Prohibitionist and primitive Christian. Near the end, he had abandoned both Prohibition (ironically just as it was winning the day) and formal religion. Yet, some things did not change over his forty-year odyssey (1880-1921) of public writings: Hicks hated violence and war, denounced white supremacy, supported female suffrage, and eventually, longed for a Socialist commonwealth.¹

Some might suggest that a white East Texas farmer and working man who believed these things must have been an outlier, even one-of-a-kind. While obviously fascinating to historians, is he not otherwise insignificant in understanding the mainstream history of this place? Why should we care about Hicks and his unusual worldview?

As Lawrence Goodwyn, James R. Green and Chandler Davidson have shown, agrarian radicals like Hicks formed a substantial minority in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Southwest. But, in our stronger-than-history cultural memory, such people have been categorically erased and replaced by cowboys, oilmen, entrepreneurs and other iconic myths more serviceable to contemporary elites. Consequently, we think we know more about the poor majority, the American and Texas and East Texas working class, than we really do. Such people appear as stock villains in our popular culture from the facile stereotyping of the entertainment industry to the uninformed generalizations of pundits and even scholars. Indeed, they remain
the butt of the last safely expressed public bigotry in mainstream American culture. Writing a 2016 election-year piece in the National Review, political pundit Kevin D. Williamson explained the poverty of the twenty-first century American working class (including those in his native Texas), with the same contemptuous language used by Hicks’s opponents a century earlier. In spite of the fact that “nothing happened to them,” Williamson writes, he finds them filled with “an incomprehensible malice.” Far from being victims of “the Man,” the working class is poor because it is dysfunctional, dependent, and engages in the “whelping of human children with all the respect and wisdom of a stray dog.” Such characterizations could have come from the press of Gilded Age Texas seeking to explain the rise of rural poverty during the agricultural crises of the 1880s and 1890s. Indeed, as Nancy Isenberg’s important 2016 work White Trash: The 400-Year Untold History of Class in America shows, the roots of such contempt for the poor majority run even further back into American history. In all times and places in the American past, spokespersons for the elite have explained disparities of wealth as the natural result of the distribution of virtue within a population using the reigning normative language of the age: religion, science, economic ideology, or, more recently, a sort of pop-ethnography that finds a “culture in crisis.” In every era, the economic winners have confidently explained that the working poor majority (“hillbillies,” “white trash,” “rednecks,” “black rednecks,” “losers” or worse) embodied backward traits that kept them poor.

What follows is the brief story of a poor man, a small farmer and hourly wage hand in newspaper print shops. Nevertheless, within this small story lie big contradictions of the malicious cultural portraits we have come to accept for the poor and working class.

Joshua Louis Hicks was born in 1857 the oldest of four children in southwestern Alabama on a small family farm in a county of small semi-subsistence farms. When Hicks was six-
years-old his father died leaving Hick's mother Nancy to provide for the young family. A family friend described Nancy Hicks as "full of humility and love" and "free of prejudice or bigotry." She must have been a hard worker, too. Somehow, his mother kept the family intact and on the farm, probably with the help of kin, for another decade. Hicks described it as a hard childhood but wrote glowingly of his mother. His mother was a member of a religious minority—a Primitive Baptist—in a county noted for another religious minority—a small colony of Quakers—and it is tantalizing to note that this woman's youngest son was named William Penn Hicks. According to the census records, in 1860 they had been among the respectable poor majority with $700 worth of land and no slaves. By the following decade, this fatherless family's fortunes had dropped by over half and they were looking to get out of Alabama. At age 18, Joshua struck out for Texas working as a plow hand and cotton picker in Brazos County.3

By 1880, the widow Nancy Hicks along with her three grown sons and married daughter lived together on a homeplace in Hopkins County, Texas. Hopkins County lies in the beautiful Post Oak strip with its magnificent hardwood trees, sun-dappled meadows and cheap sandy soil. Such soil would produce all the subsistence a family could want as long as they never needed money. Taxes, mortgages, doctors and the like demanded cash but small farmers could pay with the proceeds from the money crop of cotton, which would indeed grow there but sparsely and under protest. The Hicks family lived in the euphoniously named community of Forest Academy, about ten miles from the county seat of Sulphur Springs. It was instructive that the census-taker labeled Nancy Hicks and her three adult sons as illiterates in the 1880 census. Within a few months of the census-taker's visit, the supposedly illiterate Joshua Hicks made his debut in the pages of the East Texas press as a gifted writer and his two younger brothers would exhibit similar levels of literary competence. How did the census-taker arrive at his assessment of the Hicks
boys' literacy? Might he have been estimating the value of their farm, their economic status, their class, instead? ⁴

Joshua Hicks turned 23-years-old the year of the census. He had put in his time as a farmhand to get his family to Texas and bought land and he was living in a growing community that included young women. His thoughts turned to love. By that I mean the sappy, gob-smacked, doggerel-writing variety addressed to 19-year-old Henrietta Elizabeth Harrison, "the girl I love so dear," with whom he would spend the next fifty years: "In dream of night I oft-times view those lovely smiles so sweet; then when I wake my all I'd give to see those rosy cheeks." ⁵

His writing improved with time. In any case, apparently Henrietta liked this poem as well as his carefully handwritten marriage proposal. They married when she was twenty-one and together they had eight children. ⁶

During the decade he spent farming at Forest Academy, Hicks began writing contributions to the newspaper in the county seat of Sulphur Springs with reports on the doings of the farm folk of his community. He subscribed to, or, at least read, a variety of local newspapers as well as national papers promoting Prohibition and agrarian reform.

Along the way, he became a zealous partisan of Prohibition and occasional defender of the agrarian ideal. His range of contributions widened to include pieces in the regional Prohibition and Granger newspapers he read. He stuck mainly to prose with occasional returns to what he called poetry. With each passing piece, his writing achieved greater ease and confidence revealing an earnest and occasionally eloquent voice. This period is also when he first challenged conventional stereotypes. During his zealous defense of the Prohibition Party, he regularly denounced the hold that Civil War memory and resentment played in maintaining Southern white voters' loyalty to the Democratic Party.

In 1882, Hicks turned out what was, perhaps, his best poem and was rewarded by seeing it appear in the Mississippi state
Granger newspaper. It read, in part:

How strange! When farmers every hour
Feel the death-grip of corp’rate power
They do not rally to the Grange—
Their only hope. Is this not strange?
How strange! That Congressmen should pass
Bills in behalf of every class
Except farmers; to them they cry,
"You need no help." (Root, hog, or die.)
How strange! That some who advocate
Religion in the Lone Star State
Should be so deaf to human cries
As to publish the railroads’ lies?

What followed this in the 1880s was a long string of essays defending, promoting and preaching the Prohibition Party line. It is within the reams of that dry discourse that Hicks wrote something brave and unexpected. He took on Texas’ leading Prohibition luminary, the formidable Rev. Dr. J. B. Cranfill, publisher of Texas Baptists’ prohibition newspaper and financial secretary of Baylor University.

In an 1888 editorial carried by a nationwide Prohibitionist newspaper, Cranfill furiously warned Northern Prohibitionists to “abandon all that nonsense about ‘breaking down the color line.’” In a following issue, Hicks took his stand. Hicks approached the question carefully, claiming the Northerners meant only to eliminate the color line politically, not socially. The Northern reformers simply “see no good reason why the two races should stand arrayed against each other at the ballot-box. That such is the case here in the south no-one [sic] can deny. And that it results from the war—is a fruit gathered from old battlefield’s [sic], which is poisonous and destructive to the political health of this nation, cannot be seriously questioned.” Hicks defended the only somewhat less incendiary position that Northerner Prohibitionists thought black and white Southerners should ignore race in their voting behavior and that “they are
right about it until some decent reason is shown why the whites and blacks in the south should vote against each other.” “How like a wet blanket” Cranfill’s rejection must be “upon the ardent zeal of Bishop Turner, Hector Jordan and other colored me who are laboring and suffering and sacrificing for the uplifting of their race—and our own.”

Cranfill was unmoved. “With my own eyes,” he retorted days later, “in the Northern states I have seen negro [sic] and white children attending the same school, playing on the same playground, and those same children recited together in the same classes.” From there, he warned, “it is but a step to intermarriage” and “race annihilation and the end of the Anglo-Saxon.” Cranfill reminded his readers that he had said before and continued to maintain that “the negro is a lower race... that he is not... the equal of the white man and will never be.”

Hicks did not reply. Indeed, after this famous preacher’s rebuke, he went silent on race for years. In 1915, he wrote in the *American Socialist* that Southerners needn’t dread that Socialism would be the catalyst to erase the color line because capitalism had already achieved that. Somewhat tongue-in-cheek Hicks described black and white workers digging together in the same ditch and black and white businessmen filing deeds in the same courthouse with the observation that capitalism had already achieved what white Southerners accused Socialists of seeking to do.

Hicks got close to but did not arrive at values many on the left hold dear in our own time. He did not live in our time. He lived in Waco, Texas, in 1916, where white men burned a seventeen-year-old African American child to death on the courthouse lawn then brought their children to see his charred remains. Over a year after his neighbors tortured and murdered young Jesse Washington, Hicks ventured forth in the local paper with a column entitled “When the Mob Gets Started.” He carefully stated that he based this column on his reading of a sociology tome that analyzed mob mentality and on a sickening experience from his own youth.
"When you read the book you will get an idea of how quickly the human animal can descend from heights divine and be drawn into a mob and do things, as a member of the mob, that he could not be hired to do on his own moral responsibility as an individual." He then related a disturbing experience from his young farmhand days in Brazos County. One snarling, howling, shrieking night he lay in bed and listened in dread as the otherwise friendly neighborhood dogs ganged up on and killed a stray dog wandering into the community. After describing in gruesome detail the blood-chilling sounds he heard that night, he told his Waco readers: "The noise I heard was the noise of a mob."12

Hicks did not arrive at class-consciousness in a sprint. It took over a decade of struggle as a small farmer for him to show signs of beginning such a journey. Through his many writings in the 1880s and 1890s, we can observe that beginning.

In his twenties, he followed the conventional New South line that diversification and frugality would save the small farmer. While acknowledging that the new year of 1885 brought cries of "'hard times,'" debt and "'short crops,'" Hicks insisted that if only farmers would reform themselves, diversify and "live at home" their "state of affairs would be alleviated."13

The oft-repeated phrase "live at home" was a nineteenth-century phrase that would persist well into the 20th century generally used to pass judgment farmers who supposedly spent too much money at the credit merchant's store for sustenance which they could have grown in their own garden patch.

A year later, January 16, 1886, found Hicks still blaming his fellow farmers for widespread rural poverty. He then rejected the agrarian radicals' charge that railroad and corporate collusion explained cotton farmers' distress. Instead, he blamed the "credit system," or, more accurately, farmers who relied upon credit. The 29-year-old counseled greater self-restraint and to stop visiting the merchant unless one had something to trade or sell. "That's the route for me though the bridge over the next eight months be ever so shaky."14
In the spring of 1886, he took on the Farmers' Alliance plan for cooperative “Exchange Stores” which he feared would run honest merchants out of business. Once Alliance Exchange Stores were the only supplier available, Hicks predicted they would gouge farmers as badly as any privately held monopoly. He sparred with a correspondent from neighboring Reilly Springs in the Hopkins County Echo over the virtues of frugality and greater competition versus the pitfalls of cooperation through the Farmers' Alliance. While Hicks claimed to agree with much of the Alliance program, he feared the “misguided zeal and blind prejudice” of the “average farmer” would ruin what good was in it and warned once more about putting small town merchants out of business. Once more asserting his faith in competition, he declared that farmers “need a thousand more merchants in Sulphur Springs” not fewer. The only worthy object of the Farmers’ Alliance was to educate farmers on scientific agriculture and the evils of credit accounts.15

It only took three more years of the increasingly deflationary 1880s’ cotton market to chasten the young farmer. Now in his thirties and with a wife expecting their fifth child, a considerably humbled Hicks wrote a column for the local paper lamenting “honest debts.” How to make a bale of cotton pay ...

store accounts, bank notes, doctors’ and druggists’ bills, taxes, [and] etc. . . . is the knottiest, stubbornest, and most harassing question that ever drove sleep from the eyes of an honest farmer. It makes him almost insensible to the needs of his family. It rises like a black mountain before his eyes whenever he looks forward and tries to plan for the future. It makes him utter groans that can be understood only by honest men, who have contracted honest debts and who have made all honest endeavors to meet those debts, and have failed. It harrows the very soul, and drives one sometimes to the verge of dementia.
After laying out the deplorable conditions assailing the entire agricultural community, and showing genuine empathy for the farmers’ creditors who would not be fully paid, Hicks uncharacteristically articulated temporary defeat. “This is not written,” he admitted, “with any purpose of offering a remedy.” Then he added grimly: “I shall remedy my part of it sooner or later, in the providence of God.”

This was a pivotal moment for Hicks and his young family. He heard the railroad companies’ siren song of the west central rolling plains around Abilene and abandoned the beautiful if unremunerative Post Oak strip for Taylor County, a place where Mesquite bushes were often mistaken for trees. They arrived in Abilene in the dead of winter 1891 where Henrietta Elizabeth, she of the sweet smile and rosy cheeks, immediately gave birth to their sixth child.

The 34-year-old Hicks soon discovered that Taylor County land sold only by the section. He tried to convince his new neighbors that Abilene would never prosper until landowners were willing to sell smaller parcels to “the fifty-acre man” whose tilling of the soil surely “would invite rain” and lead to prosperity. Unfortunately for him, that purported connection between plowing and raining was one of the “railroads’ lies” that he missed.

The move to Taylor County was not the only big change on Hicks’s horizon. He was now a true believer in the Alliance all the way to the Subtreasury Plan, the litmus test for Texas radicals. His understanding of the currency deflation then killing farmers and debtors had increased as well, but, with characteristic optimism, he thought he saw relief on the horizon through the building of a new “formidable” political party.

All money has increased in value, all labor has decreased in value, wages have been reduced; all prices have been brought down, and debts are doubly hard to pay. And the country will not stand the contraction, and henceforth a formidable party is being built up, which is seeking and demanding relief.
Hicks and his Alliance district voted to send their representative to St. Louis to the founding convention of the People's Party and in support of all of the "Ocala Demands" as written.\textsuperscript{19}

Of the many varieties of 1890s populists, Hicks was of the capital-\textit{P} variety meaning he saw the silverite derangement as the "shadow movement" it was and cleaved to the leftist "midroaders" and Subtreasury men, denouncing the folly of Bryan and fusion. In another change from the last decade, Hicks started to note what he considered bad behavior by preachers in their betrayals of the interests of the poor majority in favor of their wealthy supporters. In fact, he charged that the Taylor County pulpit was "almost [as] a unit against political reforms."\textsuperscript{20}

For Hicks, the Populists were the true democrats, the true heirs of Jefferson, not the plutocrats of the moment running the Texas and national Democratic Party. As a good propagandist, he reported that the Populists had "about captured" his district and that an uncle in Greer County reported, "the People's party is practically solid in that section."\textsuperscript{21}

The more Hicks studied the Populist Party and the agrarian malaise to which it responded, the better he liked the Party and the less he liked farming. From his early adulthood, he had maintained a special connection to newspapers and their editors. By learning the printer's trade Hicks solved his personal farm problem while simultaneously slaking his thirst for the world of newspapers, more particularly a Populist newspaper, Abilene's the \textit{West Texas Sentinel}. Occasionally, Hicks even got to write for the newspaper he printed. Having written steadily for over twelve years for no pay, Hicks must have been thrilled to be on a newspaper team, even from the back of the shop. This would be Hicks's lifetime career. No matter his obvious talent and growing eloquence, he spent the rest of his life in the blue-collar end of journalism.\textsuperscript{22} In any case, the Populist Party and its newspapers
did not outlast the decade, and by late summer 1899, the 42-year-old father of eight sought and found employment printing the *West Texas Baptist*.23

Just before Hicks found work with the Baptists, the United States government declared war on Spain. Like people in many small towns and cities across Texas, Abileneans rallied their boys and young men to the colors in recruiting campaigns sometimes led by local pastors. Joshua Hicks would have no part of this conjoining of Christianity and nationalist zeal. Indeed, outraged at the prospect of preachers recruiting for war, he wrote and published a pamphlet denouncing their role—and any Christian’s role—in the war effort. It was Hicks’s position that no Christian might fight in a war and “shoot down his fellow-man” without contradicting the central message of Christ. Arguing from a Christian quietist-pacifist perspective—similar to the Amish but much at odds with his earlier Prohibitionist Party zeal—Hicks claimed that the culturally accepted religion of his own time was no Christianity at all. The more popular the church became, the less Christian it was: “it suffers most when the world treats it best.”24 It appears he may have had this writing in mind years later when he took great pains to claim for Socialism a purely political and secular nature. The goals of a cooperative commonwealth in no way sought to save souls but only to regulate economic behavior.

A year later found Hicks denouncing the next war, the U.S.-Filipino War. He rejected any evidence for America’s *bona fides* as a Christian nation despite it being “of all the nations on the earth . . . loudest in the boast.” Hicks believed that if not for dishonest leadership the “vast majority” of Americans would figure out for themselves the “moral impossibility” of America’s take-over of the Philippines. After pointing out the irony of the US fight against the Filipino independence movement, Hicks went to work on his fellow Methodist, President William McKinley:
If I were a Mohammedan, or a pagan bowing before 
gods of wood and stone, I would point to the Christian’s 
Bible which says “All things whatsoever ye would that 
men should do to you, do you even so to them,” and then 
to the so-called Christian president and cabinet of the 
United States . . . and then to the sickening slaughter of 
the human beings in the Philippine Islands . . . and then 
thank my god, whoever or whatever he might be, that I 
was not as other men are.”

The turn-of-the-twentieth century found Hicks politically 
homeless with Populist demise. While still working his day-
job at the West Texas Baptist he started up a small newspaper 
of his own to tout the brand-new Farmers’ Union just born in 
Rains County. This paper he called The Farmers’ Journal and it 
was the direct predecessor of the largest Socialist newspaper in 
Texas. As others have shown, the Farmers’ Union soon devolved 
into a power struggle between “actual farmers” and landlords. 
Choosing sides in that fight was no contest for Hicks, although he 
still had no political party with which to identify. Nevertheless, 
his powerful optimism about the possibilities for human society 
remained strong. He believed that “generations of the future will 
live in an era of good will and justice and happiness and peace 
such as the world has never known.” The first year of the new 
century nearly killed Hicks; he came down with typhoid fever 
and could not work for weeks. In the interim, his fifteen-and-
twelve-years-old sons, apparently already apprentices, filled in 
for him at the West Texas Baptist print shop.

Hicks’s journey continued toward a class-conscious critique 
of the new Texas political economy taking shape around him. 
He viewed the 1902 poll tax proposal with alarm and wanted 
everyone to know that “the true object of the poll tax” was 
simply “disfranchisement.” This was in marked contrast to some 
of the more ambitious former Populist politicians who earned 
their way back into the Democrats’ good graces by embracing 
racial disfranchisement.
Hicks's *Farmers' Journal* more or less held its own from 1904 to 1911. He slowly gave up on organized religion while retaining some belief in "an afterlife." At some point in the first decade of the twentieth century, he joined the brand-new Texas Socialist Party. Founded in Bonham in 1898 by a radical ex-populist, the independent Texas party joined with Eugene Debs' Social Democracy in 1900 and combined with other groups in 1901 to become the Socialist Party of America. Hicks had denied being a member of that party in 1901, but its class-conscious message drew him thereafter. By 1908, he was proclaiming his allegiance to the Debsian party in the pages of his paper. By then Hicks had a sufficiently large readership that "Colonel" Dick Maples approvingly noted his conversion in the pages of the *National Rip-Saw.*

Shortly thereafter, he handed over *The Farmers' Journal* to an enterprising trio from Hallettsville, father-and-son E. O. and E. R. Meitzen and IWW agitator and Irish immigrant Thomas A. Hickey. Some controversy clouded this transaction. Davidson and James R. Green present it as a buy-out or merger. The Abilene newspaper reported that Hicks would stay on and regularly contribute a page. And, indeed this was true for the first few months of *The Rebel*'s storied run. His weekly feature, "Hicks's Page" pursued Socialist themes of interest to rural Texans. He made a careful case for Socialism's accessibility to believers and non-believers alike, arguing that when understood correctly it was a secular and religiously neutral vehicle for social justice. Accordingly, you could be devout and be a good Socialist or you could be an atheist and be a good Socialist. "But you can't be a Socialist and believe that any individual should have to pay any other individual for the use of the soil to make a living. Keep your Socialism on straight."  

Having dispensed with any religious controversy to his liking, Hicks moved on to another sore topic. In spite of cultural aspirations to the contrary, on small farms much of the cotton production required the labor of women and children. He asked
over four dozen “reliable farmers” to estimate the portion of the cotton crop resulting from the labor “of women, and their little children who ought to be in school” and reported—with obvious moral outrage—that his farmers self-reported an average of 53 percent. This appeared in midsummer, 1911.30

“Hick’s Page” abruptly ended and never returned. From the pages of the Texarkana Socialist, the nationally known Texas writer Nat L. Hardy opined that Hickey and the Meitzens cheated Hicks. “They took J. L. Hicks’s subscription list and gave him in exchange a ten-dollar-a-week job. But J. L. Hicks is an honest man and has trust in his fellows and therefore did not bind Hickey and Meitzen with a written contract and after six months they fired Hicks without notice.”31

Dissolving his relationship with The Rebel appears not to have slowed down Hicks’s agitation for Socialism even a little. During his last years in Abilene he contributed columns extolling the virtues of Socialism in numerous small-town and rural Texas newspapers and continued his commentary on all things Abilene in letters to the Abilene Reporter. Hicks scolded the Abilene Reporter for inviting only members of the “25,000 Club,” the city’s “heaviest tax payers,” to express their opinions regarding a new city charter. He contended the newspaper was “asking the man who won in the game to name the rules under which the loser must continue to play.” Worse yet, such elitism contradicted “Jefferson’s democratic ideals.” The Reporter printed Hicks’s critique but did not spare him in its reply. “Mr. Hicks is an expert at creating mountains out of mole hills . . . For years Mr. Hicks has stood as the champion of the laboring man, particularly the man whose taxes is confined to the amount of a poll tax receipt.” The Reporter, surely a younger man, took a gratuitous swipe at Hicks as someone old enough to know better because he “is no spring chicken.” The Hicks family had been in Abilene for over twenty years and Joshua Hicks was now 54-years-old. Soon, he would be moving again.32

Lured to Waco by the prospect of starting a new—and
short-lived—publication, he and his family stayed on after he obtained a new job with the *Waco Times-Herald* as a printer and proofreader.  

Hicks would spend almost all of the last decade of his life in Waco. This freethinking Socialist would not have seen the irony of making his home in the Lone Star Vatican. He had long admired Reddin Andrews, the two-time Socialist nominee for Texas governor, and Andrews was as good a Baptist as you could be, a graduate of Southern Seminary, an ordained pastor and former president of Baylor, no less. And Hicks loved him so much he named his youngest daughter after him.  

Waco brought its heartaches. His second oldest child died shortly after their arrival. She was twenty-nine, single and lived at home. Another daughter was deaf and could not speak; she would never leave the family home. The other six children grew up, married and moved on. He took obvious pride in his sons. Two went into typographical work and one, Louis Hicks, became prominent in the twentieth century Texas labor movement.  

The propaganda build-up to U.S. entry into World War I found Hicks sticking to his old pacifist position. To Waco’s many pastors he wryly observed that perhaps before they joined the President’s preparedness campaign they should be aware that “there seems to be some contrast between Wilson’s peace program and that of Isaiah” with America’s plowshares being beaten into swords.  

Years after the zenith of Texas Socialism had waned and former radicals like the Meitzens and Tom Hickey moved into new ventures, Hicks kept the faith. In 1919 he engaged the editor of the *Waco Times-Herald* in a vigorous debate over which system best protected individualism, capitalism or Socialism. The *Times-Herald* asserted that it chose individualism over socialism and the editor challenged Hicks to state why capitalism was not individualism. Hicks began with an orthodox definition of democratic socialism but moved on to a more imaginative argument claiming for Socialism “freer and more unshackled
individualism." Hicks argued that when the capitalist system established laws allowing one man to determine whether to hire or fire a thousand men, “to feed them out of the products of their own labor or starve them by withholding those products” then, there was capitalism but not individualism. The *Times-Herald* called Hicks “beloved brother” and observed patronizingly that he “discusses every question in fine spirit and to intelligent purpose” and that “we recognize in Mr. Hicks one who loves his fellow-man” before roundly rejecting his arguments with a rebuttal from Hicks’s own eighteenth century hero: “That government is best that governs least.”

Hicks kept on writing and preaching his radical gospel of Socialism, nonviolence, female suffrage and the brotherhood of man during his last years in Waco. He spent his final year in Dallas. He and his wife moved to the northern metropolis to be near their sons Jesse and Louis, both typesetters and union activists. He had been a night sky-watcher for decades and his amateur astronomical reading and observations seemed to increase as he aged. This did not, however, diminish his zeal in fighting for the working class. Seven months before he died he denounced the rise of Dallas’ open shop movement in the pages of the *Dallas Craftsman*. “‘Open shop’ may sound nice to the general public,” he wrote, “but its real meaning” is that the union hall will be henceforth will be “closed tight forever.” “It means that the lone individual worker, unidentified with any other worker in the whole wide world, shall go to a closed corporation shop and make an entirely one-sided bargain for a job by which to keep from starving to death.” Less than three weeks before he died he sent one last epistle out into posterity: “Sooner or later the world will have to come to public ownership of its basic industries as the only remedy for inequality and inequity of distribution.” This appeared on October 11, 1921. Eighteen days later he died.

Three years before he died, he wrote one last poem contrasting his love for the night sky and for astronomy to the war-and-
pain-wracked earth below it, In spite of the earth’s “stench of death” and “blast and explosion and broken wings and the aching wonder – Oh! Why these things?” the aging ex-farmer and print shop worker comforted himself with this prospect:

Night wind, blow the smoke from beneath these stars;  
Let me see Vega, Capella and Mars  
Their glitter and gleam and majestic sweep  
Drive away all thought of the things that creep  
They are singing love’s sweet, celestial song.  
I have looked at the earth too long.41
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1. In my first encounter with Joshua L. Hicks, I missed the importance of the changing nature of his spiritual journey and ascribed 1880s-1890s motives to his 1910s writings. His final adoption of the Socialist Party occurred after he left the church. Several years later, Hicks articulated a belief in Socialism’s secular utility based in a rational search for a more just and humane society without regard to religious belief. Nevertheless, his roots in primitive Christianity with its intimations of human equality remained an influence. Kyle Wilkison, Yeomen, Sharecroppers and Socialists: Plain Folk Protest in Texas 1870-1914 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008), 141; Joshua Hicks, “Hicks’s Page,” Rebel, (Hallettsville, TX), July 1, 1911, 4.


3. “Clarke County,” Encyclopedia of Alabama, http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/article/h-1204 (Accessed October 10, 2016); Joshua L. Hicks, “Family Record” loose leaf typescript, Scrapbook 1, Hicks Family Papers, AR228, Box 1, Folder 228-1-1, Special Collections, The University of Texas at Arlington Library [Hereafter Scrapbook 1 or Scrapbook 2 with page numbers.]; Clarke County, Alabama, Manuscript Census, Eighth Census of the United States, 1860; Clarke County, Alabama, Manuscript Census, Ninth Census of the United States, 1870; T. H. Ball, *A glance into the great South-east, or, Clarke County, Alabama and its surroundings: from 1540 to 1877* (Grove Hill, Alabama, 1882), 354-355; Scrapbook 1, 197 and 227.

4. Hopkins County, Texas, Manuscript Census, Tenth Census of the United States, 1880; Scrapbook 1, 249.

5. Untitled, love poem to his future wife dated September 12, 1880, two years before their marriage. Front matter loose leaf scraps in Scrapbook 1.


10. Scrapbook 1, 155.

12. Davidson writes that he searched in vain for any commentary from Hicks on the Waco Horror or on race in general after 1915 but it is clear that his 1918 "Mob" piece was indirectly responding to his struggle to understand the horrifying behavior of his neighbors in the lynch mob death of Jesse Washington. "When the Mob Gets Started," *Waco Times Herald*, April 17, 1918; Scrapbook 1, 283.

13. Scrapbook 1, 10.

14. Scrapbook 1, 18.

15. Scrapbook 1, 19-23.


17. Scrapbook 1, 176.

18. Scrapbook 1, 177-179.

19. Scrapbook 1, 196.


22. Davidson, xxiv.

23. Scrapbook 1, 178.

24. Joshua L. Hicks, *Christianity, War, and Politics: Can a Man be a Christian and Kill his Fellow Man?* (Abilene: J. L. Hicks, 1898), 3, 18-19, Folder AR228-1-11, Hicks Papers.

25. Scrapbook 1, 203-204


28. *Abilene Daily Reporter*, November 1, 1921, 3; Davidson, xxv; Scrapbook 1, 208 and 219.


31. Scrapbook 1, 221; Green, 138; Davidson, xxv; Scrapbook 2, 103.

32. Scrapbook 1, 221-222.

33. *Abilene Daily Reporter*, November 1, 1921, 3


37. Scrapbook 1, 269-273.

38. Scrapbook 1, 323; Wilkison, 140-143.

39. Scrapbook 1, 288.

40. Scrapbook 2, 61.

41. Scrapbook 1, 258.
Negotiating Ownership in a Contested Landscape: A Consideration of Post emancipation Black Community Development during Jim Crow in Anderson County, Texas.

BY SARAH LOFTUS

Introduction

The rise of black land ownership and the development of post emancipation African American communities among the plantation dominated the landscape of East Texas is a complex and diverse history that has often been homogenized (Exceptions include Sitton and Conrad 2005). While recent narratives concerned with the rural south during the Jim Crow era accurately portray a racially oppressive and violent space characterized by brutal social and economic stagnation, they often also fail to recognize the grinding struggles of rural black farmers to build community and achieve the citizenship that emancipation promised but failed miserably to deliver. Focusing on the nuances of local scale transformations in landscape and property ownership the following article considers the development of an African American community around the town of Bethel in northwest Anderson County and corresponding transformations on the adjacent Benjamin Jackson plantation. The intertwined histories of the African American community and the Benjamin Jackson plantation expand upon previous narratives of black communities in this region and long term generational investments in the land by people previously enslaved and early tenants throughout the first half of the twentieth century.

Sarah Loftus is an Anthropology doctoral candidate in the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University
A Brief History of the Pre-Civil War Benjamin Jackson Plantation

The Benjamin Jackson plantation was initially part of a much larger 5,000-acre plantation system owned by Benjamin Jackson’s father, Frederick Stith Jackson, which spanned across much of northwest Anderson County, hugging the banks of the Trinity River (Anderson County Probate Record 1863; Crider 2011). Purchased in 1857, it produced cotton and corn, as well as subsistence crops through enslaved labor. While only operating for a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War, by 1860, 46 people were enslaved on Benjamin Jackson’s plantation, possibly more by the time of Texas Emancipation in 1865 (1860 United States Census Records).

The Jacksons were originally from Virginia and arrived in Texas during the early 1850s by way of plantation ventures in Tennessee and Alabama (United States census records 1840 and 1850). The enslaved people who traveled with them experienced the deep tragedy of America’s secondmiddle passage, a period of extreme disruption that further severed the fragile bonds of enslaved families and resulted in high individual mortality rates (Berlin 2003: 161; Tomich 2004: 63). A review of Texas census records traces the families of those enslaved on the Jackson plantation to Alabama and the eastern seaboard states of Virginia and Georgia (United States census records 1870 - 1940).

According to oral history provided by living descendants, as well as, primary accounts in the form of journal and newspaper articles from the 1920s and 30s authored by Walter Jackson, Benjamin Jackson’s son, Benjamin Jackson, his wife Ellen Douglas Jackson and their three children lived in a house on the plantation lands throughout the Civil War. They also spent a great deal of time at his father’s, Frederick Jackson, estate in Palestine, the county seat (Crider 2011, Jackson 2012; Jackson circa 1930). Conversations with descendants who have remained close to the land indicate that the main house on the Benjamin Jackson plantation burned down shortly after the Civil War (Crider 2011, Jackson 2012). The exact location of the structure remains circumspect, as do events surrounding the fire, but the home is referenced in the writing of
Walter Jackson (Jackson circa 1930).

Census records indicate that in addition to the main house there were at least eight structures housing enslaved people during the antebellum period (1860 United States Census Records). While no official records or photographs documenting construction or the layout of a slave quarters has been uncovered, historical maps refer to the far southwest corner of the plantation as “the quarter” (Figure 1 shows a hand drawn map of “the quarter” produced sometime in the 1950s by the Jackson family). Enslaved people were likely housed here, and emancipated free laborers may also have occupied this area during the initial transition to tenancy post-Civil War.

The Jacksons did not stay on the plantation for very long after Emancipation. Ellen Jackson died young shortly after the fall of the Confederacy, leaving Benjamin Jackson and their three children behind. Suffering financially as a result of the War, Jackson decided to leave Bethel and move with his young children to the burgeoning town of Springfield in adjacent Limestone County (Henry Jackson 2012). He did not frequently return to the plantation after the move, and instead acted as an absentee landlord, an arrangement that was common during this period (Jackson circa 1930).
Figure 1: Map produced by the Jackson family circa 1950 showing the location of “the quarters” (in green) and the possible location of the original Benjamin Jackson family home (shown in red).

(Copy provided by Robert Crider, the current land owner, the provenience of the original in unknown).
Reorganization of the Plantation after Emancipation

Slavery’s end and Benjamin Jackson’s abandonment of the property after the Civil War resulted in an altered setting and the beginning of a reformulation of the plantation landscape. Adam Smith has argued that landscapes in the United States, both real and imagined, “regularly pivot around a central apparatus of political authority—a civil axis mundi” (Smith 2003:9). Within typical plantation landscapes the “civil axis mundi” aptly describes the planter’s main house which served as a panoptic symbol, as well as a literal point upon which all other elements typically revolved. During the post emancipation era both the symbolic and real presence of this axis were fractured, and centrally controlled plantation agricultural systems began to transform. Power was deposed, and the control that owners had implemented during slavery was slowly disseminated and renegotiated. People who were previously enslaved dispersed, moving away from concentrated “quarters” and into more autonomous domestic spaces. On the Jackson plantation, the axis was literally and metaphorically leveled to some degree, when the main house was destroyed by fire and the Jacksons moved away.

Previous studies that have addressed post emancipation transitions during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century have often overlooked rural black community formation and frequently dismiss the power of African American relationships to the land itself (Penningroth 2003: 148). While many people quickly fled plantations and rural areas heading north and into urban areas in an effort to escape rampant violence and poverty, experiences were heterogeneous, and in some situations the rural physical landscape became an immense source of strength and deep attachments to place and community formed over generations. In her 2009 essay, “Touching the Earth,” Bell Hooks explored African Americans’ relationships with place and in particular with the land itself, arguing they were central to survival during Jim Crow (Hooks 2009:118). Remembering her grandfather, Hooks wrote,
Working the land was the hope of survival. Even when the land was owned by white oppressors, master and mistress, it was the earth itself that protected exploited black folks from dehumanization. My sharecropping granddaddy Jerry would walk through neat rows of crops and tell me “No man can make the sun or the rains come—we can all testify. We can all see that ultimately we all bow down to the forces of nature. Big white boss may think he can outsmart nature, but the small farmer know. Earth is our witness.” This relationship to the earth meant that southern black folks, whether they were impoverished or not, knew firsthand that white supremacy, with its systemic dehumanization of blackness, was not a form of absolute power. (Hooks 2009:118)

While writing about a deeply personal experience and sentiments for the land that was not shared by everyone, Hook’s focus on people’s relationships with place and environment add new dimensions to the complexity of why people moved in different ways after emancipation.

Though white discrimination, violence, intimidation, vagrancy laws, and poverty have long been recognized as defining African Americans’ movement in this region after slavery’s end and during Jim Crow, the influence and power of local black communities and environment have been overlooked, and their roles in settlement and migration undermined. Speaking to this, historian Dylan Penningroth has argued: “black peoples fierce resistance to anything that smacked of slavery destroyed the plantation, not just as a labor system but also as a physical landscape.” Within the Bethel community, the power of the physical landscape is evident through the back and forth struggles to exercise control over the land. These struggles are explored below through a consideration of community development and property transactions as people moved out of slavery’s designated living space and established
small farmsteads. These settlements formed in family clusters that skirted the edges of the plantation near access to main roads, water sources and eventually other black neighbors, providing new measures of economic and psychological independence.

**The Emergence of a Post Emancipation Black Community around the Benjamin Jackson Plantation**

By the early-twentieth century the area around Bethel, where the Benjamin Jackson plantation is located, was reportedly a comparatively less violent space for African Americans to settle in contrast with neighboring towns, such as Cayuga where white supremacy politics and the Ku Klux Klan dominated (Vaughn 1967 and 2012). These political dogmas were certainly not liberated in Bethel, but this region appears to have been less outwardly violent and eventually held a majority black population (Johnson 2013, United States Census Records 1970-1940). While the surrounding threat of violence across sections of northwestern Anderson County resulted in restricted movement within certain spatial boundaries, African Americans sought to develop this marginalization to their advantage (Price 1999:334). People living within and around Bethel appear to have used a semi-imposed landscape of social marginality to develop insulated communities that afforded protection, but also, and perhaps more significantly generated social, economic, and cultural opportunities among community members. As has been pointed out by Maria Franklin, the autonomy of rural black communities resulted just as much from an internal desire to commune with people with a shared history, experience, and cultural background, as it was a response to white racism (Franklin 2012:30).

To advance community and solidify space within the region residents persistently negotiated with the white land owning population to acquire greater control over the local landscape through the purposeful acquisition and planned development of key properties and infrastructure including a cemetery, school, and churches that cemented and furthered community growth. Negotiations also took place internally among members of the black
community, who had diverse economic and social backgrounds and were not necessarily a unified group (Kelley 1996). While the area around Bethel was initially populated by sharecroppers and wage laborers working commercial cotton and corn on white-owned land, by the turn of the twentieth century, this demographic shifted to include a mix of prominent black landowners, small land owners, tenants, and laborers.

**Black Land Ownership – Struggles and Success**

The rise of black property ownership following decades of sharecropping and tenancy was crucial to successful community formation, and opportunities to purchase land were prioritized by many people. Immediately following the Civil War, tenancy dominated northwestern Anderson County and appears to have continued with no exceptions on the Benjamin Jackson plantation through the beginning of the twentieth century. This system remained unaltered until Jackson’s death in April of 1914, and the shift of control of the lands to his sons, Walter and Douglas Jackson (Texas Death Certificate 1914). Within a year of Benjamin Jackson’s passing, his sons began selling parcels of former plantation lands to black families and individuals, many of whom were already established tenants.

One exception to this is the Jackson Quarters Cemetery, which Benjamin Jackson deeded to the black community in 1899 for a sum of fifteen dollars (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 65, Page 221). The cemetery dates to the antebellum period, but remains active today and contains the unmarked graves of enslaved people as well as the burials of local community members interred as recently as 2014. The cemetery was the first of many tracts eventually subsumed by the black community, but the only parcel that Benjamin Jackson would actually convey. The unwillingness of former plantation owners to sell land to African Americans was a common phenomenon across the south, and Penningroth has argued,
although most ex-masters understood that the war had ended their property rights in black people, they never the less expected to keep their wide claims over land and movable property. These claims had formed the basis of the slave economy, and their general belief was that if they could hold onto them, they would effectively keep blacks under their thumb. (Penningroth 2003: 142)

The initial cemetery transaction between Benjamin Jackson and the black community marks the beginning of decades of officially documented negotiations that took place regarding how the post emancipation landscape was to be occupied and controlled. Unlike some previous narratives concerned with tenancy in Texas, in which renters are primarily depicted as living in a largely unorganized and mobile fashion with few attachments to the land, people in the Bethel area actively invested in the long term. Community members, including both new black landowners, and long-term tenants slowly and persistently laid down roots in the community and over generations acquired more control over property and infrastructure. The process was long, drawn out, imperfect, and marked by both successes and failures. The initial cemetery purchase exemplifies these tensions. While the purchase was a victory for the black community, the deed itself was subject to stipulations that ensured that while officially transferring responsibility for the cemetery’s upkeep, Benjamin Jackson still ultimately remained in control of the property. The land “is to be used only as a cemetery and for nothing else, and if it is used for anything else the land will revert back to me or my heirs” (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 65, Page 221). This paternalistic overreach prevented the black community from exercising true ownership over the cemetery, and would have limited their control of the burial grounds both in a literal sense as well as a deeply psychological one.

The apparent shift that occurred after Benjamin Jackson’s death regarding the sale of land to black tenants and neighbors was likely the result of a combination of economic and social factors.
This included the persistence and determination of the local black population to secure land in order to successfully establish community and infrastructure over generations, changes in social attitudes among the next generation of the Jackson family, a decrease in the land value of the sandy soils in this area which had suffered from cotton production, as well as, the movement of former plantation owning families into new business ventures in urban areas. In the following section land transactions that took place during the years 1914 – 1935 between Benjamin Jackson’s sons and the local black community are considered (Figure 2). These negotiations, which are primarily evidenced through deed of sale records available at the Anderson County Courthouse, serve as a means to demonstrate the transformation and mediation of the landscape in relation to property ownership and control.

Figure 2: 1933 Aerial showing parcels of land on the Benjamin Jackson plantation sold by the Jackson brothers to African Americans during the early-twentieth century (Drawing by S. Loftus, 1933 Tobin Aerial Photograph, Anderson County Deed Records)
African Americans Begin to Buy Land on the Benjamin Jackson Plantation

Tillis Washington was the first African American to purchase land on the Benjamin Jackson plantation. Washington’s history is largely absent from official records, and he only appears in the Texas census in the year 1900. At that time he was 21 and living with his mother and stepfather, Jana and Robert Govan, who were tenant farmers in the Fifth Precinct, an area that includes the Benjamin Jackson plantation (1900 United States Census Records). The conveyance took place on November 15, 1915. Washington purchased 25 acres of land in the far northwest corner of the plantation (Figure 2). The deed of sale was not located at the court house, so how much money was exchanged and the terms of the purchase are not known; however, an oil and gas lease from March of 1928, references the transaction. The lease indicates that Washington established a house and barn on the property and documents the sale of the lands oil and gas rights to R. R. Jackson, a white physician and descendant of Benjamin Jackson.

In lieu of money, the mineral rights exchange covered $150 Washington owed Dr. Jackson for treatment of his “sore leg” (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 140, Page 94). Based on inflation rates this translates to roughly $3,500 today, a fairly expensive medical treatment. Negotiations of this type were not unusual during this period and demonstrate the lack of currency exchanged within rural East Texas communities. The deal also provides evidence of an underlying battle that was just beginning, but continues to characterize much of East Texas today, control over rich deposits of oil, coal, and natural gas that lie below the surface. Records indicate it was not uncommon for debts to be settled through the sale of mineral rights, and in addition to the possibility of eventual monetary gain through extraction, provided previous owners with a degree of control over their former lands.

Negotiations that took place regarding the settlement of land debt, and in some instances foreclosure, further exemplify the back and forth struggle of many African Americans to gain
independence through property ownership and maintain that independence. It appears that Washington eventually forfeited the 25 acres of land on which he established his homestead and today the parcel is back in the hands of the Jackson family. Documentation of this final transaction was not found in the archival record and it is possible the foreclosure may have happened after his death. Struggles to maintain ownership of land once it was purchased plagued many black families who bought property either from the Jacksons or from other white families in the area. People frequently lacked the capital to pay for land in full and warranty deeds typically came with attached vendor’s liens and steep interest rates that were difficult to meet in a discriminatory rural economy that was characterized by little monetary wealth and exchange.

Less than a month after selling the first 25 acre tract of land to Washington, the Jackson brothers sold another parcel to Bruce Glenn; a one-acre tract in the far northeast corner of the plantation. The acre housed the community’s first African American school, the Green Street School, and was not far from Washington’s tract, which was also located along the northern property line (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 135, Page 439). The Glens eventually became one of the most prominent black landowning families in this part of Anderson County. Bruce Glenn’s father and mother, Reverend Jessie and Catherine Glenn, already owned 200 acres of land across the street from the Green Street School, abutting the Jackson plantation on the north side. These lands had been purchased in 1902 and 1909 from Ben Gee and M. J. Derden, respectively, both white landowners in the area (Anderson County Deed Records, Volume 71, Page 343 and Volume 72, Page 102). Figure 3 illustrates the Glenn’s acreage and the location of the Green Street School.

The purchase of the school provided the community with ownership and governance over the space where their children were educated. Reverend E. N. Glenn, a descendant of Jessie and Catherine Glenn described the historic Green Street School as
a one-teacher school taught by Mrs. Maggie Vance and located across the public road from the late Rev. Glenn’s, sawmill, canemill, and store. In later years it was named Bethel and then moved to another public road now FM2707 (Palestine Negro Business and Professional Women’s Club 1989:14).

Prioritizing the purchase of the school and acquiring the Jackson Quarters cemetery allowed African American residents to gain control of important elements of basic infrastructure and suggested careful planning to acquire key properties as important steps towards building independence. It also suggested willingness by the Jackson family to relinquish control and let go of spaces within the plantation landscape that were clearly an established part of the black community.

In January of 1916, Walter and Douglas Jackson sold another parcel of land to Charlie Norris, this time a ten acre tract at the opposite end of the plantation near the southern boundary. Norris paid $25 in cash and agreed to pay two vendor’s liens with eight percent interest totaling $200 (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 142, Page 571). A year later in January of 1917 the Jackson’s sold him an additional adjoining 22.4 acres for ten dollars in cash and $326 in vendor’s liens with the same interest rate (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 142, Page 570). This left Norris with a total of 33.4-acres. Included within Norris’s purchase, was the previously mentioned “quarters” depicted in Figure 1, the probable location of the eight “slave houses” listed on the 1860 census records. As with the Green Street School and the Jackson Quarters cemetery, this parcel of land was strongly tied to the African American community, and may partially account for why Charlie Norris wanted to buy it and also why the Jackson’s were willing to sell it. Establishing ownership over an area where African Americans, and quite possibly Norris’s relatives, were enslaved may have held some redemptive and symbolic meaning not only for Norris, but the entire black community.
Eleven months after selling “the quarters” to Norris, the Jackson brothers sold an additional five tracts of land, totaling 154.5-acres. Two of the subject tracts were sold to other members of the Glenn family. Bruce Glenn acquired an additional nineteen acres surrounding the Green Street School that secured an insulating buffer around the original one-acre piece of land. The same year, his brother Mathew Glenn purchased 12.5 acres also located along the northern boundary of the plantation and abutting Tillis Washington’s property on the east (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 135, Page 439 and Volume 116, Page 475). The land has a perennial stream running through it that would have been useful for agriculture both on Mathew Glenn’s land, and possibly across the street on his parent’s larger 200 acre farm. While unoccupied today, descendants of the Glens still grow hay on the property.

In 1916 the Jackson brothers began selling additional tracts of land on the southern end of the plantation. One of which was a 40 acres tract in the far southeast corner purchased by Caldonia Jackson; an African American woman whom historical records indicate was single and divorced (Figure 3.1; Anderson County Deed Records Volume 116, Page 350). Her brother, Ben Cummins, also purchased property from the Jacksons. 53 acres located immediately north of his sister’s 40 acre tract (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 116, Page 354). Caldonia Jackson’s ability to purchase land given society’s discriminatory attitudes towards woman, divorce, and people of color is remarkable. Census records indicate her parents were from Alabama, where the white Jackson’s had a plantation prior to settling in Texas, and along with her last name, this suggests a possible long-term relationship with the Jackson family.

The history of Caldonia Jackson and her brother Ben Cummins is interesting and remains shrouded in mystery. Additional research and oral history with community members and descendants may eventually shed more light on their family’s story. Neither Caldonia Jackson nor Ben Cummins appear in any Texas census
records prior to 1900, but in 1880 a man named Jesse Cummins was living in Precinct 5 next-door to John H. Gee, a cousin of Benjamin Jackson and one of the presumed overseers of his plantation. Cummins is described as “mulatto.” The designation of mulatto possibly allowed the family access to white community members that other African American families did not have, and a familial relationship may have existed. While purely speculative, this possibly may have provided some advantage in negotiating the sale of land. Historic and contemporary ideas concerning “race” are blurry and problematic and it is beyond the scope of this article to address this important issue, but it should be clear that my use of the terms black, African American, white, and Anglo European speak to social and cultural constructions of race, not inherent biological differences. For an idea of the complexity of the genealogy of people in this area of Texas, I’ll refer to a conversation I had with a woman in Tennessee Colony, just outside of Bethel, who self-associates as African American, but has ancestry that is African, Anglo European, and Blackfoot Indian (for further reading on race in America see Ferrante and Browne 2001 and Delgado and Stefancic 2001).

Caldonia Jackson and Ben Cummins were both tenants on the Benjamin Jackson plantation prior to purchasing land from the Jackson brothers and lived next-door to Charles Alexander, one of the men who represented the black community in the sale of the Jackson Quarters Cemetery (United States Census Records 1900). Records indicate Caldonia Jackson’s husband, Samuel John Jackson, died sometime prior to 1900 and she and her brother, Ben Cummins, who was single at the time, shared a household (United States Census Records 1900). Together, it appears they developed a plan for acquiring their own land within the community.

In 1901, Ben Cummins bought his first parcel, 100 acres located near the eastern boundary of the Benjamin Jackson planation (Figure 3). The land was purchased from John H. Regan for $200 with a vendor’s lien and 10% interest (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 69, Page 308). A year later, after having satisfied
the lien on the 100 acres, Regan sold Cummins an additional 50 acre adjoining tract (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 74, Page 574). Over the next several years, Ben Cummins and his sister Caldonia Jackson appear to have developed a successful farming enterprise on the property and five years later purchased another 75 acre tract in the same area, this time abutting Benjamin Jackson’s eastern plantation boundary (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 85, Page 231). After Benjamin Jackson passed away, and his sons began selling plantation land, the family purchased what may have constituted their original home place as tenants, a purchase that was likely economically fruitful as well as psychologically and emotionally redemptive. With the final purchase of the previously mentioned 40 acres by Caldonia Jackson and 53 acres by Ben Cummins in 1916, the family had secured 318 acres of farmland, a significant amount of land for a small farmer in east Texas (Figure 3).
Figure 3: Lands owned by the Cummins (yellow) and Glenn Families (blue) located on and around the former Benjamin Jackson Plantation (Drawing by S. Loftus, Anderson County Deed Records, Google Earth 2014)

Around the time that Jackson and Cummins acquired their 40 and 53 acre parcels, the Jackson brothers sold additional parcels of land to two other African American community members. Ruben Alexander acquired a 73 acre tract along the southern end of the plantation located between Caldonia Jackson and Charlie Norris, and a 30 acre tract was sold to Billy Jones located adjacent to the Jackson Quarters Cemetery (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 120, Page 175 and Volume 115, Page 631). In 1920, one final 15 acre parcel, adjacent to Billy Jones and Ruben Alexander’s land, was sold
to Levi and Delia Terry. After this sale, the brothers stopped selling lands on the Benjamin Jackson plantation. In general, the property the Jackson’s sold skirted the perimeter of the original plantation and the parcels were concentrated along the northern and southern boundaries, and along the eastern edge, near the Jackson Quarters Cemetery (Figures 2 and 3). This allowed the Jackson family to remain in control of the central area and descendants continue to own this property today. Though no members of Benjamin Jackson’s immediate known family lived on the plantation permanently during the late-nineteenth and twentieth century, a hunting camp was built on the property and became a sort of secondary axis-mundi after the main house burned down. During the early-twentieth century the Jacksons frequented the camp and oversaw several African American tenants who were living on the lands through the mid-twentieth century. The African American families who remained in tenancy situations and did not purchase property worked alongside the black families who did buy land to establish, build, and maintain the Bethel community (Loftus 2015).

As previously discussed, while many individuals and families who purchased parcels of land on the Benjamin Jackson Plantation were able to hang on to their property, others were unable to meet liens outlined in the bills of sale. Official records document some of the difficulties people had making payments and meeting required interest in order to maintain their land. An analysis of the records indicates Benjamin Jackson’s sons typically sold parcels for a small amount of cash up front, though not a meager sum given the context, around $25, to be followed by a series of annual payments at 8 percent interest. Other white landowners in the area, such as John H. Reagan, sold lands at 10 percent interest, a relatively steep payment plan. In several instances the Jackson’s renegotiated the terms of the vendor’s liens instead of forcing foreclosure when someone could not meet payments.

Ultimately, three families who purchased lands on the Benjamin Jackson plantation during the early-twentieth century lost their titles. Tillis Washington, Levi and Delia Terry, and Cora and
Charlie Norris all eventually forfeited their properties back to the Jackson family. All three foreclosures occurred during the early 1930s, the time of the Great Depression in the United States, which had devastating effects on small farms. In one document, Delia Terry argued that the vendor’s lien on her property along with the accrued interest exceeded what the land was actually worth, and therefore she would not pay it. The deed states that Ms. Terry “not being able and willing to pay of the indebtedness existing against the above described tract of land which with accrued interest is as much if not more than the land is worth” (Anderson County Deed Records Volume 234, Page 457). As previously mentioned, in events of foreclosure, people frequently sold their mineral rights and oil and gas rights in an attempt to cover interest payments. For investors, mineral rights were essentially the only monetary value that was held in lands, but for small farmers a parcel of land provided independence, a home, and a means of subsistence. These deals were just one more way that the landscape was negotiated after the Civil War and power relations played out between plantation owners and people who had suffered through slavery.

While owning land was a priority for most people in East Texas regardless of racial affiliation, this was particularly true for African Americans who were able to gain limited autonomy through purchasing land, and some relief from persistent racism. Conversations with local residents reinforce how important land ownership was within the context of Jim Crow. A descendant of the Cummins family who I had several conversations with over the course of the research told me that his family did everything they could to hold on to their land, “no matter how bad things got, you held on to your land” (Anonymous 2013). He said it was usually hard, if not impossible to get property back, once you let it go and he knew of many black families in the area that had suffered as a result of forfeiting ownership, and thus their independence.
The Establishment of Community Infrastructure

Once community members acquired land, a permanent place of worship, the Bethel Baptist Church, was established to house the local congregation. The church was organized in 1872, and members previously met in people's homes and other donated spaces. Bethel is often referred to as the “Mother Church” and several other black churches in the area eventually split off from Bethel to serve adjacent communities in northwest Anderson County (Browne 2012). Church partnerships, or covenants, as they are known in parts of East Texas, allowed for congregations to pool resources and strengthen community ties. Covenants would gather on alternating Sundays and one gospel preacher would circulate to several churches (African-American Roots 2006: 123). Covenants were common across rural East Texas and fostered communication and the development of important relationships and alliances between adjacent rural communities by providing opportunities for people to come together and discuss social, economic, and political challenges.

Bethel church was built on land owned by Ben Cummins, whose history was previously discussed. The church is referred to by present day community members as “Old” Bethel Church. The lands were not part of the original Benjamin Jackson plantation, but an adjacent parcel Cummins had purchased from John H. Regan (Anderson County Deed Record Volume 69, Page 308). According to local history, M. C. Hunter was the first reverend at the new location. The Hunter family owned 300 acres to the south of the Cummins land, a parcel that remains in the family and is currently occupied by two of M. C. Hunter’s daughters and a grandchild, one of whom, Mrs. Johnson was generous enough to allow me to record her oral history (Johnson 2013). While the original wood frame structure of the Bethel Church has been covered with a brick façade, it remains standing and continues to serve the community (Figure 3.11). Two long-time congregation members in their late 80s and early 90s recalled the way the
community slowly acquired brick for the façade from a local kiln in Athens as funds became available, and how people gathered on weekends to build the façade as well as a concrete wheel-chair ramp that leads to the front door (Johnson 2013).

Figure 4: Old Bethel Baptist Church and New Bethel Baptist Church (S. Loftus 2014)

A second church, New Bethel Baptist Church, was established down the street in 1916 (Figure 4). New Bethel was formed by members of the original Bethel Church who shared a difference of opinion on how the church should operate. Oral tradition offers that the new congregation originally met in an old log cabin, until they acquired two acres of land from Caldonia Jackson in 1918 located on the former Benjamin Jackson Plantation (African American Roots 2006: 424). Jesse Glenn, the prominent land owner previously discussed, was one of the original trustees of New Bethel Church and provided the lumber as well as carpentry skills for its construction. Glenn also served as the first pastor of New Bethel (African American Roots 2006: 424). Tillis Washington, the first person to purchase a homestead on the Benjamin Jackson plantation was also an original trustee (Anderson County Deed Record Volume 120, Page 563).

Bethel and New Bethel Church continue to operate today and community members often go to services at both, attending on alternating Sundays depending on the pastor’s schedule (Johnson 2013). The Bethel School was built next to the original Bethel
Church and served as a replacement for the original Green Street School. Ben Cummins is believed to have been the first teacher and principal, receiving a teaching certificate from Austin in 1892. The school operated until integration took place here in the early 1970s and children were required to attend school in Cayuga. The Bethel school is no longer extant, but the concrete foundation remains visible, and the lunch room, a single story wood-frame structure remains standing. Next to the lunchroom is another structure that housed the local African American fraternal organization, the Order of the Eastern Star, a group that included hundreds of area members during the early-twentieth century.

The African American community in Bethel thrived during the first half of the twentieth century through people’s combined efforts to acquire land, develop infrastructure and create informal exchange economies that empowered people to survive in the environment of Jim Crow. The formation of a somewhat insulated community landscape within a context of extreme racism enabled and provided support for successive generations to engage in opportunities both within and outside of the community. “Grassroots institutions such as mutual benefit associations, fraternal organizations, and religious groups not only helped people with basic survival needs, but created sustained bonds of fellowship, mutual support networks, and a collectivist ethos that ultimately informed black working-class political struggle” (Kelley 1996: 38). Conversations with locals in Bethel indicate that people survived and in some instances prospered through communal solidarity. There was little monetary wealth or exchange during the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century, however people regularly exchanged goods and services. Families often specialized in certain commodities or labor and these informal economies allowed people to survive in the face of economic challenges and segregation. People who grew up during the 1930s and 40s recalled how one family might have sweet potatoes, and another milk. In terms of labor, one family may have a well digger, one a
syrup maker, and another a blacksmith. Medical needs were also met in this way and according to local history Caldonia Jackson, whose property history was discussed above, was a midwife for the community (African American Roots 2006). As one woman I spoke with several times described it, “you knew your own family’s needs and you could also anticipate what other families needed” (Anonymous 2013). This internal economy and communal self-reliance ran counter to the capitalist ideals of individual property and wage labor that were engrained in other parts of the United States, particularly in urban settings.

The Mechanization of Farming and Communal Decline

The introduction of mechanization coupled with industrialization, the burgeoning of the oil and gas industry, and the rise in abundant, cheap, mass produced and readily available goods all contributed to the demise and shift away from the informal economies that bound small rural communities together. When asked why people started to leave the community, one local resident had this to say, Well, it wasn’t nothing down here at the time! We couldn’t make a living. There wasn’t enough farming...And then later on there was something came out they called the cotton picker. Well, we didn’t have to pick cotton no more. They would pick it with their cotton picker, which they still use it. They could pick more with that stripper in a day then fifty of us could pick in a month! And so that put us out of business of pulling cotton (Johnson 2013).

This shift in labor coupled with other economic, social, and cultural milieu led to a rapid decline in small farms and ultimately ended small farming and tenancy as it existed in the late-nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century. Altered forms of farm labor endured on large scale commercial farms, but in many cases in even more tenuous forms, with much of the labor being performed by migrant workers, particularly
people seeking employment from Mexico and South America. Additionally, during the post-World War II period many black men who fought overseas and experienced equality in Europe, including those from the Bethel community returned to a deeply segregated East Texas and decided there was nothing there for them, opting instead to move to urban areas and out west.

Ironically, community decline was further accelerated in many ways by integration, which brought opportunity, but also necessarily fractured the communal ties and insulation that people had built up over decades. Integration was resisted by both blacks and whites alike in this area, and during an informal conversation, one local African American resident told me that in his opinion integration was one of the worst things that happened to the community (Anonymous 2013). While in theory and in some cases reality, integration corrected the gross fallacy of "separate but equal," it also necessarily fissured ties that bound small rural black communities together by closing local schools, which were important centers of communal learning and action and instead centralized people into a controlled institutionalized environment that was disconnected from elder community members.

The exploration of oil, natural gas, and coal accelerated throughout the twentieth century, and what was once farm land began to be bought and sold for mineral rights alone. Today the landscape is marked by massive energy related infrastructure and pipelines as well as pumping stations that have replaced what was once an agricultural landscape. Tenancy ceased on the Benjamin Jackson plantation in the 1950s. Cattle were run on the land through the 1970s, but today it is designated as an unofficial wildlife refuge, crisscrossed by pipelines, and populated by dense scrub and new growth forest.

The Bethel Community Today

While many people moved away from the Bethel community and other rural communities in this area during the second half of the twentieth century, and into larger cities in Texas or out of state,
others have stayed, maintaining the local churches which continue to serve as centers of community. Some people eventually returned to Bethel after years of living elsewhere. One elderly man who recently moved back with his wife told me, "I wanted to come back home, before they brought me home." This is a sentiment that seems to be shared by many people (Anonymous 2013). During my interview with Ms. Johnson she had the following to say about the landscape in the 1930s and people's decisions to move back to it today,

There wasn't nobody in the community then but African Americans. Wasn't nobody around here but us. Everybody had homes 'round here, and all this, as far as you can go down there, was just houses, houses. Where this oil well is? Well, it was the Jackson houses, and all that [referring to Caldonia Jackson]. But they died out, and them died out, moved to town. And it just ain't too many people, just—and what few you see now is coming back in. Just like the Nollie farm up there? It's seven houses, seven of the Nollie kids have come back on their daddy's place. One, two, three, four of us have come back on our daddy's place, because Sherry Ann up here, she came from Houston back here. I came back from Hillsboro. And Michael, he had been here a long time. And Mary, she came back from California. She lived in California at one time, and she came back home (Ms. Johnson 2013).

While the landscape has transitioned throughout the last century and many people have moved away, the sense of community, family, and place that was built over the generations remains strong among some and offers people a place of return. The lands continue to embody the diverse history of generations emerging from the shadowy legacy of slavery to find a way forward in a society that was dominated by Jim Crow.
Conclusions

Writing about landscape in the late 1970s when cultural geographers were beginning to encourage a more humanistic approach to place Edward Relph wrote,

Landscape is not merely an aesthetic background to life, rather it is a setting that both expresses and conditions cultural attitudes and activities, and significant modifications to landscapes are not possible without major changes in social attitudes (Relph 1976:122).

The ways that the Benjamin Jackson Plantation lands were divided, sold, built, lived in and abandoned during the century that followed the Civil War provide evidence of shifting social and economic realities, and demonstrate a slow transformation that occurred over multiple generations as people grappled with what the politics of freedom actually meant within a landscape previously dominated by slavery and awash in the racial disparities that plagued the United States throughout Jim Crow. These discourses in many ways mirror broader struggles across the colonized world as the politics of modernity and the emergence of the citizen individual coincided with the rise of industrial capitalism and the end of state sanctioned slavery (Bender 2002: 104; Delle 1998). They also complicate traditional narratives concerned with the transformation of plantations in the rural southern United States which have obscured the complexity and diversity of peoples experiences during the period that some have referred to as the New South (1880–1940) and during the post-WWII era leading up to the 1960s Civil Rights movement (Aiken 1998:16).
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Flames engulfed the Texas Capitol Building on November 9, 1881. Of course, no one seemed to mind. In fact, many were relieved that the structure, completed in 1853, was destroyed, forcing the Texas Legislature and Governor Oran Roberts to find funds to build a replacement. 1 As Frederick W. Rathjen writes, “The only real tragedy of the fire was the total loss of a considerable volume of records dating back to the days of the Republic. The building itself was an eyesore and the only ones having cause to lament its passing were the bats who were left homeless.” 2 Whether tragic or timely, the immediate need for a new Capitol pulled Texas closer to Scotland and into the Gilded Age in new ways.

For most Texans, knowledge of how Texas built the current Capitol follows a particular narrative, as follows. By the 1870s, the first Texas Capitol building had grown out of favor and fallen into disrepair. Without available funding, the state legislature voted to construct a new Capitol through the sale of three million acres of west Texas public lands. A syndicate from Chicago eventually received the contract to build the Capitol and developed the XIT ranch on the lands Texas used as payment.

During construction, contractors and state leaders changed the exterior stone from limestone to granite, causing contractors to face a labor shortage when granite cutters went on strike rather than work with convict labor. Eventually, the contractor imported stone cutters from Scotland to complete the building. Despite many challenges throughout construction, the state dedicated the Capitol on May 16, 1888, but remaining structural issues meant the contractors were not released until December of that year. Given its history and size, the Capitol remains a unique Texas treasure. 3

This particular account gives minimal—if any—significance to individuals and events outside the State of Texas. The use of Chicago contractors becomes noteworthy merely because they later organized the XIT Ranch, and Scottish stone cutters arrive without consideration for how they were chosen or why
they agreed to take the job. Therefore, this tale fails to place the Capitol’s construction within a broader national and international context or consider long-term effects and consequences of construction. The reconstruction of the Texas Capitol following the fire in 1881 connected Texas to broader American Gilded Age patterns of skilled labor migration as well as legal challenges between labor organizations and business owners regarding this migration. Therefore, the new Capitol caused Texas to become a central location for Gilded Age labor upheaval between American organized labor, skilled migrant laborers, business owners, and the United States government in a way unimaginable before the Capitol project.

The Texas Capitol consumed by fire did not start out despised by most Texans as an architectural “eyesore.” Instead, American architecture styles changed following the Civil War, reflecting changing cultural attitudes as well as innovations in building technology. Most Gilded Age architecture was designed to display wealth and prestige, and those involved in construction sought profits along with the creation of new structures. Texans’ desire for a more massive, imposing structure for their state Capitol than the 1853 Greek Revival building represented this change in attitude.

Chicago, in particular, became famous during the Gilded Age for experimentation in architectural designs for both public buildings and private residences. Chicago’s architectural prominence benefited and grew from two conditions: a transportation network strengthened by Civil War re-routing of train traffic and the 1873 fire which destroyed much of downtown. Chicago thus enjoyed access to materials, capital, and a need for new buildings which could employ the most current architectural styles and technological innovations. Thus, the Texas Capitol construction project drew from architecture styles and construction methods developed outside the state.

Yet, factors other than changing architectural preferences impacted construction of the Texas Capitol. Gilded Age
economics also affected both the decision to build the Texas Capitol and the ability to do so. During the late 1870s and early 1880s, the entire United States recovered from a depression, and northerners' interest and ability to invest in southern states increased with both the end of Reconstruction and improved economic conditions. In Texas, however, this economic recovery did not translate into additional capital for a massive building project. Following the Civil War, the state had little money, and few individuals or businesses had enough capital to complete a project of this size. What Texas lacked in capital, it made up for in land. Under Governor Oran Roberts, the state legislature voted to fund construction of a new capitol building through the sale of public lands.

Choosing an architect, given the state's minimal funding, proved a major challenge for the project. In 1881, Texas called for architects to submit plans for a new state capitol, with the winner to be chosen in a contest. This way, the state avoided paying an architect for any planning time, and since some had criticized the planning and completion of the first state capitol as an "insider-job," the Texas Capitol Building Commission opened the contest to a national audience. Participation was minimal, however, since the commission offered meager prize money. As William Elton Green explains, "The commissioners offered the paltry sum of $1,700 for the winning entry and no prizes for second and third choices, a decision that revealed their naivete about architectural fees and reflected, at the same time, the conservative view toward government spending held by Governor Roberts and most other Texans, together with large numbers of southerners." After few entries and much debate, the Capitol Building Commission selected the design of Elijah E. Myers of Detroit. Myers was well acquainted with architectural designs for this type of structure, although rarely of this magnitude since Myers previously designed the Michigan State Capitol in Lansing and several other public and private buildings.

With a design chosen, the State of Texas accepted contracting
bids from mid-1881 through January 1, 1882, and received only two. Eventually, Mattheas Schnell of Rock Island, Illinois, beat A. A. Burck of Rockdale, Texas, for the Texas Capitol contract. The fact that anyone in Texas submitted a bid at all seems impressive due to the general lack of banking facilities and capital within the state at the time. As W.G. Kerr explains, “In 1880, on the eve of the arrival of British land and mortgage money, Texas banking facilities numbered 13 national banks and some private houses. Their deposits were £400,000.” Yet, upon closer examination, the choice of a Texas Capitol contractor likely resulted less from the financial standings of the two bidders and more from bribery. During the bidding process for the Capitol contract, one of the Capitol Building Commissioners – N. L. Norton (who later resigned in 1884) – accepted a bribe of $5,000 to award the contract to Schnell over Burck. Within five months (January to May 1882), Schnell transferred all of his interest and obligations in the contract over to the firm of Taylor, Babcock, and Company of Chicago, Illinois.

Before the transfer, Governor Roberts accepted letters of recommendation for the Chicago investors prior to reassigning the contract, notably from the Governor of Illinois, Shelby Cullom, who provided a recommendation for the ability of C.B. Farwell, John V. Farwell, Abner Taylor, and A.C. Babcock to cover construction costs. Cullom writes, “I have known each of these gentlemen for many years. They are wealthy men, and I feel sure are worth altogether from two million to three million dollars. A bond for one million dollars signed by these gentlemen I would accept as perfectly satisfactory if presented to me for approval as governor of Illinois.” In a post script, he offers to add another million dollars to the value of the bond, if necessary, to secure the contract with the State of Texas.

The willingness of the governor to vouch for the men of the Capitol Syndicate is hardly surprising given the Syndicate members’ political connections. Of the four main investors of the Capitol Syndicate, Amos Babcock and John B. Farwell did
not hold public office. John Farwell’s brother, C.B. Farwell, served as a United States Senator for the State of Illinois, and Abner Taylor, a former Colonel and the Head Contractor for the construction of the Texas Capitol, served as an Illinois representative in the United States House of Representatives.\textsuperscript{16} Frederick W. Rathjen describes the Capitol Syndicate members as follows: “These associates were all remarkable men, who, ... engaged in politics and finance, and promoted many great individual projects. Although the building of the Texas capitol was a large undertaking, it is probable that Taylor, Babcock, and Company regarded it as just one of many grandiose schemes.”\textsuperscript{17}

In other words, the Capitol Syndicate represented the strong Gilded Age interconnections of business and government, and while Texas viewed the Capitol’s construction as monumental, it was only one piece of a much wider pattern of construction and business speculation for the era.

However, political connections could not spare the Capitol Syndicate from economic difficulties during the early years of construction. Although excavation began in 1882 and foundation work in 1883, the economic depression from 1883 – 1885 meant the Capitol Syndicate could not sell the three million acres of Texas land for a profit, let alone cover the construction costs.\textsuperscript{18} Debates on materials caused further delay and economic concern, especially when Abner Taylor (by this time Chief Contractor) realized the Oatmanville quarry outside Austin could not provide enough limestone of adequate strength and uniformity to meet the original plans’ design of a limestone exterior. A quarry in Bedford, Indiana contained limestone of proper quality, but Texans, led by Governor John Ireland, rejected this option and insisted on the use of Texas materials.\textsuperscript{19}

By 1885, Taylor suffered financially from both construction delays and the national recession. Therefore, he agreed to use donated Texas granite from outside Burnet in exchange for convict labor and an extension of the completion deadline. Because Taylor compromised on the use of Texas granite, the
Texas Capitol Building Commission arranged for the use of 500 Texas prison convicts as granite cutters. Taylor paid 65 cents per day for food, clothing, and guards for this labor. Ruth Allen explains best why Taylor agreed to this arrangement: "...the Capitol Syndicate protested their inability to fulfill their contract even though failure meant forfeiture of a quarter of a million dollars. Relief was offered in the form of convict labor from the state prisons which might be used to quarry the stone and build the railroad necessary for transportation from Burnet to Austin." In other words, the Capitol Syndicate benefited financially from the agreement as failure to meet the original deadline would have incurred high penalties and fees for Taylor and the Syndicate, and the state provided further financial relief through an extremely cheap and abundant labor source. Soon after the arrangement of the new contract, Abner Taylor appointed Gus Wilke (also of Chicago) as sub-contractor of the entire Capitol project.

Although economics encouraged Taylor to change the exterior from limestone to granite, the decision coincided with a rise in the popularity of granite in Chicago construction. Throughout the 1880s, granite (often from either Maine or Minnesota) became a noticeable feature of influential Chicago buildings such as the Board of Trade (1883-85); the Home Insurance Building (1883-85); the Rookery (1885-87); and the Auditorium Building (1886-90). *Inland Architect*, a publication based in Chicago, described the growing use of granite within the city: "The use of granite in the construction of modern buildings is of comparatively recent date. A decade ago, its use was hardly noticeable in Chicago. Today, however, one can scarcely find a substantial building that has been built within the past few years that has not more or less in it to give it either strength or ornamentation, or both." Therefore, while economic considerations certainly played a role in Taylor's willingness to change from Texas limestone to granite, the increased use of granite in Chicago may have also influenced Taylor's decision. Regardless of the cause, Texas's move to a granite exterior coincided with architectural trends of the time period.
Meanwhile, owners of the Granite Mountain quarry in Texas clearly calculated the benefit of donating the granite for the Capitol. Prior to use for the Capitol, the quarry (located just outside present-day Marble Falls, Texas) lacked a railroad connection, which meant it lacked a cost-effective, reliable route to markets. As part of the agreement to donate granite, the convict labor contracted to Taylor built a narrow gauge railway from the quarry to the Austin and Northwest Railroad connection at Burnet, Texas. A connection to railroad transportation along with the growing use of granite in a variety of American industries meant the quarry could become a profitable venture.

The Capitol construction project was not the first time the state of Texas allowed contractors to use prisoners as labor. Between 1883 and 1912, Texas leased prisoners to contractors willing to pay for them. The state saved money through this system because of decreased daily prisoner costs (since contractors paid living expenses of the prisoners) and the ability to avoid building new prisons. The housing situation, in particular, made the state leasing system attractive to Texas lawmakers. In 1886, Texas’s two prisons in Huntsville and Rusk together could hold 1,600 of the 3,000 state prisoners of the time. The prisoner lease system was hardly unique to Texas as all southern (formerly Confederate) states used some form of the leasing system during the late nineteenth century.

The Granite Cutters’ National Union strongly objected to the use of convict labor in the Burnet granite quarry. The Union feared their members would train convicts in the Burnet quarry at a fair wage only to be completely replaced by the cheaper convicts once they obtained the necessary skills. A letter in the Granite-Cutters’ Journal from September 1885 described the American granite cutters’ position against convict labor.

If 200 granite cutters work with, and teach 100 convicts the trade the probability is that in twelve months time there would be but 100 granite cutters and the number of
convicts would be increased to 200, and in a year's time there would be 300 convicts, and no free granite cutters whatever employed on the job, for if free granite cutters learn the convicts the trade, after the first lot is taught they will be put to teach other convicts, and thus drive out free labor altogether, for we have been reliably informed that the state officials of Texas have agreed to supply the contractors with 500 convicts.30

Gus Wilke, informed of union objections, stated he needed 100 granite cutters but would hire either union or non-union labor. In a letter to the Granite Cutters' National Union, (also printed in the September 1885 Granite-Cutters' Journal) Wilke wrote, "I will not permit you, nor any society, to dictate whom I shall employ, whether they be convicts or free labor."31 The vote of 500 to 1 in favor of a boycott meant granite workers could not work on the Capitol building and remain in good standing with the union.32 The Capitol Assembly Knights of Labor, upon learning the Granite Cutters' National Union had "declared the Texas State Capitol a scab job," voted to assist the granite cutters' in the strike by also boycotting the job and providing aid to those stonecutters already working on the job who wished to find other employment.33

This antagonistic relationship between organized labor and business owners/supervisors was hardly unique to the Gilded Age and neither was the importation of foreign skilled labor that followed. During the Gilded Age era of nativist sentiment and restrictive immigration legislation, labor organizations sought United States government action specifically against skilled migrant laborers. Trans-Atlantic skilled labor migration occurred after the Civil War largely because the country needed labor. In fact, the United States Congress passed the Act to Encourage Emigration in 1864. The height of this migration occurred within the Gilded Age as skilled laborers moved between the United States and Europe to enjoy higher wages and lower living expenses in
the United States. For example, a British worker could come to the United States during the busy season for his craft (spring and summer for construction), earn a great deal of money, and live cheaply in his home country with his family for the remainder of the year.  

When migration of skilled labor began, weak and unorganized American labor unions accepted foreign skilled laborers in good standing with the unions of their home country. When American trade unions grew stronger and competition for jobs increased, these unions pressured foreigners to join. Fees from United States unions hit migrant skilled laborers especially hard and discouraged them from joining American unions in addition to their home unions.

Similar trade unions often communicated across the Atlantic, especially American and British trade unions, but skilled migrant laborers increasingly ignored such information, especially regarding to strikes. Migrant laborers quickly learned the economic value of strikebreaking as they came to America and made money without affecting their British union standing. At the end of the American work season, they found employment for the British work season; thus, they maintained a full year of work. At times, the British unions encouraged emigration to the United States for a work season to relieve the British labor market of surplus workers.

In 1885, labor organizations (especially the Knights of Labor) succeeded in getting Congress to pass the Foran Act. The act made it illegal for businesses to hire foreign laborers abroad and help cover the cost of their journeys to the United States to perform a particular job. The act did not prevent workers from coming to the United States on their own for the height of the season for their industry and being hired by businesses upon arrival. Therefore, most United States companies likely felt the law would have little, if any, effect upon their hiring practices. Labor organizations, however, thought the law was an important step in preventing skilled foreign labor from serving as strikebreakers.
Of course, when encouraging the legislation in Congress, labor organizations employed nativist language rather than pro-labor rhetoric to encourage passage of the act.\(^{38}\)

Despite the passage of the Foran Act (or Alien Contract Labor Law), American labor struggled to gain legitimacy and have many of its concerns addressed by government officials in the Gilded Age. Organized labor’s minimal success gaining protection against skilled migrant labor occurred because of a broader existence of nativism within American society, not because of a pro-labor stance by many Americans. Meanwhile, laborers in the Gilded Age struggled with deteriorating working conditions. As Gilded Age corporations grew in size and power and high immigration rates provided an abundance of cheap labor, workers maintained less and less control over their job situations and living conditions. Because of this, Gilded Age workers began to band together through a variety of labor organizations to balance the power of business owners and improve their situations. Early labor attempts for change were rarely successful, but their continued efforts created a dynamic of aggression and hostility between business and labor throughout the era.

Texas was not immune to the labor organization and demonstrations of the Gilded Age, but it also did not witness activity on the scale of the Northeastern or Midwestern industrial centers. During the 1877 railroad strike, Galveston became the main location of unrest within the state as Galveston workers protested low and inadequate wages by walking off jobs around the city on July 27, 1877. The strikes began with dock workers in Galveston’s harbor and spread to day laborers and washerwomen seeking better working conditions.\(^{39}\) Galveston differed from other Texas cities at this time both in its connections and available capital, conditions which existed because of its role as a shipping point for cotton. As Clifford Farrington describes, “Many factors contributed to Galveston’s commercial success – the port’s location, the vision and commercial acumen of local businessmen, investment by northern capital and the federal government, expanding
railroad networks, and the production and demand for cotton all played their part."

As the Gilded Age continued and Texas industries developed, labor unions entered the state, beginning with the Knights of Labor in 1882. A variety of labor disputes occurred within Texas throughout the 1880s, but most were job specific and quickly over without any major changes. As John Spratt describes, "The last quarter of the century was punctuated by labor disturbances, but, while some of them were important and of major proportions, most of them appear to have been nothing more than manifestations of fits of temper between a worker, or workers, and foremen." The main exception came in the railroad industry as the Knights of Labor organized the Southwest Strike against Jay Gould in 1886. The strike began in Marshall, Texas, and ended in defeat for the Knights of Labor.

Even within an era of labor organization and unrest in Texas, the Texas Capitol boycott differed from other labor movements within the state. Unlike spontaneous demonstrations which provided most of the state's labor unrest, the Capitol boycott was coordinated between two national organizations: the Granite Cutters' National Union and the Knights of Labor. The strike against the Texas Capitol granite yard differed even from the large-scale Southwest strike as it involved the use of skilled labor from outside the United States, the violation of federal law, and the attention (and eventually the direct intervention) of the federal government in the legal proceedings.

Faced with the loss of his labor force, Gus Wilke actively recruited workers from Aberdeen, Scotland. He sent his agent, George Berry, to procure replacement workers in the spring of 1886, a clear violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law (or Foran Act) which made it illegal to hire workers abroad for employment in the United States. Once in Scotland, Berry advertised in the Aberdeen newspapers for granite cutters and blacksmiths for construction of the Texas Capitol. For example, a notice from the Aberdeen Evening Express read, "WANTED, 50 more Granite Cutters. – Apply at Spare
Room, Northern Friendly Hall, from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. To-Morrow (Saturday). – George Berry.” Eventually, between recruitment through newspaper advertisements and a meeting at the Northern Friendly Society Hall on April 12, Berry recruited eighty-six men (both stoncutters and blacksmiths) to travel to Austin, Texas on April 15, 1886.

By the time of Berry’s recruiting trip, Aberdeen was well-established on both sides of the Atlantic as a leading location for the quarry of raw granite and the creation of finished granite products. A variety of factors allowed Aberdeen, Scotland, to dominate the trans-Atlantic granite industry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Because the region contained abundant granite deposits, laborers in Aberdeen had a great deal of experience and developed improved methods of granite production. Nineteenth century Aberdeen, although economically diverse, became identified with the trans-Atlantic granite trade and developed markets for the stone outside Scotland, and Aberdeen labor migrated to the United States to develop that country’s granite industry. By the late nineteenth century, a variety of recruitment and reporting measures existed in Aberdeen which reinforced the trans-Atlantic granite trade connection for most aspects of society, specifically labor, management, and the general public.

Granite is an extremely hard, naturally occurring stone formed when magma cools within other, older rocks. Several mineral deposits define granite, mainly quartz, felspar, and mica. The specific proportion of these minerals, as well as the color of the felspar, determines the properties and color of individual granites. Granite deposits occur throughout Scotland, and at one time at least seven regions supported quarry operations; however, nineteenth century Aberdeen became the focal point of the Scottish granite industry. The Aberdeen region contains a wide variety of granites which meant Aberdeenshire quarries produced granites of different colors and textures. Of the most prominent quarries – Rublislaw (Figure 1), Kemnay (Figure 2), Corrennie, Peterhead, Slattie, Persley, Dyce, Cairncry, Dancing Cairns, Toms Forest, Tillyfourie, Hill of Fare,
Biresmohr, and Invergelder—each produced a distinct stone. Also, the granite deposits in the Aberdeen region were easier to split and provided more granite capable of polishing (or polishing stone) than other Scottish deposits, and the Aberdeen harbor allowed for rapid and inexpensive transport of granite products.47

The sheer volume of granite available in the Aberdeen region also allowed it to dominate the nineteenth century market. The fourteen specific quarries listed represent only a portion of production since at one time the region supported sixty quarry operations.48

Due to the abundance of deposits, Aberdeen used granite as a building stone long before the nineteenth-century growth of the granite trade. Castle Fraser and Crathes Castle were constructed in the late medieval period, and St. Machar’s Cathedral in Old Aberdeen was built in the fifteenth century. Because of the stone’s hardness, builders gathered from surface granite deposits for these structures, and granite did not become a common building material in Aberdeen in until the eighteenth century. In the early nineteenth century, granite became a recognizable feature of Aberdeen as the industry made advancements in quarrying, stone cutting, and polishing techniques.49 Meanwhile, Aberdeen granite became widely used locally due to city growth. City planners sought to more closely tie Aberdeen to the harbor rather than the Old Aberdeen region of the city, and thus cleared slums and built bridges, roads, and public buildings of granite.50 (See Figures 3 and 4 for images of Old Aberdeen and the newer section of the city near the harbor.) Outside markets for Aberdeenshire granite also developed in the early nineteenth-century as cities, especially London, absorbed Aberdeen granite for their expansion, specifically to use as “paving setts, kerbstones, and building stones.” The construction of British harbors, such as the one in Newcastle, also relied on Aberdeen granite.51

Following the American Civil War, a United States market for Aberdeen granite memorials developed. In Boston and New York especially, the wealthy considered it fashionable to use
Aberdeen granite in memorials. By this time, Aberdeen had a decades-long history of creating granite memorials, especially of polished stone, since in 1830, Aberdonian Alexander Macdonald created a machine-based technique for polishing granite which cut down the time (and thus cost) of creating a polished stone. Therefore, the combination of locally diverse granite deposits and technological advancement made Aberdeen the center of the Scotland / United States granite trade in the late nineteenth century.

Even so, the connection between Aberdeen and the United States involved more than the trade of granite. A migratory labor pattern developed between the two locations as the United States sought skilled granite workers to develop local granite operations following the American Civil War. Aberdeen, given its long history with granite and large-scale granite production, provided the necessary labor for the fledgling United States industry. Marjory Harper describes this situation as follows: “American labour at this time was inadequate and, for its skill-value, expensive; hence Scottish masons were in particular demand, often being employed as instructors to train a native labour force.” Most United States granite operations first emerged in New England, but other deposits discovered in the South, Midwest, and California also relied on Scottish labor. Aberdeen masons worked the quarry in Aberdeen, Colorado, and also cut granite for the Mormon Temple in Salt Lake City, Utah. Overall, skilled labor during the late nineteenth century was in demand, and business owners paid well to entice a skilled labor force to travel to the United States. Once begun, the seasonal migration of men between Aberdeen and the United States became a regular feature of the granite industry. Masons and other granite workers spent winter months in Aberdeen preparing stones for the United States. When these stones were shipped in the summer months, granite workers also migrated to the United States for employment. Workers became part of this migratory pattern because they wished to earn the highest wages possible,
and some planned to accumulate money while working in the United States to open their granite yards in Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{58}

Employment for the Texas Capitol job differed from the traditional seasonal migration pattern between Aberdeen and the eastern and midwestern United States in both location and length as Berry offered eighteen months of work instead of the typical summer season. Despite the differences, several factors may have influenced Aberdeen granite cutters' willingness to accept employment on the Texas Capitol job. Although a new location for migration, Texas was not the first southern state to attract workers from Aberdeen. At the informational meeting held April 12, 1886, Mr. Robert Hall of Aberdeen spoke of his experience (four years in America, some of this time in South Carolina) as a positive one, and he believed Texas likely had a similar climate given its similar latitude.\textsuperscript{59} Therefore, although work in Texas was new, work in the southern United States, in general, was not completely foreign. Economic conditions in Aberdeen in 1886 also likely influenced granite cutters' willingness to accept a job in Texas. Stories in the Aberdeen newspapers in both April and May 1886 describe a depressed state of trade.\textsuperscript{60} The issue of a depressed Aberdeen trade was even raised at the Capitol information meeting. As the \textit{Aberdeen Journal} reported, "Looking to the dull times through which the granite cutters were passing – he [Robert Hall] had not seen the times so bad in Aberdeen for 20 years – he regarded this as a grand opportunity for many who were idle. It would also benefit those who stayed at home."\textsuperscript{61} In other words, employment in Texas benefited the men who accepted the job since they would be employed, and it helped granite cutters who stayed behind in Aberdeen as it decreased competition for jobs at home.

Regardless of why Aberdeen granite cutters accepted employment, the question remains why Gus Wilke chose Scottish workers (specifically workers from Aberdeen) as strikebreakers over other available sources of labor. Since most labor migration from Aberdeen went to the Northeastern and Midwestern region
of the United States, migration to Texas in 1886 was both an extension of and a deviation from the established pattern. Perhaps, as Marjory Harper argues, Wilke chose Aberdeen workers because they were the best in their craft at the time. However, Harper’s reasoning does not explain why Capitol contractors viewed American workers as adept and capable prior to the boycott and Scottish workers as superior afterward. An established pattern of skilled labor migration between Texas and Aberdeen did not exist before Texas Capitol construction (and in fact never developed), so this also does not explain the choice.

Likewise, Scottish settlement and investment in Texas does not appear relevant in the decision toward Scottish granite cutters. In the late nineteenth century, Texas became a popular location for Scottish capital investment in ranching operations. The Edinburgh-based Prairie Cattle Company, Limited became the first British joint-stock company involved in Texas ranching in 1880. Other similar corporations included the Texas Land and Cattle Co., Ltd., the Swan Land and Cattle Company and the Matador Land and Cattle Co., Ltd. Most funding for these enterprises came from Edinburgh, Dundee, and Aberdeen. In addition to their role as foreign investors, Scots served on-site as ranch managers and other positions for these ranching operations. If the investment connection reached into the construction and granite industries, it seems likely these workers would have been recruited much earlier—especially before American workers—since Scottish investment in Texas ranching was well established before Taylor’s decision to use granite in 1885.

Wilke most likely turned to granite cutters from Aberdeen when faced with a labor shortage because of previous construction projects in the Midwest—an area which did maintain a skilled migrant labor relationship with the Aberdeen granite industry—made him aware of this Scottish labor source. Wilke’s father owned a construction business in Chicago, and together they worked on multiple Chicago projects following the Chicago fire as well as a building on the campus of the University of Michigan at Ann
Also, it seems the boycott made recruitment of Scottish workers cost effective whereas such a cost was prohibitive when an American labor force seemed available.

Once Wilke hired workers from Aberdeen, American organized labor attempted to stop these strikebreakers from reaching Texas. The American Granite Cutters’ Union sought George Berry’s arrest in New York for importing contracted labor, but the U.S. District Attorney in New York did not comply due to insufficient evidence. By the time workers produced necessary proof, the Scots had traveled from New York to Texas. Before their departure, however, American union members persuaded twenty-four of the eighty-six Aberdeen workers to participate in the boycott. In exchange for not working in Texas, the American Granite Cutters’ Union employed these men in the American northeast.

For the Scottish recruits, the Texas Capitol job often failed to meet expectations for employment, wages, and working conditions. When George Berry recruited workers in Aberdeen, he indicated men would have a year and a half of work. Yet, the last payroll voucher specifically for "Stonecutters" occurred in May 1887. For the remaining months of 1887 and through to completion in 1888, payroll records indicate a few specifically designated stonecutters working on the Capitol grounds. This change in payroll seems to indicate that most of the granite cutting work was completed and the granite yard at Burnet no longer operated. Meanwhile, although Berry recruited workers with the expectation to receive between $4.00 and $6.00 per day (depending on the speed of the individual worker), some apparently did not earn $1.00 per day. Also, the blacksmiths hired in Scotland slowed the stonecutters’ work by not properly sharpening tools. Many stonecutters thus lost valuable working time by going back to have their tools repaired.

Further, the climate proved difficult for some of the stonecutters. The men were unprepared for working in 90-degree heat, and the Galveston Daily News described the first day of
work. "The men started work Wednesday morning, and the clatter of hammers and tools was quite lively until after 2 P.M., when they began to stop work by twos and threes, not being able to endure the sun, and at 6 P.M., there were not a dozen at work. Since then, they have worked by fits and starts, and from present appearances, it is doubtful whether their labor will form an important part in the erection of the Austin Capitol."\textsuperscript{69}

Throughout construction, work at the granite quarry just outside present-day Marble Falls (during construction of the Capitol referred to as Graniteville) and the granite yard at Burnet remained separate. The granite quarry was mostly staffed with the convict labor arranged by contractor Abner Taylor and the State of Texas, and a yard for cutting stone also existed at the quarry for convicts to do some stonecutting work.\textsuperscript{70} In a seemingly rare exception to this separation, some Scottish stone cutters initially went to the Graniteville quarry instead of Burnet because the Burnet yard did not contain enough stone to keep everyone busy.\textsuperscript{71}

As the Scottish workers adjusted to the Texas climate, the Knights of Labor and the American Granite Cutters' National Union continued to coordinate their efforts on the Capitol boycott and subsequent legal proceedings against the Capitol Syndicate. In an attempt to enforce the boycott, both organizations employed blacklists of men who worked in the Burnet granite yard. The Granite Cutters' National Union included a blacklist of those men who came with George Berry in their coverage of the Scots' arrival in May 1886, and by August 1886, the Knights of Labor collected and circulated a list the Scottish granite cutters imported specifically for the Texas Capitol job.\textsuperscript{72} As the Capitol neared completion, another blacklist appeared in the \textit{Granite-Cutters' Journal} in June 1887 to remind others not to hire these men. This later list included the Scots specifically recruited from Aberdeen (as appeared in the Knights of Labor circular) as well as a list of all other workers who worked on the Capitol once the boycott began.\textsuperscript{73}

In addition to coordinating blacklists, the American Granite
Cutters’ Union and the Knights of Labor cooperated to bring charges against Gus Wilke and the Capitol Syndicate for violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law. As soon as the Scottish workers arrived in New York, the American Granite Cutters’ Union collected evidence from the men who chose not to continue on to Texas, including affidavits, Wilke’s letter of introduction for George Berry in Aberdeen, proposed price lists and room and board charges once in Burnet, and steamer tickets through to Galveston. The Granite Cutters’ Union then forwarded this information to the Texas Knights of Labor to pursue prosecution. As the Granite-Cutters’ Journal explained, “The documents [those just listed] having been sent to D.A. [District Assembly] 78, of Texas, our Brothers of the K. of L., who are in this fight with us, will undoubtedly push the matter there, General Secretary Frederick Turner having promised to send word to the Chairman of the Executive Board of D.A. 78, to push the matter.”

The Texas Knights of Labor apparently did “push the matter” forward as charges were filed against Gus Wilke and all four members of the Capitol Syndicate (John Farwell, Charles Farwell, Abner Taylor, and Amos Babcock) in July 1886 in the United States Federal District Court in Austin, Texas. Although each of the sixty-four cases (one for each Scottish immigrant hired abroad and brought to Texas) was a separate entity, they were combined in such a way for the trial that a guilty verdict for one would equate to a guilty verdict for all. Yet, rather than prosecute the cases immediately, the trial was postponed for a year to August 1887, and the trial was postponed again in August 1887 to August 1889.

Again, the Knights of Labor chose to help the American Granite-Cutters’ Union pursue legal action for the Texas Capitol job. As soon as the case was postponed the first time, the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor voted to provide $5,000 to help prosecute the Capitol Syndicate for violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law. Following the second postponement, lawyers hired by the Knights of Labor collected testimonies of the Scottish granite cutters still at Burnet once it became obvious work would be
completed and they would seek other employment before the cases actually came to trial.\textsuperscript{76}

Meanwhile, before the cases actually came to trial, Gus Wilke actively tried to prevent the Scottish granite cutters from providing evidence against him. The \textit{Granite-Cutters' Journal} of September 1886 reported, "We are also informed that Gus Wilkie has been around among the saloon keepers and others of Austin asking them not to contribute anything towards the fund for prosecuting him and the Syndicate. Also, they refuse to settle with any of the imported Scotchmen who want to leave Burnet unless they sign a paper that they were not brought over under contract by Berry the scab hunter."\textsuperscript{77} One granite cutter, Peter Smith, even testified that Wilke went to several of the Scottish granite cutters in a local saloon and offered to get them into the Stone Cutters Union without paying the entrance fee in exchange for their favorable testimony.\textsuperscript{78}

The attention on the Capitol project for a labor law violation was unique for Texas during the Gilded Age. The use of Scottish stonecutters on the Texas Capitol, with Wilke's violation of federal law, became a national political issue and highlighted the widespread use of foreign contract labor and Alien Contract Labor Law violations. The House of Representatives eventually formed a Select Committee to investigate violations of the law which met in New York City in July 1888. Testimony covered a wide range of industries and nationalities involved in violations, and the Texas Capitol project received specific attention. Josiah Dyer, Secretary of the American Granite Cutters' National Union, testified on the illegal importation of Scottish granite cutters for the Texas Capitol job and presented evidence collected by the Granite Cutters' National Union in New York and other Northeastern states. The committee also interviewed two of the recruited Scots: David Dawson (spelled Dorson in the recorded testimony) who worked at Burnet for several months, and James Anderson who chose to stay in the Northeast for work rather than continue to Texas.\textsuperscript{79}
In spite of legal proceedings and labor-relations issues, work on the Capitol continued. By July 1887, the exterior and interior walls were essentially finished, and work focused on completing the dome and remaining interior details. This work continued throughout the year, and by May 1888, the Capitol was deemed ready, and the building was dedicated May 18, 1888. A leaking roof meant the contractors had additional work to get the Capitol in acceptable condition, and it was not until December 8, 1888 that the Capitol Board fully accepted the building and the contractors were released. 80

During construction and even after completion, the Texas Capitol project impacted those associated with construction. The destinations of most of the Scots after construction of the Capitol are unknown, but a few left a record of their plans or actions after work in Texas through court testimony. Of those with documented plans, most migrated to the granite production regions of the Northeast or Midwest or returned to Scotland. Notable exceptions include Thomas Kesson who planned to go to Georgia, Robert Robertson who planned to go to Australia, and George Kelman who planned to stay in Texas as long as he found work. Two (the two who testified before a House Special Committee) found work in the Northeast and planned to become United States citizens. Three Scottish stonemasons died while in Burnet, and their fellow Scots erected a granite monument in the Burnet Cemetery (Figures 5 and 6). 81

For the Capitol Syndicate, construction of the Texas Capitol translated into ownership of the XIT ranch, a project with perhaps the longest-lasting impact for Syndicate members. 82 The trial for violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law had minimal long-term effects since the trial ended favorably for the Chicago men. By 1889, all charges against Syndicate members were dropped, and only Gus Wilke remained on trial for violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law. In August 1889, Wilke plead guilty to the charges and was sentenced to pay $64,000 plus court costs. Eventually, through intervention by a North Dakota senator and
President Harrison, Wilke only paid $8,000 plus court costs.\textsuperscript{83} The Farwell Brothers and Gus Wilke conducted another, smaller project around the Brazos River and the Velasco, Texas area under the company name Brazos River Channel and Dock Company. Although this project suffered some legal challenges as well, the project proved to be of a much smaller scale and notoriety than the Texas Capitol.\textsuperscript{84}

Most of the connections between Aberdeen, Scotland, Gilded Age labor, and Texas due to reconstruction of the Texas Capitol proved temporary. The ranching connections between Scotland and Texas strengthened as the Capitol Syndicate organized their 3,000,000 acres of Texas land into the Capitol Freehold Land and Investment Company, Limited, in London.\textsuperscript{85} The granite industry connection between Scotland and Texas, however, failed to continue once the men recruited by Berry moved on from Texas. For Texas during the Gilded Age, the state’s general lack of manufacturing and strongly integrated industries (outside a few exceptions in Galveston or along the railroad lines) meant labor organization and unrest within the state continued to be relatively minimal and localized (rather than tied to national organizations), especially when compared to the industrial centers of the Northeast and Midwest. The attention given to Texas by the federal government over violation of the Alien Contract Labor Law, then, also was an anomaly rather than the beginning of a trend for the era. Politically, the end of the case against Wilke and the Capitol Syndicate meant Texas faded from the national spotlight on the issues of immigration and foreign contract labor. It would not be until the early twentieth century – specifically through the growth of the oil industry – that Texas would become and remain a feature in American economics and politics on a national level.

Construction of the Capitol connected Texas to Scotland and the American Gilded Age in ways previously unseen within the state. The United States and Scotland maintained a variety of connections by the late nineteenth century, especially with
immigration and capital investment. Scotland’s economic position during this era proved extremely influential in the growth of United States business ventures, and for Texas this translated into a strong relationship between Scottish financing for Texas ranches. Building the Texas Capitol deepened this relationship between Scotland and Texas (if only temporarily) as the established migration pattern of skilled granite workers between Aberdeen, Scotland, and other regions of the United States entered Texas. The use of a Chicago subcontractor likely forged the (short-lived) granite industry relationship between Aberdeen, Scotland, and Texas. Even Chicago’s architectural trends of the time period may have influenced how the Syndicate approached the Capitol construction project. Meanwhile, the Capitol Syndicate members entered Texas as wealthy, politically connected individuals during an era of extreme labor unrest. Therefore, connections formed in the Midwest entered Texas through Capitol construction and eventually impacted the national labor movement. Following construction and dedication of the Capitol, some relationships remained and strengthened while others faded. The ties between British investment and Texas ranching grew as a British syndicate controlled the XIT Ranch. The granite industry relationship failed to continue as Texas did not become a regular destination for skilled migrant granite cutters from Aberdeen, Scotland. The economic and political connections between the Midwest and Texas also faded, although they did not completely disappear. It would be several years before Texas again connected to business and labor issues on a national scale – this time permanently – with the discovery of Spindletop and the growth of the oil industry.
The Rubislaw Quarry in 2010. Photograph from the author’s personal collection. This quarry operated from 1741 through 1969 and provided most of the gray granite used in the construction in newer sections of Aberdeen. See Graeme Robertson, “A Short History of the Aberdeen Granite Industry,” a lecture presented to the Aberdeen and North-East Scotland Family History Society, May 19, 2007, Aberdeen, Scotland.
The Kemnay Quarry in 2010. Photograph from the author’s personal collection. The quarry is currently active, largely for aggregate. The most recent use of the quarry's granite for dimension stone was for the Scottish Parliament building in Edinburgh. Jenny Brown, personal e-mail communication with the author, August 22, 2011.
View of High Street in Old Aberdeen from the campus of the University of Aberdeen, King's College. Photograph from the author’s personal collection.
Figure 4

View down Rosemont Viaduct in Aberdeen. Photograph from the author’s personal collection.
View of the monument to Scottish stonemasons who died at Burnet, located in the Old Burnet Cemetery, Burnet, Texas. Photograph from the author's personal collection.
View of the inscription for the Scottish stonecutters' monument. Photograph from the author's personal collection. Inscription reads as follows:

ERECTED
by their fellow workmen
in memory of
GEORGE MUTER
who died 13\textsuperscript{th} of June 1886
Aged 23 Years
Also
JOHN SMITH
who was drowned 27\textsuperscript{th} of June 1886
Aged 27 Years
Also
GEORGE MOIR
who died 15\textsuperscript{th} of October 1886
Aged 22 Years

Cut of Burnet Granite
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On February 1, 1858, Walker Martin ended a dispute with his business associate, P.A. Doggett, by emptying both barrels of his shotgun into Doggett’s back as they crossed Indian Creek near Sugar Hill in Collin County, Texas. Such was the story reported by John H. Thomas in the *Dallas Herald* of February 13th of that year. Thomas’ report with its screaming headline: “HORRIBLE MURDER,” made the news both state and nationwide, as newspapers from San Antonio to New York City picked up his story. Considering the publicity and outrage over the murder, how did the murderer escape punishment and remain at large for over thirty-five years? Twenty-first-century access to archival records allows today’s investigator to do what nineteenth-century law officers could not--discover where and how the indicted murderer hid from frontier justice.

When the shooting took place, Martin and Doggett were on a business trip from the Indian Territory riding to Rockwall, Texas, with fourteen-year-old John Newman. According to the Grand Jury testimony in the Collin County District Court, Martin submerged Doggett’s body into the creek and tied it down with a tree limb to keep it hidden. Martin demanded that John Newman keep quiet and stay with friends in Fannin County.

Alice Specht is the Dean of University Libraries, Retired, at Hardin-Simmons University.
Martin was supposedly going to finish his business in Rockwall, and then, the two would travel back to the Indian Territory. Newman stated that he last saw Walker Martin on the road to Greenville.

Newman did travel to Fannin County as instructed, but he did not keep quiet. The court recorded testimony from witness after witness claimed that young John Newman told one story and then another about the whereabouts of Martin and Doggett until, after several days, he told the truth. A week after the murder, a posse found Doggett’s submerged body in the creek. Missing from Doggett’s body was eight hundred dollars from the business venture as well as his gold watch.

The Collin County District Court Grand Jury indicted Walker Martin for murder on April 18, 1858. The Grand Jury also issued a second indictment for theft. Witnesses were subpoenaed, and jurors were summoned; however, Walker Martin could not be found. The judge issued two continuances while Sheriff James H. Lovejoy attempted to locate Walker Martin.

What happened to Walker Martin after he rode east on the road to Greenville? Did he deliberately run and hide from the legal authorities? How was Martin so well concealed that the sheriff could not bring him to justice? Using available records, it is now possible to uncover the long cold trail of Walker Martin.

Back in Collin County, the search for Martin after the two court continuances was not totally abandoned. James L. Read was elected sheriff in Collin County in August of 1860, two years after the Doggett murder. Read, in one of his first acts as sheriff, wrote to Texas Governor Sam Houston requesting a reward be posted by the state for Walker Martin. Read had heard from Martin’s business associates that he was in the Indian Territory. However, instead of issuing a reward, Houston issued an extradition order to the Chickasaw Nation and sent it to Sheriff Read. Read would have to travel into the Indian Territory with the extradition order to apprehend Martin provided Martin was actually in the Territory. Going into the Indian Territory to get
Martin was a particularly dangerous job for a Texas sheriff to undertake. At least 114 United States Marshalls were killed while on duty in the Indian Territory during the period 1871 through 1907. Because Sheriff Read claimed no travel expenses related to this case, it appears unlikely that he attempted to track Walker Martin north of the Texas border. The court took no further action in the case of *The State of Texas vs Walker Martin* for the next thirty-five years.

Despite the failure of Sheriffs Read and Lovejoy to find Martin, he had not traveled far. Exploring beyond Collin County for clues to the life of Walker Martin by examining the political events of the day revealed evidence relevant to Martin’s activities. Following the murder in 1858, the nation became focused on the discord over slavery and secession, leading to the Civil War. And Martin, like so many others, was caught up in the conflict. The *Compiled U.S. and Confederate Military Service Records* lists Walker Martin as a Captain of the U.S. Indian Troops, Company A, Chickasaw, Sheco’s Cavalry Battalion. Martin’s military service record as an officer for the Confederacy provides proof that he fought in, and lived through, the Civil War. His service with troops from the Indian Territory provides a lead to other lines of research in the Oklahoma archives.

The *Oklahoma Indian Pioneer Collection* recorded an interview with William R. Surrell, a longtime resident of Atoka. In his interview with Etta Mason on August 9, 1937, Surrell stated:

One mile west of Atoka was the Walker Martin farm, Walker was a wine merchant. He raised grapes and apples on his farm and made cider and grape wine. It was said that he made such good wine and cider and was so liberal with it that the trainmen always carried a supply in the engine-room. He used a sixty gallon brass kettle to make the wine in.
The testimony to Martin’s wine-making skills inside the Indian Territory where the sale of liquor was illegal led to the possibility of additional criminal activities on his part. Legal jurisdiction of the territory during this time was complicated due to American western expansion and the governance of the tribes of Native Americans. Beginning in the 1830’s, the U.S. began the removal of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Seminole, Creek, and Chickasaw tribes from lands east of the Mississippi into the vast western region and into what became Oklahoma. The removals of additional tribes continued into the 1870’s, which partly overlapped the years Martin apparently lived in the Indian Territory. Describing criminality in the Indian Territory of this period, historian C. H. McKennon wrote:

The old tribal governments worked well in governing the new nations, but, these governments had no provisions for prosecuting a white man who was wanted for a felony in the states. Outlaws, quick to recognize this man-made legal quirk and the natural frontier vastness of the Territory as a haven, mingled with the incoming settlers.¹⁰

The United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas was set up in Fort Smith in 1871 to provide a solution to the crimes committed by the white settlers in the Indian Territory. If Walker Martin continued to break the law after 1858 while in the territory, there was the possibility of prosecution by the court in Fort Smith. President U. S. Grant appointed William Story as judge of the Western District of Arkansas. Story served in Fort Smith from 1871 to 1874 when he resigned to avoid impeachment due to a charge of corruption in the court. Grant then appointed Isaac Charles Parker judge in 1875, and he served until 1896. Records show that “Three mass executions of fifteen felons within his first two years on the bench secured Parker’s reputation as the implacable “Hanging Judge.”¹¹

Fort Smith District Court records confirm that Walker Martin actually did make several appearances before the judges.
following the Civil War. In 1868, 1870, and twice in 1876, the court charged Martin with larceny. He stole two mules from the U.S. Government, 47 hogs from W. D. Taylor, and 60 hogs from Thomas Guthrie. In 1873, 1877, and twice in 1880, he was convicted of “liquor.” The charges stated he had “introduced spirituous liquors into the Indian Country” in the form of five gallons of whiskey on more than one occasion. In 1874, the court charged him with “engaging in business as a retail liquor dealer without paying the special tax.” From these charges and the resulting fines, it was clear that lawmen in the Indian Territory knew the whereabouts of Walker Martin. However, with little communication between the separate government entities, it seems likely that the authorities in Fort Smith never knew of Martin’s indictment for murder out of Collin County, Texas.

Written on the cover of the larceny indictment filed in 1876 at Fort Smith was a note from the court, “From the information filed in this case it appears that Martin is a Chickasaw Indian by marriage. Before making the arrest of Martin the Marshal will satisfy himself that the person from whom the property was stolen is not an Indian.” The instructions indicated that if Martin stole from another tribal member, then the U.S. Marshall would not have jurisdiction. The notice that Martin claimed Chickasaw tribal membership by marriage in 1876 was supported by the inspection of the Dawes Commission archives.

The U.S. Congress established the Dawes Commission in 1893 to negotiate agreements with the Choctaw, Creek, Chickasaw, Seminole, and Cherokee Indian tribes. The commission’s mission was to divide tribal land into plots which were then divided among the members of the tribe. As part of this process, the Commission accepted or rejected applicants who claimed tribal membership. If the commission accepted certain claimants, they were given land allotments. The Dawes Commission files are a treasure trove of primary sources regarding Native Americans in the Indian Territory, detailing how they came to reside in the territory along with proof of their tribal citizenship.
The Dawes files were originally indexed on cards. The Walker Martin Dawes Card #141 filed in 1898 shows a family claim: Chickasaw Walker Martin, Chickasaw Sally Moore Martin, and eight-year-old Chickasaw Mary Elizabeth Martin. Accompanying the card file is the handwritten application filed by Walker Martin explaining why he should be accepted as a Chickasaw citizen and given an allotment. The file included personal references and the Commission’s ruling.

The Walker Martin file in the Dawes Commission archives provides a firsthand account of Martin’s life between 1855 and 1898. In the Dawes application, Walker Martin reported details about his life in the Indian Territory starting with his 1855 marriage to Adeline Folsom, a Choctaw woman. This marriage took place three years before the murder of Doggett in Texas. Martin stated that his first wife died in 1863 while he was in the army. In addition, he married a Chickasaw woman in 1866 who died in 1881. He reported living with the Chickasaw until the “present time” (1898) except for the six years he lived in Atoka in the Choctaw nation. He mentioned his military service during “the rebellion.” In 1890, he married Sally, a white woman who had been married to a Chickasaw man, “according to the laws of that nation.” He stated he made application to prove the Chickasaw citizenship of his daughter, Mary Elizabeth, whose mother was the white woman Sally Moore Martin.

Within the file of the Walker Martin Dawes application was a statement from the attorneys for the Chickasaw Nation stating that the Martins did not show sufficient evidence to prove their tribal membership. Therefore, the attorneys recommended denial of the Martin application. Also attached was a reference from a Chickasaw citizen who wrote in negative terms about Martin as a white man who was fraudulently attempting to get a tribal allotment. The Dawes Commission denied the Martin family application.

As is often the case with historical research, other interesting paths branch out from the original research topic. Walker
Martin's daughter, Mary Elizabeth Martin, provided one of those offshoots. In 1904, Mary Elizabeth won an appeal to the Dawes Commission decision to deny her an allotment. Her case became an important precedent in the rulings regarding allotments. The appeal questioned whether the offspring of two recognized citizens of the Choctaw-Chickasaw nation was entitled to enrollment as a Chickasaw citizen even though the applicant had no Indian blood. The First Assistant Attorney General for the Department of the Interior, Frank Campbell, rendered the opinion that Mary Elizabeth was entitled to enrollment as a citizen of the Chickasaw nation. The Secretary of the Interior approved that opinion, and Mary Elizabeth was enrolled. This enrollment decision so enraged the Chickasaw tribal members that President Theodore Roosevelt asked the Attorney General to review the case, and so the decision for enrollment was reversed. It is unclear if the case was decided on its merits, or rather, on the fact that her enrollment would cause reversal for a number of other applicants and cost the U.S. government a million and a half dollars.\textsuperscript{17}

Working from the Dawes Commission application information about Martin, the investigation next led to the review of possible tribal records available in Oklahoma State Archives. The tribal rolls and censuses add information about Martin's life and they identify several of Martin's children and grandchildren. The 1885 Choctaw Census listed Martin as sixty years old (born in 1825), farmer, white, and a citizen by marriage. He was living with his son Walker Zeno Martin, aged sixteen.\textsuperscript{18} Martin had seventy acres under cultivation, owned three horses, two mules, eight cows, and 25 hogs. Walker Zeno was listed as a citizen by blood. The 1896 Choctaw Nation Census listed Emma (Emily) Henderson as the daughter of Walker Martin and Adeline Folsom.\textsuperscript{19} The 1898 Choctaw Nation Roll enumerated Emily as the wife of Joe Henderson. She was 39 years old, was one-quarter Choctaw, and her father was listed as Walker Martin and her mother Adeline Martin.\textsuperscript{20} Emily had four children living with her. In the Dawes
Commission files, there was an application dated 1903 for James H. Bounds, aged 48, who reported his marriage to Joanna Martin, daughter of Walker Martin, a Chickasaw living in the Choctaw nation. The 1900 census of the United States in the Indian Population Schedule reported Mary E. Martin as an orphan, born in 1890. The census identified her father's birthplace as Kentucky and her mother's birthplace as Texas. Therefore, by 1900 both Walker and Sally Martin must have died.

Rather surprising, considering his fugitive status, Walker Martin allowed his biography to be published in Leaders and Leading Men of the Indian Territory by H. F. O'Beirne in 1891. In this biography Martin identified his father as John H. Martin of Jefferson County, Kentucky. Martin reported traveling when he was young to California, New York, and Panama. Details of his Civil War service with the Chickasaw troops were included. He also stated he sold Kentucky horses in Texas beginning in 1855 and settled in Atoka in 1884. No mention was made of his criminal activities.

The archival trail provided documentation that Walker Martin lived in the Indian Territory as far back as 1855. He served in the Civil War as an officer, was primarily a farmer and a bootlegger, and had a number of children with three different wives. He continued to have trouble with the law until 1880. There is no record that he lived a life of violence. There is no indication that he tried to change his identity or that he was concerned about hiding from the authorities in Texas. Apprehending Martin in Indian Territory may have appeared dangerous to Sheriff Read in 1860, but while Martin lived at the farm in Atoka, he was only 100 miles from the District Court in McKinney, Texas.

Eventually, Walker Martin was apprehended. The court records do not explain whether he surrendered to authorities, or if the Sheriff in Collin County arrested him in the Indian Territory. On December 6, 1892, the Collin County District Court instructed Sheriff J. L. Moulden to serve Walker Martin, the defendant, with a certified copy of the indictment from 1858. In January of 1893,
the Sheriff assembled 60 men as special jurors for the case of *The State of Texas vs Walker Martin*. The court summoned witnesses. Thirty-five years after the murder of P. A. Doggett, the trial to bring his alleged murderer to justice was scheduled.

The court records also show that in January of 1893, Throckmorton, Garnett and Rainey, attorneys for the defendant, filed a motion to quash the indictment. The motion to quash detailed eleven different weaknesses in the 1858 indictment ranging from the grand jury records to the court filings. The shortcomings included wording from the 1858 document, a lack of grand jury minutes, and no record of a grand jury quorum. The *Dallas Morning News* of January 31, 1893, reported the criminal docket was taken up in Collin County and the indictment was quashed. Walker Martin was released.

Walker Martin benefited from the fact that the legal environment in Texas in 1858 was not one of clearly understood codes, regulations and precedents. Texas was admitted to the United States on December 29, 1845, but, the state did not adopt a penal code until 1856 in the sixth legislature. The earliest publication of the complete code was printed in Galveston in 1857. At the time of the murder of P.A. Doggett on February 1, 1858 few if any lawyers, judges or other legal officials in Collin County were familiar with the new code passed down in Austin. Bill Neal in *Getting Away with Murder on the Texas Frontier* described the working of lawyers in Texas in the 1880s:

> They had little money, they lacked library facilities, they were ill-trained and poorly paid, they were torn between the “unwritten” folk laws of the frontier and the crude legislation passed in distant Austin, and they were largely without legal precedent to guide them.

In 1879, the state totally rewrote and adopted a new Texas Penal Code. During the thirty-five years between the death of Doggett in 1858 and the trial of 1893, the Texas legal code and
procedures were entirely revised. It is understandable that the indictment written in 1858 would not meet the legal standards of 1893. The 1858 indictment stated:

That one Walker Martin late of the County and State not having the fear of God before his eyes, but being moved and seduced by the instigation of the Devil on that first day of February AD in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and fifty eight with force of arms in the county and state aforesaid and upon one P.A.T. Doggett in the peace of God and our state then and there being feloniously, willfully and with malice aforethought, did make an assault, and that the said Walker Martin a certain double barreled shotgun of the value of twenty dollars then and there loaded and charged with gunpowder, and diverse lead ...did shot [shoot] and discharge weapon.... P.A.T. Doggett did then and there instantly die.  

The "Old Code" had a number of oddities not evident in today’s legal code. When describing types of homicide, for example, Article 610 added, "If any person be killed with a bowie knife or dagger, under circumstances which would otherwise render the homicide a case of manslaughter, the killing shall nevertheless be deemed murder, and punished accordingly." Since Martin used a shotgun, the bowie knife issue did not concern his case.

After the indictment was quashed, Martin returned to the Indian Territory. Printed sources after the trial add the final chapter regarding Walker Martin. On April 23, 1898, Martin committed suicide in Cale (now Calera), Indian Territory. The newspapers reported Martin owed Joe Perry a thousand dollars on a loan with cattle as the collateral. According to Perry, Martin did not have the funds, and told Perry he would meet him in Cale to turn over sufficient cattle to settle the loan. As Martin did not own the cattle, he chose to end his life with morphine, leaving a note detailing information of the unsatisfied loan. Martin was 73
years old at his death. He lived a long life on the western frontier at a time when the average life expectancy of an American male was 46 years.

Details as to where and how Walker Martin lived during the years he was under indictment for murder are readily available in today’s online accessible archives. Information regarding his livelihood, military service, brushes with the law, family life, and how he died is available. As for the murder indictment, the lack of communication and cooperation among government jurisdictions, the legal structure in the Indian Territory regarding white men, and the changes in the Texas Penal Code meant that Walker Martin skated free of conviction. Walker Martin literally got away with murder while living in plain sight.
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Riding Lucifer’s Line: Ranger Deaths along the Texas-Mexico

Former State Historian Light Townsend Cummins, respected widely for his scholarship of and enthusiasm for solid Texas history, has produced an important study of Dallas sculptor Allie Victoria Tennant, whose monumental works (quite literally) spanned from the 1920s to the 1950s. It is at once a detailed and valued biography of an important figure in the state’s cultural history, and also a biographical study of the Dallas arts community, which historically had such a profound impact on the development of the visual arts in Texas and the Southwest. An even tighter focus within those contexts is the story of the emerging family of twentieth-century Texas women artists who encouraged each other, and subsequent generations, through their achievements, recognition, and perseverance.

Heavily stratified, the central story draws on a wide range of contributing elements ranging from artistic education, philanthropy, and museum philosophy to political influences, women’s clubs, and local interpretations of national trends in art. Tennant played a defining role in the development of the American Scene regionalism that began to take center stage in artistic circles beginning in the 1920s and remained en vogue through the 1930s and beyond. Even as it eventually began to give way to abstract expressionism in the years following World War II, Tennant remained a stalwart supporter of change, as well as a tireless opponent of artistic censorship. Most of her works have survived the generational trends, however, to remain important landmarks of the state’s cultural landscape that are evocative of a particular time and place. Perhaps most notably, perhaps,
is the one featured on the book’s cover—*Tejas Warrior*—that has graced the entryway to the Hall of State at Fair Park since the centennial celebration of the 1930s. Her last major public sculpture, which commemorated the philanthropic work of Louis Calder, adorned new facilities at Lufkin’s Memorial Hospital in 1957.

Tennant was in many ways an atypical artist of the time—independently wealthy, gregarious, and socially and civically engaged—and her leadership roles in various institutions, associations, clubs, and causes made her a key player in how Dallas came to view its sizable role in the arts. As Cummins noted, she was one of those pivotal individuals who “helped to shape the contours of both the artistic and the civic development of the city,” which in turn transcended its influence regionally. (p. 208) In that vein, Tennant shared the spotlight with countless others, including the well-known Jerry Bywaters and Frank Reaugh, and those like Vivian Aunspaugh and Katherine Lester Crawford, who richly deserve the renewed attention the author provides.

Significantly, Cummins’s book is the first offering in the Women in Texas History Series by Texas A&M University Press. Series editors Nancy Baker Jones and Cynthia J. Beeman made an important statement in that regard, and the author delivered a book that not only makes an important contribution to Lone Star cultural history but also sets a high standard for other works to come. *Allie Victoria Tennant and the Visual Arts in Dallas* is a compelling exploration of how one remarkable artist, with great purpose and quiet assurance, helped her communities—both locally and statewide—develop a distinct and enduring sense of place.

Dan K. Utley
Texas State University

In his admirable study, Richard McCaslin, Professor of History at the University of North Texas, presents a concise but thorough chronicle of Washington, a town located at the confluence of the Brazos and Navasota rivers. In many cases, studies focusing on a single community are written by lay historians, who possess an emotional attachment to their subject. Frequently, such studies are influenced by local lore, misguided interpretations, and limited historical context. Despite these shortcomings, local histories generally are laden with factual data which often proves invaluable to professional historians. Utilizing existing local histories related to Washington on the Brazos, McCaslin provides a balanced and meaningful account of the historic settlement, highlighting its significance in early Texas history.

Every year, hundreds of visitors come to the Washington-on-the-Brazos State Park to experience the birthplace of Texas. If these sightseers were honest, they would probably admit to being a little disappointed, especially as they walk the trail that meanders from the back doors of the park headquarters down a steep hill to a platform built overlooking the old Robinson ferry crossing. Their disillusionment is understandable, particularly considering that no original structures remain at the location. The visitors might initially be enthralled by Independence Hall, but their enthusiasm usually fades when they learn that the building is a replica constructed in the late 1960s and not the original hall where delegates signed the Texas Constitution of 1836. Even the oldest structure in the park, a cistern standing in the middle of the field across from the rebuilt hall, will likely leave the most avid Texas history buff disenchanted. For many, the most satisfying aspect of their trip is that they walked the same ground as some of the most famous figures from the state’s past, including Sam
Houston, José Antonio Navarro, Lorrenzo de Zavala, Thomas J. Rusk, David Crockett, John C. "Jack" Hays, Anson Jones, Asa Hoxey, George C. Childress, and David G. Burnet. At the end of the day, sightseers, especially those who do not take time to visit the park's museum, will leave the site without fully appreciating its historical significance.

Prior to the publication of McCaslin's study, no single volume was readily available to the public highlighting Washington's role in Texas history. Thankfully, this is no longer the case. Following the chronological development of Washington from fledgling frontier community to a bustling settlement and later a noted state landmark, McCaslin fills a void in Texas historiography and presents readers with a vision of the town that cannot be gleaned from visiting the location today. The author traces many of the important aspect of the community's history, reminding his readers that Washington on the Brazos was the birthplace of the Republic of Texas; that it twice served as the capital of the Lone Star Republic; that it was a thriving commercial center in Washington County for three decades following Texas independence; and that it was on par with other fledgling settlements of its day, including Houston and Austin. McCaslin also reveals how a town with such promising origins ultimately failed and was eventually reclaimed by the wilderness from which it sprang. Though many unfortunate incidents led to the historic settlement's demise, key among them were the failure to advance reliable navigation on the Brazos River; the shortsightedness of local leaders, who failed to see the commercial importance of railroads; the impact of divisive politics during the Reconstruction era; and finally, a 1912 fire that ravaged a majority of its buildings.

The final chapter examines the creation of Washington on the Brazos State Park, revealing how modern trends in historical preservation aided in the construction of the replica of Independence Hall. McCaslin does a commendable job of
examining major developments associated with the park’s history and provides key insights on individuals involved in the evolution and expansion of the site over time.

Washington On The Brazos will surely become the most popular book published on the historic town, especially among the many visitors to the state park who are interested in gaining a fuller appreciation of the community that once stood along the trail that ends at the old Robinson ferry crossing. Furthermore, because the study is exceptionally researched and places Washington within the broader context of Texas history, scholars should include it in their Texana collection.

Kenneth W. Howell
Blinn College

When power is concentrated in the hands of a small minority, people and events can influence society in unwelcomed ways. If citizens do not remain involved in maintaining order, sanctioned behaviors can become disconnected from the law. In response to pressures to change or to social disorder, groups may rise to protect social systems from attack by “outsiders.” Sometimes those very protections backfire and must themselves be rejected and controlled, or put down entirely.

That may sound like a commentary on current events but it is instead a core premise of this book. Written by a past President of the Louisiana Folklore Society, this work focuses on the legend and facts of seven outlaws from Jean Laffite to Bonnie and Clyde. Though it seemed to be yet another repetition of uncorroborated stories that have been repeatedly exaggerated in their retelling, the author takes significant measures to also explore any available research which supports or disputes each legend. By doing so he elevates the work to become an examination of the turbulent times during which these outlaws had their way, as well as a commentary on the extent to which outlaws were embraced and even protected by segments of society. The author also focuses on our modern-day celebrations of these outlaws in the form of festivals and re-creations. Though the acts of murder, thievery, and arson committed by these outlaws are not celebrated per se, the outlaws themselves continue to be somewhat glorified and given at least a nod of understanding.

The author points out the “logic” of the homespun law, that “the enmity one feels for an outside agent of the law always exceeds the hatred one feels for a personal enemy.” One hundred
years ago or more communities were close-knit and protective of their ways. Isolation led to a need to protect these communities from anything or anyone that would disrupt their way of life. Outlaws often started out as a violent or criminal offshoot of those communities, but when allowed excessive power they ultimately met their end.

The way in which the author uses these stories to explain and interpret the concepts of frontier justice is what makes this a book worth reading by historians as well as folklorists.

Gary Pinkerton
Houston
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ARCHITECTURE THAT SPEAKS
S. C. P. Vosper and Ten Remarkable Buildings at Texas A&M
Nancy T. McCoy and David G. Woodcock
McCoy and Woodcock, distinguished preservation architects and scholars, review the history of Texas A&M campus architecture and provide in-depth coverage of Vosper and his legacy. Illustrated by the sumptuous photography of Carolyn Brown, Architecture That Speaks concludes with observations on recent approaches toward the reuse and rehabilitation of campus heritage architecture and a view to the future, as plans evolve for further development of the campus that maintains a respect for both strategic vision and historical heritage.
11x10. 158 color, 52 b&w photos. 28 line drawings. Bib. Index. $40.00 cloth

TEN DOLLARS TO HATE
The Texas Man who Fought the Klan
Patricia Bernstein
Bernstein tells the story of the massive Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s and the first prosecutor in the nation to successfully convict and jail Klan members. Dan Moody, a twenty-nine-year-old Texas district attorney, demonstrated that Klansmen could be punished for taking the law into their own hands.
44 b&w photos. Bib. Index. $34.95 cloth

BULWARK AGAINST THE BAY
The People of Corpus Christi and Their Seawall
Mary Jo O’Rear
After a devastating hurricane in 1919, the people of Corpus Christi faced the stark reality of their vulnerability. It was clear that something had to be done, but the mere will to take precautionary measures did not necessarily lead the way. Instead, two decades would pass before an effective solution was in place. Mary Jo O’Rear, author of Storm over the Bay, returns to tell the story of a city’s long and often frustrating path to protecting itself.
74 b&w photos. $27.95 cloth

STORM OVER THE BAY
The People of Corpus Christi and Their Port
Mary Jo O’Rear
In gripping detail, author Mary Jo O’Rear chronicles the successful efforts of the newly unified Corpus Christi—efforts that culminated in the dedication of the Port of Corpus Christi on September 14, 1926, seven years to the day after the storm that devastated the city.
13 b&w photos. 2 line art. 4 maps. $19.95 paper
Texas Rangers
Lives, Legend, and Legacy
Bob Alexander & Donaly E. Brice

This one-volume history of the Texas Rangers tells their story from the pre-Republic years through the present day, addressing the various wars, companies, and famous episodes that shaped the Ranger service.
Hardcover $34.95 • E-book $27.96

The Ranger Ideal, Vol. I
Texas Rangers in the Hall of Fame, 1833-1861
Darren L. Ivey

Volume I of this three-volume series presents capsule biographies of the seven Texas Ranger Hall of Fame inductees who served prior to the Civil War.
Hardcover $39.95 • E-book $31.96

Death on the Lonely Llano Estacado
The Assassination of J.W. Jarrett, a Forgotten Hero
Bill Neal

Neal investigates the cold case of J.W. Jarrett, a West Texas settler whose death at the hands of hired assassins baffled law enforcement officials for over 100 years.
Hardcover $24.95 • E-book $19.96

Legends and Life in Texas
Folklore from the Lone Star State, in Stories and Song
Kenneth L. Untiedt, Ed.

Stories about real-life characters from Texas history, as well as personal reflections on life from various perspectives throughout the last century.
Hardcover $45.00 • E-book $36.00

Available December 2014

Distributed by Texas Book Consortium
Orders: 1-800-826-8911 • UNTPress.unt.edu
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The Presidents Speak
Milton S. Jordan & Dan K. Utley
PAPER * 20.00

"THE PRESIDENTS SPEAK IS AN INVALUABLE TOOL for future leaders of ETHA and other regional historical groups. Covering a wide range of topics, this series of speeches reflects a broad minded inclusiveness that provides history, context and meaning for twenty-first century East Texas."

Heather Green Wooten, PhD
ETHA President, 2017-2018

ONE OF THE IMPORTANT DUTIES of an association president is to deliver an address to the members of the organization. The presidential address provides glimpses of the speaker's convictions, insight into the past and present, vision for the future and renews the membership's dedication to the work of the organization. The addresses collected in The Presidents Speak present a powerful message and leave an important footprint for the East Texas Historical Association and similar organizations.

Kenneth W. Howell, PhD
Director, Central Texas Historical Association

‘F. LEE LAWRENCE, A TYLER ATTORNEY, F. I. Tucker, an attorney from Nacogdoches, and C.K. Chamberlain, Chair of the History Department at Stephen F. Austin State University, called the organizational meeting of the East Texas Historical Association at the Nacogdoches school in September 1962. Those attending that gathering selected Chamberlain as editor/director and Lawrence as the first president. One year later, Tucker became president of the association. From 1963 through the end of the century, thirty-seven men and women served one-year terms as president. Throughout those years, the presidents often presented papers at association meetings during their terms in office. They were not called on, however, to offer presidential addresses, a custom that formally began with the new century."

Dan K. Utley
Milton S. Jordan

1.800.826.8911 TAMUPress.com 936.468.1078 sfasu.edu/sfapress
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