

3-1988

The Evolution of Black Political Participation in Reconstruction Texas

Merline Pitre

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



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

Tell us how this article helped you.

Recommended Citation

Pitre, Merline (1988) "The Evolution of Black Political Participation in Reconstruction Texas," *East Texas Historical Journal*: Vol. 26: Iss. 1, Article 8.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol26/iss1/8>

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

THE EVOLUTION OF BLACK POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN RECONSTRUCTION TEXAS

by Merline Pitre

Historians have devoted a good deal of attention in recent years to the question of Southern Reconstruction politics. The Republicans who initiated, shaped, and ultimately lost control of Reconstruction programs in the former Confederate states have been the focus of much historical controversy. While recognizing that Southern Republicans everywhere consisted of a coalition of newly enfranchised blacks, Northern carpetbaggers and Southern white scalawags, scholars have disagreed and continue to disagree sharply over the origins, characters, and effectiveness of these political groups. Despite such disagreements, or perhaps in part because of them, an increasingly refined picture gradually has emerged on the identity, ideology, and political behavior of Southern Republicans, especially black Republicans.

True, recent historians have had little trouble dispelling the myth of Black Reconstruction, but they have been less successful in determining how blacks helped to shape Reconstruction in a state such as Texas which had the smallest number of blacks of any Confederate state. The purpose of this article is to shed light not only on the ideology and political behavior of blacks who served in the Reconstruction Convention of 1868-1869, but also on the role they played in helping to reconstruct their lives, their communities, and their state.

Historical and Biographical Background of Black Constitutional Delegates

The blacks of Texas, like those in many other Southern states, did not take an active part in politics until the passage of the Reconstruction Acts of 1867. These acts, which declared all previous actions of the state null and void and called for the drafting of new constitutions, made it possible for blacks to become actors rather than merely objects in politics. So, in keeping with their idea of making political rights a reality, Texas blacks went to the polls on February 10, 1868, and not only cast 35,952 votes in favor of a constitutional convention, but elected nine blacks to serve as constitutional delegates.

To many white natives, events in the Lone Star State in that winter month clashed sharply with fond remembrances of the old regime and the people they thought they knew best. The sudden politicalization of their ex-slaves was inexplicable. Unable to understand the activities of blacks, whites conjured up powerful and tenacious images about blacks in general and black delegates in particular. Created by the Democratic and conservative white Republican press, and nurtured by succeeding generations of historians and publicists, depictions of these black delegates as poor, ignorant ex-slaves ascending straight from the fields to the

legislative halls were rife. These traditional images have been sustained to the present, largely by continued ignorance of who these delegates were and the roles they played in the constitutional convention.

To get a better understanding of the men who helped to draft the constitution of 1869, it is necessary to take a look at their backgrounds. The black who probably stood out most in the convention, by virtue of his training and background, was George T. Ruby. A free-born mulatto, Ruby was a native of New York. After acquiring a sound liberal arts education in Maine, Ruby journeyed to Haiti where he worked as a correspondent for the *Pine and Palm*, a New England Newspaper edited by James Redpath. Ruby's job was to collect information about Haiti and send it to the United States to be read by black Americans who were searching for an alternative to slavery and discrimination.¹

After the American Civil War, Ruby returned to the United States and settled in Louisiana where he was employed in 1866 as a school teacher. In September of that year Ruby left Louisiana and became an agent for the Texas Freedmen's Bureau in Galveston. One year later, he became President of the Loyal Union League of Texas. With a firm base in the urban setting, his acquaintance with leading Republicans of the state, and his support of blacks, Ruby at twenty-seven years of age was elected as a delegate to the Republican National Convention of 1868. In 1869, he was elected from a predominantly white district, which consisted of Galveston and Brazoria counties, to the Texas Senate. After failing in his bid for re-election to the Senate in 1874, Ruby returned to Louisiana.²

Another black elected to the legislature was James McWashington. He represented Montgomery County where blacks outnumbered whites by 250 votes in 1868. McWashington was born a slave in Alabama but had lived in Texas sixteen years before his election to the convention. After serving as a delegate, he remained active in politics, attending many of the Republican Party's conventions. Siding with Andrew Hamilton in 1869, McWashington ran on the conservative ticket for a House seat, but met with defeat.³

From Harris County came Charles W. Bryant, a minister and a native of Kentucky. Born a slave, he became an agent for the Freedmen's Bureau of Texas before entering politics in 1869. Harris and Montgomery counties elected him as their delegate to the constitution convention of 1868-1869. Though Bryant was a young man of thirty-eight years when elected to the convention, after his tenure in this body he did not become involved in politics again.⁴

Benjamin Franklin Williams was one of the most active black delegates at the Reconstruction Convention. He was born a slave in Brunswick County, Virginia, in 1819. As a slave, he was taken to South Carolina, then to Tennessee in 1830, before being brought to Colorado County, Texas, in 1859. After Emancipation, Williams became a traveling

Methodist minister. He was the officiating minister when the Wesley Methodist Chapel in Austin was established in 1868, a church, according to the *Galveston Daily News*, which forbade blacks from attending if they were not Republicans. Combining religion with politics, Williams became a militant spokesman for his race. As early as 1868 he served as vice president of the Union Loyal League and as such kept the white Unionists abreast of what was happening in the black belt area. It was Williams' involvement in politics that won him a seat at the constitutional convention at the age of forty-eight.⁵

Apparently Williams made a good impression on his fellow blacks while serving in the convention because he was subsequently elected by Lavaca and Colorado counties to the 12th Legislature; by Waller, Fort Bend, and Wharton to the 16th; and by the counties of Waller and Fort Bend to the 19th. Likewise, Williams' popularity was manifested among his colleagues in the 12th Legislature when they nominated him for Speaker of the House; he lost by only three votes. It was Williams, the land speculator, mechanic, and engineer, along with other blacks, who was instrumental in the settlement and development of Kendleton, Texas.⁶

Two other delegates of note were Sheppard Mullins and Benjamin O. Watrous. Mullins was born a slave in Lawrence County, Alabama, in 1829. He was still a bondsman when he arrived in Texas in 1854. The skills of a blacksmith, which he acquired while in bondage, served him well in freedom. After the Civil War, he labored in his own behalf and acquired several lots as well as a block of land in Waco in McLennan County, Texas.⁷ Mullins was elected to serve in the second session of the convention when McLennan County chose him as their delegate upon the death of the incumbent.

Mullins' colleague, Benjamin O. Watrous, was born a slave in Tennessee, where he was known as Ben Carter. After being set free he took the name of his last owner, John Watrous. A wheelwright and property owner, Watrous was also a minister. He had lived in Texas twelve years when Washington County chose him as their delegate to the convention.⁸

A dearth of biographical information exists on the other delegates, Mitchell Kendall, Ralph Long, Stephen Curtis, and Wiley Johnson. Kendall, a blacksmith from Georgia, represented Harris and Panola counties. He was fifty years of age when elected to the convention, but he probably was the wealthiest of the delegates. Despite his birth as a slave, while serving as a delegate his assets were valued at \$2400.⁹ His colleague, Ralph Long, was not as wealthy. Long, of Limestone County, was a Tennessean by birth and a farmer by occupation. At twenty-five years of age, Long was the youngest member of the convention. He had lived in Texas for only two of those twenty-five years before he became a delegate.¹⁰

In contrast to Long's youth, the oldest black man to serve in the constitutional convention was Stephen Curtis, who was sixty years of age.

He was a carpenter by trade and was born a slave in Virginia. He became involved in politics almost from the organization of the Republican Party in Texas. He could be found at most, if not all, Republican gatherings held throughout the Reconstruction era.¹¹ Wiley Johnson, a man much younger than Curtis, represented Harris County in the convention and was a shoemaker by profession. His slave birth took place in Arkansas.¹²

Of the stereotypes drawn about these men, namely that they were a group of illiterate ex-slaves and penniless farmers, only the one of their *antebellum* status as slaves stands up to close scrutiny. As to occupations, there were two blacksmiths, three ministers, one carpenter, one teacher, and three farmers. Of the ten blacks who served in this convention, only three could not read or write. This does not mean that the other blacks were highly educated, but with the exception of Ruby, who was a teacher, all the others had acquired a rudimentary education or better.

As to the image of a penniless worker, at least three blacks had some form of property, real or personal, with the assets of one totaling \$2400. Although the majority of these blacks did not own property and although the property held by the minority of them was minimal as compared to that of whites, these blacks cannot be classified as penniless farmers who were not interested in the fiscal policies and economic development of the state. In truth, these men were not drawn from a middle class because none existed in Texas at that time, but rather they came from a rank that was far below the ruling white class and a little above the black masses.

Blacks, Allies, and Adversaries at the Constitutional Convention

The process by which black delegates arrived at their political opinions generally involved a realistic appraisal of their vital self-interests. When the convention assembled in Austin on June 11, 1868, there were four major blocs — individuals with similar voting patterns. The first and largest bloc consisted of individuals who were loyal to Governor Elisha Pease and who probably best represented statewide Unionist opinions. This bloc supported the basic political and civil rights of blacks as defined in the Civil Rights Act of 1866, but was not willing to move beyond that point.

The second bloc represented the interests associated with the more populous part of the state — East Texas. These individuals were hostile to the interests of blacks, in large part because the majority of blacks resided in that section of the state. Fearing the potential of black power in that area, they rejected the civil rights of blacks as defined by the federal government and looked for ways to avoid its implementation.

The third bloc was sectional in that it consisted of individuals who resided in the Western counties that made up the Fourth Congressional District. This group held the broadest view of the rights of blacks among whites in the convention. Moreover, they made more concessions in the areas of office-holding and education to blacks than did any other group. It goes without saying, then, that they became the blacks' strongest ally.

Unlike the first three blocs which typified political divisions that existed prior to the Civil War, the fourth group consisted of the black delegates, who operated in a manner designed to achieve the interests of blacks. Among other things, the blacks desired political and civil rights and worked for free public education.¹³ In keeping with their interests, blacks took an active part in the *ab initio* controversy, the first major issue to appear before the convention.

The *ab initio* controversy began when Andrew J. Evans of McLennan County introduced a resolution which stated that since the United States government was constituted by the people and their representatives in Washington, rather than by the states, "the constitutional convention of Texas should not recognize or sanction the Ordinance of Secession on March, 1861, or any bills, laws, ordinances, acts, resolutions, or rules that were passed, made or enacted since the passage of the Ordinance."¹⁴ In other words, Evans' proposal called for the nullification of the civil government which existed in Texas during the period of 1861-1866.

Since rejection or approval of the *ab initio* would determine which direction the constitutional convention would take, the delegates took a long time discussing it and were mixed in their reactions toward *ab initio*. Some sided with Evans because they wanted the nullification of laws which granted lucrative railroad charters to a group of former Confederates; others wanted to invalidate land seizures made during the war; still others (blacks) joined Evans because the school fund was attached to *ab initio* and they believed that restoration of the school fund would hasten the organization of public schools. Conversely, many Democrats opposed *ab initio* on principle.

Because of the diverse interests represented at the convention, it soon became apparent to the Republicans that Evans' bill would not pass unless it was altered. Thus, a number of substitute bills were introduced to keep the ideas of *ab initio* alive. After a lengthy discussion, the convention adopted an amendment which stated that the Texas constitution would make valid all legislative enactments and decisions since secession, insofar as they did not interfere with existing federal laws, aid rebellion, or "operate to bring harm to any class of citizens."

That blacks were not satisfied with the amendment became evident when six out of nine - Ruby, Williams, Long, Johnson, Bryant, and Watrous - voted in a losing cause to defeat this measure. Not willing to accept defeat, Ralph Long offered a resolution similar to Evans' one week later, that would declare invalid all obligations incurred by the purchase of slaves or debt payments made with Confederate money and asking to set the statue of limitation ahead to include the war years. This motion was defeated by almost two to one.¹⁵

After the *ab initio* issue was settled, blacks and other delegates turned their attention to other matters. Because blacks had supported West Texans

on *ab initio*, the West Texans came to the aid of blacks in trying to get civil rights clauses inserted into the constitution. When B.F. Williams introduced a resolution to insure that blacks would have equal access to public accommodations, his bill was referred to the committee on General Provisions, a committee which was controlled by a westerner, Morgan Hamilton. Hamilton knew that on its merits Williams' bill would not pass; therefore, he tried to attach it to Section Four of the proposed Bill of Rights of the constitution, which was being drafted and discussed. Section Four, if adopted as originally proposed, would have gone beyond equal protection before the law to equal treatment in the areas of the private sector.

Section Four provoked outrage among most white delegates - Democrats, Conservatives, and Republicans alike — because they viewed this section as an attempt to accord blacks social equality. Thus, barring some form of compromise, this bill was doomed to failure. Because Edmund Davis, a westerner who controlled that bloc, realized that this section would never pass as written, he offered a substitute bill which outlawed racial discrimination but authorized the owners whose facilities were in question to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to secure "comfort, good order, and decency."

In a word, this bill committed the state to civil rights on paper, but not in practice; and at the same time the state took a *laissez-faire* attitude toward the owners. Still, the majority of the delegates refused to pass even this modified proposal. They substituted their own bill which only recognized the "equality of all persons before the law."¹⁶ But all was not lost for blacks; while they failed to get Williams' resolution incorporated into the constitution, they nevertheless secured a political ally in West Texas.

Bills, Resolutions, and Declarations Initiated by Blacks

Contrary to the opinion of Ferdinand Flake, editor of the *Flake's Daily Bulletin*, who asserted that black delegates did not add one constructive idea to the work of the convention, blacks did offer some resolutions, declarations, and bills which showed not only merit and thought, but also their concerns for the people they represented. Thus, early in the first session, and then again in the second session, George T. Ruby offered a declaration that "no one should present any qualified elector of the state from free exercise of the elective franchise by violence or bribery, or by threat of violence."¹⁷

When Ruby moved to suspend the rules to take up discussion on the declaration, his motion was defeated by a vote of eighteen to forty-four. It is interesting to note that only the so-called black radicals — Long, Ruby, Williams, Watrous, and Bryant — voted for this motion. The other blacks, for some unknown reasons, did not feel it necessary to suspend the rules at this time. As a result, this declaration never reached the floor; instead it got lost in the legislative shuffle.

Concomitant with their efforts to achieve suffrage, blacks were also

concerned with the right to hold office. Hence, Watrous presented a resolution to the convention urging that the right to hold office be extended to all men without regard to race, color, or creed. This act was referred to the Committee on Bills of Rights, reported back favorably, and incorporated in Article I, Section 2, of the Constitution.¹⁸

Blacks were not only concerned with the problems of blacks, but also with promoting the general welfare of the state. This idea became evident in resolutions they presented to regulate the practice of medicine and law. For example, B.F. Williams proposed that "no one should be allowed to practice medicine in the state without having first attained a diploma from some medical college or otherwise a certificate from some regular medical board." Williams' resolution called for a penalty of \$500 or five years in jail if one were found in violation of the law.¹⁹

Wiley Johnson drafted a similar resolution with regard to lawyers: "That no person shall be eligible to the office of judge of the Supreme Court, or Criminal Court without being admitted to the bar of Counselor-of-law at the Supreme Court of the state."²⁰

Discussion of marriage laws and reform was also crucial to black delegates. McWashington and Bryant championed the cause in this regard. McWashington first offered a resolution that "all marriages solemnized among free people of color during slavery should be declared legal and binding and that all the children born to that marriage should be declared legitimate."²¹ After no action was taken on this resolution, Bryant of Harris County offered one of his own. His resolution called for making illegitimate black children, or children of slave parents, legitimate with all the legal rights of inheritance upon the marriage of their parents.²² Unlike McWashington's resolution, Bryant's was adopted and was incorporated in Article XII, Section 27, of the constitution. McWashington would not be too easily silenced not discouraged on marriage reform. He later proposed that the personal property of a lady, acquired either before or after marriage, should not come under jurisdiction of her husband.²³

Activities of Blacks in the Second Session of the Convention

It should be noted that the convention delegates were extremely dilatory in drafting a constitution. It was not until after one session of dealing with *ab initio*, listening to resolutions and declarations, and another of discussing the issue of division that the delegates got down to work on drafting the constitution on January 27, 1869. After that date, the convention moved rapidly with each section and each article because various acts and provisions of the constitution had been worked over in committee.

Only the question of suffrage provoked any real discussion. Radicals and black delegates supported a provision that established a system of registration and disfranchisement that would exclude all federal and state officers, ministers, and newspapermen who had favored and openly supported rebellion. But the Conservatives, who managed to get moderate

Republicans on their side, offered a substitute motion that allowed all men to vote except those disqualified by the United States Constitution.²⁴ Rather than accept defeat on this issue, Edmund J. Davis and the Radicals attempted to adjourn the convention instead of finishing its work.

When the convention completed its work on February 6, 1869, only forty-five delegates willingly signed the constitution. Edmund Davis, president of the convention, signed only upon the orders of General E.R. Canby. Other than Davis, there were only two white Radicals, W. Frank Carter and William R. Tyle, and five blacks, Stephen Curtis, Mitchell Kendall, Wiley Johnson, Benjamin O. Watrous, and James McWashington. Other individuals who signed included four conservatives and thirty-four white Republicans who can be classified as moderates.²⁵

The blacks who did not sign objected to the constitution on the grounds that enfranchising ex-rebels might cause them to become strong enough to regain political control of the state, to violate the will of Congress, and to suppress the rights of blacks. Thus, Ruby and Wiley Johnson signed a protest letter saying that "not only the right of loyal blacks and whites are imperiled by this constitution, but that the expressed will of Congress has been ignored."²⁶ In the same vein, B.F. Williams wrote, "I was under the impression that I voted for a substitute that would include the future, not the past; I protest against the past."²⁷ Ralph Long joined in written protest with Edmund Davis, stating that he was opposed to the constitution "except only that part which charges deception and intimidation on the part of its members."²⁸

Unhappy with the constitution largely because it did not disfranchise all ex-rebels, Ruby joined forces with Edmund Davis and Morgan Hamilton of the Radical group in sending a commission to Washington to lobby against acceptance of the document. When Congress turned a deaf ear to their plea, this dissident faction accepted the constitution as a *fait accompli*, and fielded a slate of candidates to be elected at the same time as the constitutional referendum.

Despite the fact the Texas constitution was the least radical of the constitutions drawn up at that time, the delegates to the 1868-1869 convention established a workable structure of government which many authorities regard as the "best constitution" the state has ever had. As for blacks, this document recognized the equality of all persons before the law; proposed that office holding and jury service be open to blacks; and that equal educational opportunities and general civil rights be accorded to the freedmen. The education article provided for the opening of state-supported schools on an equal basis, regardless of color or previous condition of servitude. Despite the convention's leniency on the suffrage section, it granted the right to vote to "every male citizen of the United States of age twenty-one and upward." More importantly, the delegates were able to accomplish their primary goal - to draft a constitution which was ratified by the electorate on November 9, 1869, and which was accepted by Congress.²⁹

After helping to write a constitution which would serve as the organic law of Texas for six years, the black delegates returned to their organizational work in the hinterlands, towns, and cities. They helped prepare the way for themselves as well as for scores of others who were elected to state and local offices under both Republican and Democratic regimes. This constitutional convention not only gave black delegates experience in politics, but the biographical and political profiles of these delegates also provide one with some indication of the make-up of black leadership as well.

If one were to judge future leaders based on the backgrounds of these constitutional delegates, it would be safe to say that the leadership cadre would come from the ranks of the ex-slaves; that the average age would be somewhere in the mid-thirties; and that the majority would not be native-born Texans. Indeed, this seems to have been the norm in Reconstruction and post-Reconstruction legislatures in Texas. Out of a total of forty-one black lawmakers who sat in the legislature between 1868 and 1898, all except five had been slaves, seventeen were mulattoes, and only five were native Texans. Moreover, the majority of them served for only one term in the legislature. The same analogy holds true for the majority of these black delegates. The larger percentage of them did not run for the legislature in 1869. As a matter of fact, most of them did not seek public office after they left the convention. However, it was their hope that the constitution that they helped to draft would be implemented with the help of black lawmakers in the Reconstruction Legislature.

NOTES

¹Randall Woods, "George T. Ruby: A Black Militant in the White Business Community," *Red River Valley Historical Review*, I (1974), 269-280; Barry Crouch "Self Determination and Local Black Leaders in Texas," *Phylon*, XXXIX (December, 1978), 344-355; J. Mason Brewer, *Negro Legislators and Their Descendants* (Dallas, 1935), 20, 27, 47-48, 115, 125.

²G.T. Ruby to Charles Garreston (Acting Adjutant General), September 14, October 17, 1867, Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands, Record Group 05 (National Archives, Washington, D.C.); *Austin Daily State Journal*, October 13, 1870; *Weekly Austin Republican* August 29, 1868 July 18, 1869; James M. Smallwood, *Time of Hope and Time of Despair: Black Texans During Reconstruction* (Port Washington, New York, 1981), 71, 91, 108, 138-141, 146-148.

³Carl H. Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Reconstruction Texas*, (Austin, 1980), 242; *Weekly Austin Republican*, April 24, July 18, 1868; Harrell T. Budd, "The Negro in Politics in Texas 1867-1898" (M.A. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1925), 18.

⁴Brewer, *Negro Legislators of Texas*, 20, 23-24, 28, 115, 125; *Houston Telegraph*, February 16, 17, 18, 1866; *Flake's Daily Bulletin*, February 16, 17, 18, 1868; *U.S. Congress, Senate Document 40th Congress*, 2nd Sess. No. 53 (Serial 1317); Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Reconstruction Texas*, 79.

⁵Brewer, *Negro Legislators of Texas*, 20, 24, 47, 49, 53; *Houston, Union*, July 6, 1870; *Austin Daily State Journal*, August 17, October 13, 1870; Clarence Wharton, *History of Fort Bend County* (San Antonio, Naylor Co., 1939), 187. See also B.F. Williams, "Circular of the Union League," James P. Newcomb Papers, Eugene Barker History Center,

University of Texas at Austin; B.F. Williams to J.P. Newcomb, July 17, August 28, 1869, July 24, 1870, Newcomb Papers.

⁶*Texas Legislature, House Journal of the 12th Legislature*, 1st Sess. (Austin, 1870), 1482.

⁷*New National Era* (Washington D.C.), June 16, 1870; Central Texas Genealogical Society, McLennan County, Texas, Cemetery Records, I (2 vols.; Waco, 1865), 87; Betty J. Sandlin, "The Texas Reconstruction Convention 1865-1869," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1970), 51.

⁸Budd, "The Negro in Politics in Texas," 18; *The Weekly Austin Republican*, April 29, July 18, 1868; Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Reconstruction Texas*, 246.

⁹Sandlin, "The Texas Reconstruction Convention," 231; Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Texas*, 241; *Austin Weekly Republican*, April 24, July 16, 1868.

¹⁰Ray A. Walter, *History of Limestone County*, Austin, (1959), 56-58; Sandlin, "The Texas Reconstruction Convention," 278; Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Texas*, 242; *Grosbeck New Era*, July 29, 1876.

¹¹Budd, "The Negro in Politics in Texas," 19; Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Texas*, 238; *Weekly Austin Republican*, April 29, June 18, 1868.

¹²Budd, "The Negro in Politics in Texas," 19; Brewer, *Negro Legislators of Texas*, 24, 125; Sandlin, "The Texas Reconstruction Convention," 213; Moneyhon, *Republicanism in Texas*, 242.

¹³*Journal of the Reconstruction Convention of 1868-1869*, I (2 Vols.; Austin, 1870), 12-17, 235, 696-697; *Galveston Daily News*, April 26, September 8, December 21, 1867; June 16, August 22, 1868; *Flake's Evening Bulletin*, April 22, May 6, 14, July 5, December 22, 1867; *Weekly Freeman's Press*, July 20, 1868, clipping in the E.J. Davis biographical file, Barker History Center.

¹⁴*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 28, 275; Moneyhon, *Republican in Texas*, 86-87.

¹⁵*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 794, 797, 921-922.

¹⁶*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 235, 696-698; see also Article XII, Section 21 of the Constitution of 1868.

¹⁷*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 510-511.

¹⁸*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 308, 488; *Constitution of 1869*, Article I, Section 2.

¹⁹*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 90.

²⁰*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, 247; See also Article XII, Section 3 or Constitution of 1869.

²¹*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 267.

²²*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 416; See also Article XII, Section 27, Constitution of 1869.

²³*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, I, 456; See also Article XII, Section 14, Constitution of 1869.

²⁴*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 518-59; 527-529, *Galveston Daily New*, February 14, 1869, Weekly; *Austin Republican*, January 23, 1869.

²⁵Sandlin, "Texas Reconstruction Convention," 213. Bryant did not cast a vote on the constitution because he had been expelled. However, given his record, it is logical to assume that had he remained in the convention, he would have sided with the "Radicals." Mullins, for some unknown reason, abstained from voting.

²⁶*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 520.

²⁷*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 520.

²⁸*Journal of Reconstruction Convention*, II, 520.

²⁹See *Texas Constitution 1869*.