

WHITENESS AND CIVILITY:
WHITE RACIAL ATTITUDES IN THE CONCHO VALLEY, 1869-1930

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies of
Angelo State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
MASTER OF ARTS

by
MATTHEW SCOTT JOHNSTON

August 2015

Major: History

WHITENESS AND CIVILITY:
WHITE RACIAL ATTITUDES IN THE CONCHO VALLEY, 1869-1930

by
MATTHEW SCOTT JOHNSTON

APPROVED:

Dr. Jason Pierce, Ph. D.

Dr. Kenneth Heinemann, Ph. D.

Dr. Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai, Ph.D.

Dr. Cheryl Stenmark, Ph.D

August 2015

APPROVED:

Dr. Susan E. Keith
Dean of the College of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

Implicit in the ideology of White Supremacy is the idea of moral supremacy over non-white peoples. However, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century whites consistently crossed the blurry, racialized line that defined them by *what they were not*. In the west-central Texas region of the Concho Valley, breaching law and order and social mores condemned some whites to lose degrees of whiteness in the eyes of their peers. Some whites appeared hypocritical in their rebuke of racial terrorism. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century many white West Texans became guilty of the very lawless and violent attributes they generally applied to those of a different skin color, thus exposing the schizophrenic and ambiguous nature of the notion of white supremacy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER	
I. AFTER JUNTEENTH: RACE AND WHITE SUPREMACY IN POSTBELLUM TEXAS.....	7
II. WHITE SUPREMACY IN THE CONCHO COUNTRY, 1867-1900.....	18
III. LAW AND ORDER AND THE PERCEIVED THREAT TO WHITE SUPREMACY, 1900-1920.....	42
IV. VIOLENCE AND RHETORIC IN THE TURBULENT 1920s.....	58
V. THE DAUGHTERS OF THE LOST CAUSE AND WHITENESS.....	69
CONCLUSION.....	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	83

INTRODUCTION

As historian Barbara J. Fields has aptly observed, “Ideologies are the eyes through which people see social reality, the form in which they experience it in their own consciousness.”¹ Revealing the constructed nature of “race” many whites in the Concho Valley region of west-central Texas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century viewed their social reality through the ideology of white supremacy. This ideology took the form of a racialized rhetoric that reinforced the color line. This line existed as an abstract concept, subject to mutability in practice. This color line, when crossed by whites, could render the transgressor as theoretically less white.

Simply dismissing the perspectives that many whites had toward those of a different color as “racism,” or as “a product of the time,” denies the glaring schizophrenic² or contradictory nature of whiteness and white supremacy. The ideology of white supremacy claimed the superiority of whites was divinely ordained. As the term suggests, the social, political, and economic supremacy of a “white” skin tone seemed to demand absoluteness in theory and in practice. However, the ambiguous status of “white,” as demonstrated by scholars such as Barbara Fields, David Roediger, Noel Ignatiev, and Matt Wray, exposes the

¹ Barbara J. Fields, “Ideology and Race in American History,” in *Region, Race and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, eds. J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 161.

² For the purposes of this analysis, *schizophrenic* will be defined by the general usage of the term as defined by the *New Oxford American Dictionary*: “A mentality or approach characterized by inconsistent or contradictory elements. Angus Stevenson and Christine A. Lindberg, eds., *New Oxford American Dictionary*, Third Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

arbitrariness of the concept of whiteness itself.³ Whiteness can also be understood as a set of moral characteristics within white supremacist ideology believed by whites to be held in common by mere possession of white skin. Inherent within the notion of whiteness lay the idea of the civilized white man as an adherent to law and order, and who thus stood in contrast to nonwhites as immoral, uncivilized, savage, and criminal. However, one could lose degrees of whiteness through acts unbecoming a white person, or even by living with non-whites.

Upon closer examination, one can see the cracks in the façade of white supremacist ideology. I intend to examine these cracks and analyze white racial “attitudes” toward non-white peoples in the Concho Valley of West Texas. For the purpose of this thesis, the term “non-white” includes African Americans, Mexican Americans as well as Anglos who, in the eyes of some fellow Texans, had lost degrees of whiteness.

This analysis will encompass the period from 1869 to 1930. Beginning with the garrison of African American troops at Fort Concho this thesis traces how white West Texans in the Concho Valley displayed their disdain for nonwhites through rhetoric and, at times, violence that seemed to betray white supremacist ideology of law and order, and called into question the notion of whiteness. This study attempts to analyze the attitudes of white West Texans regarding people with a darker skin pigment, as well as those Anglo Texans who seemed at times to be less-than-civilized, and thus, *not quite* white. Overall, this thesis

³ Fields, “Ideology and Race in American History,” 161; Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); David Roediger *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991); Matt Wray, *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006). For a brief but informative survey of whiteness studies, see Peter Kolchin, “Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America,” *Journal of American History* 89, no. 1 (June 2002): 154-173.

argues that many white West Texans became guilty of the very lawless and violent attributes they generally applied to those of a different skin color, thus exposing the schizophrenic and ambiguous nature of the notion of white supremacy. In essence, they became not only less than white, but, at times, inhuman.

White racial ideology had evolved since the antebellum era.⁴ With the humiliation of defeat in the Civil War and the emancipation of slaves and the degradation of the imputed “negro rule” of Reconstruction, many white Southerners sought redemption for the apparent attack on their social, economic, and political supremacy. The mythology of the Lost Cause of the Confederacy argued that the chivalric and noble South fought against insurmountable odds to defend the northern attack on the constitutionality of Southern society and states’ rights and, thus, white supremacy. The Lost Cause, championed by Confederate remembrance groups like the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), attempted to counter the perceived blow to the supremacy of those possessing a white skin. As Caroline Janney has argued, the UDC, as the “self-appointed guardians of southern and Confederate history,” promoted a narrative that portrayed antebellum southern society as racially harmonious with benevolent masters and faithful slaves, taking part in God’s plan for humanity.⁵ Some in the Concho Valley believed that the purest white race could be found in the former Confederate states and that whites in the north-eastern part of the country had

⁴ George M. Fredrickson, *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); Joel Williamson, *A Rage for Disorder: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974).

⁵ Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Pass: Ladies’ Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 171.

mixed with a lower caste of white, somehow making them less white, and thus exposing the ambiguity of whiteness.

The Concho Valley provides an interesting setting for this kind analysis. The area known as the Concho Valley is situated in west-central Texas, taking its name from the Concho River that flows through the area. Unlike east Texas with its older establishments and history of slavery, settlement of the Concho Country by whites began after the Civil War. Many settlers looking for new beginnings after the war made their way out onto the west Texas frontier. This study will focus on Tom Green, Runnels, Coke, and Reagan counties in that area. The region played host to African American federal troops at Fort Concho in the 1870s and 1880s, providing protection for settlers pushing onto lands inhabited by Native Americans. Many of those immigrating to West Texas came from the former Confederate states and carried with them a racial ideology rooted in the Antebellum South. Many white West Texans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century believed, as white men, the region belonged to them. In first quarter of the twentieth century many whites in the Concho country reflected racial notions about themselves and nonwhites.

Within the historiography of race-relations, whiteness scholarship over the past twenty years has garnered a great deal of consideration as a useful tool through the engaging works by scholars like David Roediger, Theodore W. Allen, Grace Elizabeth Hale, and Nell Irvin Painter. Although a few regions of Texas have received attention by some historians using whiteness as a category of analysis, most notably Neil Foley, Michael Phillips, and

Cynthia Skove Nevels, West Texas, including the Concho Valley, remains unexamined.⁶

Building on the argument that race is a social, cultural, and ideological construct, scholars using whiteness as a category have explored the historical processes by which European Americans came to identify themselves as white. Within this ideology of white supremacy, these historians argue, possession of white skin implied a privileged status in American society that, for many whites provided a justification for racial oppression.⁷ For whiteness historians, whites constructed an identity by defining themselves as what they were not: non-white. This thesis fills in the gap in Concho Valley scholarship by examining how the ideology of white supremacy and the volatility of whiteness helped to shape the settlement of the region.

The opening chapter examines Texas in the aftermath of the Civil War and how the new status of African Americans and repudiation of antebellum southern society galvanized racial ideologies. Chapter Two looks at the founding of San Angelo around servicing Fort Concho and its contingent of African American soldiers. Racial tensions gave rise to violent outbursts by white residents and African Americans highlighting subtle changes in ideas of race. The third chapter delves into how some white Concho Valley residents responded to perceived threats to white supremacy in the early twentieth century. At times these reactions

⁶ Neil Foley, *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Cynthia Skove Nevels, *Lynching to Belong: Claiming Whiteness Through Racial Violence* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007); Michael Phillips, *White Metropolis: Race, Ethnicity, and Religion in Dallas, 1841-2001* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006). For a survey of the historiography of race in Texas, see Michael Phillips, "Why is Big Tex Still a White Cowboy?: Race, Gender and the 'Other Texans,'" in *Beyond Texas Through Time: Breaking Away from Past Interpretations*, eds. Walter L. Buenger and Arnolde De León (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2011), 125-178.

⁷ Grace Elizabeth Hale, *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940* (New York: Vintage Books, 1998); Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*; Kolchin, "Whiteness Studies;" Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness*.

seemed to betray the white ideal of law and order exposing the contradictory nature of whiteness. Chapter Four analyzes the racial violence of the 1920s and how some towns in the Concho country displayed a certain disconnect between the rhetoric of law and order and racial violence in the name of white supremacy. The final chapter examines the San Angelo chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and its ideas of race revealing the ambiguous nature of whiteness and how some whites could be whiter than others

The examination of racial perceptions of white West Texans in the Concho Valley has been understudied if not ignored all together. Many in the Concho Valley region shared a Southern past in a uniquely West Texan frontier setting that included white frontierspeople, Plains Indians, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, and African Americans.⁸ As race relations in the United States became more rigid in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, many white West Texans in the Concho Valley echoed the racial ideology of white supremacy. Through racialized rhetoric and violence many in the region exposed the schizophrenic nature and the ambiguity of the notion of whiteness at the heart of white supremacist reasoning. The exploration of the topic within the context of the Concho Valley could further understanding of how the idea of race is constructed and deconstructed throughout history.

⁸ Ty Cashion, "What's the Matter with Texas?: The Great Enigma of the Lone Star State in the American West," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 55, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 2-15.

CHAPTER I

AFTER JUNETEENTH: RACE AND WHITE SUPREMACY IN POSTBELLUM TEXAS

In the immediate aftermath of the Civil War, many white Texans, unsure of the future, hoped the national government would uphold the old slave system, believing the Emancipation Proclamation to be a wartime measure. By 1860, 182,566 slaves were held by 21,878 slaveholders in Texas.¹ However, when emancipation came to Texas in 1865, former slaveholders' resistance to the new status conferred on African Americans augmented the deeply rooted racial prejudices used to justify an antebellum southern culture that been supported by chattel slavery. As historian John Hope Franklin noted, "The attachment of white Southerners to their way of life was as strong as ever, and they were determined to preserve it."² Resentment developed over conflicts between federal authorities and former masters over the status of African Americans that buttressed Confederate sentiment and galvanized racial ideologies.

At Galveston on June 19, 1865, Major General Gordon Granger delivered the Emancipation Proclamation. White planters had been dreading this moment since the Confederate surrender at Appomattox two months earlier. Some, believing the proclamation to be unconstitutional, held on to the hope that slavery would remain as their primary source

¹ Alwyn Barr, *Black Texans: A History of African Americans in Texas, 1528-1995* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 17.

² John Hope Franklin, *Reconstruction: After the Civil War* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 4-5.

of labor.³ In the minds of many white Texans the Emancipation Proclamation could not supersede the United States Constitution which, they believed, still protected slavery. “Every sensible, well informed man in the country knows,” the Marshall *Texas Republican* stated in June of 1865, “that neither the President of the United States, nor all the different departments of the U.S. government acting in concurrence, possess the constitutional power” to abolish slavery. The ratification of an amendment abolishing slavery, the editor of the *Texas Republican* believed, was not likely to occur “in ten or perhaps twenty years.”⁴ Even after the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment in 1865 some planters held their slaves for years. Freedom did not come for the slaves of one Texas planter until 1868.⁵

While slavery finally died, traditional Southern views of African Americans proved harder to dislodge. Many whites considered slavery to be the normal and proper condition for African Americans. Some believed that without the institution of slavery in place African Americans would fall into vice, vagrancy, and idleness, reverting to a “natural barbaric” state. Many believed that the freedpeople of the state would not work except under the compulsion of the lash. A Galveston newspaper editor believed that the former slave would not labor to feed themselves or their children, stating, “He would rather steal, lie and loaf for a living.” The editor went on to suggest that African Americans would simply die off: “The extinction of slavery is simply the extinction of the negro race.”⁶ Speaking to the Congressional Joint Committee on Reconstruction in 1866, Texan Caleb G. Forshey echoed

³ James Smallwood, *Time of Hope, Time of Despair: Black Texans During Reconstruction* (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1981), 31.

⁴ *Marshall Texas Republican*, Marshall, Texas, June 23, 1865.

⁵ Smallwood, *Time of Hope*, 34.

⁶ *Galveston Weekly News*, Galveston, Texas, June 21, 1865.

this sentiment by explaining that “the Negro will not take care of his offspring unless required to do it. The little children will die; they do die,” if not under the care of white masters. Forshey reflected the paternalistic mindset that some white Texans possessed. Forshey further suggested that without the implementation of moral discipline by whites African Americans would not flourish: “For the sake of procreation, if nothing else, we compel men to live with their wives.”⁷

Many white Texans believed that the emancipation of African Americans threatened the traditional system of labor as well as the fundamental principle of white supremacy, a critical aspect of Southern culture.⁸ Free labor of African Americans ran contrary to the widely held racial ideology of most Southerners. Emancipation implied equality of the “races.” Racism, as an ideological, socio-economic tool, shaped antebellum Southern society. Justifications for African American slavery were based on the idea of white “racial” superiority, and the need of the Southern plantation bourgeoisie to control poor whites in the wake of Bacon’s Rebellion in 1676.⁹ However, white supremacist ideology evolved over time and became entrenched in many Southerners’ minds. Therefore, freedom for African Americans challenged the legitimacy of a society for which hundreds of thousands of Southerners died defending in the late war of “Northern aggression.” As James L. Roark has argued, many Southerners “could not reject or even compromise their central myths, for to do

⁷ Hans L. Trefousse, ed., *Background for Radical Reconstruction* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970), 26.

⁸ James L. Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1977), 107.

⁹ Theodore Allen, *The Invention of the White Race: Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control* (London: Verso, 2002), 14, 17; Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975), 328, 331, 386.

so would mean condemning a whole culture as a lie.”¹⁰ Emancipation forced the idea of the humanization of African Americans on white Texans, most of whom were unwilling to accept such a contradiction to their perception of reality regarding the idea of “race.”

Antebellum Texas society circumscribed African Americans’ station in service of the white “race.” Those defending slavery in Texas saw the legitimacy of the institution as based on the natural order that God had intended. Most defenders believed that from biblical times, blacks had been cursed as servile and had proven themselves inferior as a people. Many believed African Americans’ “natural” state of servitude had been divinely ordained.¹¹ Proponents of slavery believed that the institution benefited African Americans. Paternalism motivated some white masters as they felt duty bound to civilize and Christianize slaves and make them useful members of society.¹² Some masters believed that they played an important role in the Almighty’s plan for humanity. And anyone who interfered with this divine mission went against God.

A Declaration of the Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union adopted by the Texas secessionist convention, February 2, 1861, exemplified this sentiment. The secession committee stated that those in opposition to the South’s “beneficent and patriarchal system of African slavery, proclaiming the debasing doctrine of the equality of all men, irrespective of race or color – a doctrine at war with nature,” violated “the plainest revelations of the Divine Law.” Accordingly, white Texans “rightfully held”

¹⁰ Roark., 107.

¹¹ Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 212.

¹² Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 5-7.

African Americans and regarded them as “an inferior and dependent race.” The existence of slavery “is mutually beneficial to both” races, “justified by the experience of mankind, and the revealed will of the Almighty Creator.” Further, the committee argued, slavery protected the “equal civil and political rights” of white Texas males. Believing the “peculiar institution” in Texas under attack and that this would somehow undermine the equality enjoyed by white Texans the committee resolved to detach itself from the Union. In order to perpetuate slavery, Texans voted in favor of secession, 46,129 to 14,697.¹³

In accordance with the committee, in March, 1861, the editor of the *Austin State Gazette* argued the moral correctness of slavery and its necessity for the equality of white Texans:

But it is not alone as an element of property that slavery assumes its highest relations but as a social and political institution. It is the ark in which the noblest aspirations of the white race and the covenant of our liberty have embarked. It is the guaranty of the equality of white men among themselves and of their supremacy over the negro race. It saves the poor white man from the degradation of negro equality, and from the infamy of menial service. It removes the artificial distinctions which wealth arrogates to itself, and relieves poverty of the wretched livery of humiliation and servitude. There is no country in the world where there is as much social and political equality among citizens, as in the slave States of America. That is the crowning glory of our institutions.¹⁴

¹³ Dale Baum, *The Shattering of Texas Unionism: Politics in the Lone Star State During the Civil War Era* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998), 42; Secession Convention of Texas, February 2, 1861, *A Declaration of the Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union*, Texas State Library and Archives Commission, accessed July 26, 2015, <http://www.tsl.state.tx.us/ref/abouttx/secession/2feb1861.html>.

¹⁴ *Austin State Gazette*, Austin, Texas, March 16, 1861.

For many white Texans, the realization of equality necessitated the subjugation of African Americans. However, the idea of “equality” seems to refer more to the idea of “white” equality. Certainly the differing socioeconomic levels at which white Texans lived and the corresponding relative political power that came with it could not be construed as “equality.” In this example, the editor of the *State Gazette* alluded to the idea of white “racial” cohesion. The rich white planter and the poor white laborer could at least claim a commonality with regard to phenotype. The editor also implied the racial division of labor. White men should not have to resort to “menial service” jobs reserved for non-whites, the author argued. This argument resembled Senator James Henry Hammond’s famous “mud-sill” speech in defense of the antebellum Southern social structure supported by slavery.

In 1856, Hammond argued, “In all social systems there must be a class to do the menial duties, to perform the drudgery of life.” The “class” of laborers Hammond spoke of possessed low intelligence, little skill, and ample docility. If this caste did not exist, Hammond believed that “you would not have that other class that leads progress, civilization, and refinement.” The foundation of any nation must be built upon this “mudsill.” For Hammond’s South, “she found a race adapted to that purpose . . . A race inferior to her own . . . to answer all her purposes. We use them for our purposes and call them slaves.” “We found slaves by the ‘common consent of mankind,’ which,” he argued, is “the highest proof of what is Nature’s law.” As a result, the institution of slavery protected Southern whites from degradation and destitution. Hammond believed he saw proof of this on the city streets of the North, where whites worked “menial” low paying jobs, becoming beggars as a result.

“We do not think whites should be slaves either by law or necessity.”¹⁵ For many antebellum white Texans, the racial social structure was under attack and required a defense of arms. However, the South failed to gain its independence or thwart the abolition of slavery.

Many white Texans reacted violently when the institution of chattel slavery dissolved. Although many former masters acquiesced in freeing their bondspeople, some refused to acknowledge the drastic challenge to their antebellum heritage. Accounts surfaced of violence against African Americans whose only crime seems to have been leaving their former master. Former masters confined, beat, and killed former slaves as they attempted to assert their newly acquired freedom.¹⁶ Violent whites also victimized African American children, subjecting them to whippings, beatings, castration, and murder. Newspapers relayed tales of violence, painting bloody scenes.¹⁷ Between 1865 and 1866, five-hundred white Texans were indicted for the murder of African Americans. None were convicted.¹⁸ T.J. Mackey stated to a Congressional committee in 1865, that freedmen “are very far from being secure” from “the prejudices and feelings of the people.”¹⁹ Whether driven by the frustration of defeat in a devastating civil war, or to the challenge to the traditional

¹⁵ “Speech of Hon. James H. Hammond of South Carolina, on the Admission of Kansas under the Lacompton Constitution, delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 4, 1856.” (Washington: Lemuel Towers, 1858), 13-15, accessed September 19, 2012, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/loc.ark:/13960/t7jq19w4m>.

¹⁶ Barry A. Crouch, *The Dance of Freedom: Texas African Americans During Reconstruction* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), 103.

¹⁷ Smallwood, *Time of Hope*, 32-34.

¹⁸ Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 204.

¹⁹ Trefousse, *Background for Radical Reconstruction*, 20-21.

antebellum Southern social order, white Texans lashed out.²⁰ When asked about the feeling of the people of Texas in regard to the “late rebellion,” Caleb G. Forshey told a Congressional committee in 1866, “the feeling was that of any party who had been cast in a suit he had staked all upon,” and that these feelings were very much alive.²¹

The loss of the traditional control over their workforce that had also defined the social system of white Southerners meant that relations between whites and blacks had to be redrawn. The paternalistic system that most slaveholders lauded within their defense of slavery began to shift under the new contract labor paradigm. The new paradigm required freedpeople to enter into contract work, sometimes with their former masters.²² A writer to the *Galveston Weekly News* in the fall of 1865 still showed the paternalistic mindset of some former slaveholding Texans. The writer believed that the Southerner was duty-bound to help the freedpeople for a mutual benefit within society under the new free labor system. The author opined, “they need us much worse than we need them.”²³ Caleb G. Forshey believed that “freedom is very unfortunate for the Negro . . . his present helpless condition touches my heart more than anything else I ever contemplated and I think that is the common sentiment of our slaveholders.”²⁴

State officials instituted a replacement system of control over African Americans. And in the fall of 1866, the Eleventh Legislature enacted a series of laws dealing with the

²⁰ Crouch, *The Dance of Freedom*, 101.

²¹ Trefousse, *Background for Radical Reconstruction*, 121.

²² Barr, *Black Texans*, 54-56.

²³ *Galveston Weekly News*, Galveston, Texas, November 15, 1865.

²⁴ Trefousse, *Background for Radical Reconstruction*, 26.

issue of the former slaves in the state.²⁵ Between October 27, and November 8, the Texas House passed white supremacist legislation in order to control African Americans and reassert themselves as masters. Implementing statutes regulating vagrancy, apprenticeship, and employment enticement, African American Texans found themselves under a new brand of oppression.²⁶ The Eleventh Legislature also included a forerunner to later Jim Crow legislation. In chapter CII, Section 1 of the *General Laws*, under the title “An Act Requiring Railroad Companies to Provide Convenient Accommodations for Freedmen,” Texas lawmakers decreed that “every Railroad Company heretofore incorporated, or which may hereafter be incorporated, by the Legislature of this State, shall be required to attach to each passenger train run by said Company, one car for the special accommodation of Freedmen.”²⁷ The so-called Black Codes of 1866 provided white Texans with legal justification for controlling the state’s African American population.

Emancipation threatened a culture defined by slavery and the perceived superiority of whites. In the years immediately following the Civil War, white Texans attempted to maintain their perceived divinely superior status through a system of what may be called legal slavery. In 1866, the Texas constitutional convention refused to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment establishing equal protection under the law for all. Many white Texans perceived the amendment as a denigration of Southern identity. Accepting such an idea

²⁵ Barr, *Black Texans*, 56; Crouch, *Dance of Freedom*, 134-158; Smallwood, *Time of Hope*, 54-59; Texas House Journal, Eleventh Legislature, 1886.

²⁶ Crouch, *The Dance of Freedom*, 145; Foner, *Reconstruction*, 201; Carl H. Moneyhon, “Black Codes,” *Handbook of Texas Online*, accessed September 09, 2012, (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/jsb01>).

²⁷ Hans Peter Marcus Neilsen Gammel, *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897 Volume 5, Book, 1898*, accessed September 7, 2012, <http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph6727/>

would be to acknowledge their entire culture as a lie. In 1910, historian Charles William Ramsdell shrewdly suggested that “the rejection of the Fourteenth Amendment may be ascribed to a higher motive, the desire to maintain at any cost the fundamentals of their political philosophy, the cherished institutions which alone in their eyes made for free government.” For white Texans in 1866, and perhaps for Ramsdell as well, the Fourteenth Amendment “clearly intended to deprive the states of certain rights and powers over their citizens” and would endanger the liberties of the people as it would “degrade the governments and social institutions of the Southern states by enforcing wholesale negro suffrage.”²⁸

With the change in status of African Americans, came changes in the social and ideological structures of the South. Proslavery ideology argued that enslavement of blacks by a benevolent planter class, morally bound to care for a “subhuman race” that provided labor in the reciprocal relationship of paternalism, guaranteed white liberty and freedom within the white Southern class structure. However, as freedom seemed to legally recognize the humanity of African Americans, ideas of “race” and white supremacy slowly changed. Where would the color-line be drawn with regard to labor? If slavery had saved the “white man” from the drudgery of menial labor, which in turn provided the conditions necessary to realize equality between white men, what did the future hold for white Texans?

Many white Texans resented such a repudiation of their cherished heritage. In 1866, Texas Unionist, John T. Allen told a congressional committee, that a year after the war, most Texans’ opinions “have not had time to change. The changing of one’s opinions is not

²⁸ Charles William Ramsdell, *Reconstruction in Texas* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1964), 118-119.

within a man's powers. It takes time and circumstances to alter and modify them. They cannot change and throw off their opinions as they would a garment."²⁹ Racial ideologies began to evolve as Texans were confronted with the changed legal status of African Americans. White Texans adapted their racial ideology to their new reality on the western frontier.

²⁹ Trefousse, *Background for Radical Reconstruction*, 105.

CHAPTER II

WHITE SUPREMACY IN THE CONCHO COUNTRY, 1867-1900

In 1910, San Angelo hosted the annual Settlers' Day parade to celebrate the region's history. Watching the procession from the sidelines stood John W. Long, aged veteran of the Civil War and the Texas Rangers. To a writer for the San Angelo *Standard*, Long was "in every sense one of the fathers of Texas." Published in the local paper under the heading "He Fought for a White Man's Country" the writer recounted the "heroic" exploits of this well respected man. Long bluntly stated, "I fought for years with the rangers and pioneers to make this a white man's country and fought four years to keep the nigger from being as good as a white man." Acknowledging defeat in the Civil War, Long, however, was able to "glory in the knowledge that West Texas is and will always be what we fought for and what the Lord intended it to be – a white man's country."¹ Long, like many white West Texans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, perceived reality through a veil of white supremacy. However, African American federal troops played an important role in the settling of West Texas. Whites seemed ambivalent, at best, with regard to the presence of non-whites. West Texas proved to be contested ground and eruptions of violence highlighted racial tensions and revealed implications of change in ideas of race.

In the late 1860s white settlers began pushing further west. Seeking new opportunities, many came from former Confederate states. Demand grew for protection

¹ "He Fought for a White Man's Country," *San Angelo Standard*, San Angelo, Texas, October 5, 1910.

from, and displacement of, the Native Americans residing in the region. Among the federal troop assigned to the region, African American soldiers helped to secure the area for land-hungry white settlers.² The post that would become known as Fort Concho, in central west Texas, established in December, 1867, would serve as the regimental headquarters for the African American Tenth United States Cavalry, also known as the Buffalo Soldiers, from 1875-1882. Sprouting up across the Concho River from the fort, a town called San Angelo would play host to dramatic events that revealed the ever changing idea of race.³

A few sources remain from the early days of Fort Concho that enable a view into the racial beliefs of the occupants of that post. Post surgeon, Captain William M. Notson did leave a detailed account of his time at the fort, from 1869 to 1872. Dr. Notson hailed from Philadelphia, served in the Union Army, and was wounded at Gettysburg.⁴ Like many whites in the late nineteenth century, Notson expressed commonly held racial perceptions when writing about his experiences with African American soldiers at the fort.

For the post surgeon, the addition of African-American soldiers to the garrison would be an interesting “ethnological as well as a military experiment.”⁵ However, upon his first encounter with the African-American soldiers of the fort, Notson begrudgingly placed their

² Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820-1875* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005)

³ Gus Clemens, *The Concho Country: A History of the Concho River Region of West Texas* (San Antonio: Mulberry Avenue Books, 1980), 59-81; Wayne Daniel and Carol Schmidt, "FORT CONCHO," *Handbook of Texas Online* (<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qbfl1>), accessed September 10, 2012. Published by the Texas State Historical Association; Bruce A. Glasrud, Paul H. Carlson, and Tai D. Kreidler, eds., *Slavery to Integration: Black Americans in West Texas* (Abilene: State House Press, 2007); Bill Green, *The Dancing was Lively, Fort Concho, Texas: A Social History, 1867 to 1882* (San Angelo, Texas: Fort Concho Sketches Publishing Company, 1974).

⁴ William M. Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History: January, 1869 to July, 1872* (San Angelo, Texas: Fort Concho Preservation and Museum, 1974), 3.

⁵ Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History*, 16.

performance above that of the white troops: “The drill of the new troops, colored, is in both the manual and maneuver decidedly superior.” “The negro is essentially a mimic,” Notson noted condescendingly, “therefore in the manual they excel their white brethren, and even compete favorably with them in combinations and evolutions.”⁶ A few months later, however, Notson seemed to retract his accolade. “The impracticability of making intelligent soldiers out of the mass of negroes, is growing more evident to the Post Surgeon everyday, and his opinion is concurred in by their own officers.”⁷ For Notson, African American soldiers did not make good soldiers as “they are not as reliable” and were unable to properly interpret instruction.⁸

Notson also painted a stereotyped portrait of the troops’ deficiencies. “[L]ying and thieving are their principle vices,” Notson opined.⁹ Assigning lazy and leisurely qualities to the African American soldiers, the post surgeon stated that “they hunt less and fish less” than the white troops. Interestingly, a post chaplain in 1873 found the “moral condition” of the African-American troops to be “encouraging.” The chaplain asserted that there was “among them less drinking, less profanity, and a better attendance on religious services than I have heretofore observed.”¹⁰

Notson afforded flattery to the African American soldiers on the subject of musicianship. The post surgeon conceded, “music they excel in, and of course the calls are

⁶ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Quoted in: Green, *The Dancing was Lively*, 58.

well sounded, though sometimes sacrificing the military exactness to sweetness of execution.”¹¹ He continued, “At every permissible hour during the day, music from all sorts of instruments may be heard from their quarters. Some of them have most extraordinary talent as musicians, of course uncultivated.”¹²

Notson provides an echo of the white racial perceptions of those stationed with the Buffalo Soldiers. Historian Bill Green described attitudes toward African American soldiers at Fort Concho as “extreme.” Those whites stationed at Fort Concho viewed African American soldiers as, either courageous and brave or “worthless.” Regardless, whites on the West Texas frontier, Southern or Northern in origin, resented the presence of African American soldiers.¹³ Near the end of his time at Fort Concho in 1872, Notson recorded his opinion regarding the fort’s residents: “In the experience of the Post Surgeon, mixing of garrison has not tended to promote harmony between either the officers or men.”¹⁴ In February, 1870, Notson recorded an effort to establish a village on the North side of the river near the Fort.¹⁵

Since its modest beginning San Angelo seemed to attract a less-than-civilized group. Murders often occurred in the frontier town. Dance halls, saloons, and brothels sprang up to cater to soldier and civilian, cowboy and buffalo hunter alike. Colonel Grierson observed,

¹¹ Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History*, 11.

¹² *Ibid.*, 14.

¹³ Green, *The Dancing was Lively*, 56.

¹⁴ Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History*, 53.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

“Everything in the place is a whiskey shop or something worse.”¹⁶ Notson spoke of the uncivilized nature of the population of the town. In November, 1871, he relayed the story of a man shot four times for calling another a “louse,” his discarded body found outside of town. Notson observed, “St. Angela, the village accross [sic] the North Concho river, is attaining an unenviable distinction, from the numerous murders committed there.”¹⁷ One resident noted that “we hear of a soldier being killed, shot or stabbed without any cause whatever.”¹⁸ Traveling through West Texas in 1877, Nathaniel Taylor said of the people he encountered in San Angelo, “I could not help but think that if this folk should all go to the devil together, that worthy would be ashamed of his guests and slam the door in their faces.”¹⁹ In 1878, Dr. S. L. S. Smith, said in a letter to his sister, “This part of Texas is almost devoid of law.” The town “is full of human sharks . . . There are so many gamblers, cut-throats, murders, horse thieves living and finding harbor at San Angela it is never considered safe to pass through there at night, and no officer even thinks of leaving the garrison after dark.” A local “sheepman” described “San Angela” as “overrun with drink saloons, gambling dens and dance houses of the very lowest class. It is the most immoral town I ever was in.”²⁰

Moral judgments tempered with racialized tones as to the cause of vice “across the river” further enhanced the young town’s reputation. A visitor to the region, Nathaniel

¹⁶ Quoted in Green, *The Dancing was Lively*, 62.

¹⁷ Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History*, 50.

¹⁸ Quoted in *San Angelo Standard*, San Angelo, Texas, August 29, 1954, 70th Anniversary Edition.

¹⁹ H. F. McDaniel and N. A. Taylor, *The Coming Empire; or Two Thousand Miles in Texas on Horseback* (New York: A.S. Barnes & Company, 1877), 265, accessed July 15, 2015, <https://books.google.com>.

²⁰ Green, *The Dancing was Lively*, 63; S.L.S Smith, Letter reprinted in *San Angelo Standard*, San Angelo, TX, 70th Anniversary Edition, August 29, 1954.

Taylor, opined of the “bad subjects” in “Sant Angelus,” “the males are Mexicans or Americans, and the females are Mexicans . . .” who “earn their wages enticing the negro soldiery into their dens, and depriving them of their money at the card table, and sometimes by bolder exploits on the road. The women appear to be such creatures as would naturally be attracted to such men.” Clearly, for Taylor, only Mexican prostitutes of the basest sort could be suitable for African-Americans. Also noteworthy is Taylor’s distinguishing notion that “American” means “white.” Taylor also seemed offended by a translation of the name of the town: “[I]t means the city of ‘Holy Angels.’ If some Mexican thus named it, it is regular enough; for one can hardly hear of a highwayman or big thief in Mexico, whose name is not ‘Jesus’ or ‘Emanuel.’”²¹ When writing about a Bishop’s visit to the area in 1871, Notson displayed his disdain for “the number of Mexican families living near the post.” He observed:

To complete the characteristics of wickedness and villainous traits, with which the treacherous and dirty race abounds, where it is practicable to evade the fee and the Padre, even the simple ceremony of jumping a broomstick is evaded, as a necessary preliminary to marital relationship. His Reverence put a stop to that, for the time at least, by marrying all or nearly all who had been living in such relations.²²

Notson, as well Taylor, saw poverty and immorality as natural traits inherent in the Mexican “race.”

²¹ McDaniel, *The Coming Empire*, 265.

²² Notson, *Fort Concho Medical History*, 44.

In the 1870s peoples of Mexican descent made up the majority of the population of San Angela. Settling along the banks of the river, across from the fort, Mexican-Americans made a living herding cattle, working on nearby ranches, and servicing the soldiers of Fort Concho with libation and prostitution. As the town developed, Mexican Americans took up residence on Concho, Twohig and Beauregard Avenues. In 1877, Marcus Koenigheim of San Antonio acquired San Angela, which brought more whites to the area. After the county seat, Ben Ficklin, was destroyed by flood in 1882, San Angela attained the title, and saw more whites settling in town establishing businesses, and developing land. In the mid-1880s and 1890s white developers began displacing Mexican-American residents through legal or fraudulent means, restricting them to certain sections of town.²³

In the fall of 1889, J. E. McGowan, a correspondent for the *Chattanooga Times*, visited the San Angelo area. In the subsequent article that followed, McGowan related the perceptions that white West Texans held with regard to Mexican Americans in the vicinity. His survey can shed some light on prevailing white “attitudes” toward non-whites in the Concho Valley. It will be helpful to analyze McGowan’s remarks with regard to Mexican Americans in the Concho Valley.

McGowan’s assessment of Mexican Americans was harsh, and alluded to a blood theory of race held by many whites in the late nineteenth century. McGowan reported that “[t]he chief laboring element here . . . is the Mexican, a race of mongrels, chiefly Aztec, with a sprinkle of Spanish and negro.” Gauging Mexican Americans with a phenotypical aesthetic measuring stick, McGowan stated that “[t]he men are of medium size, angular and

²³ Arnoldo DeLeón, *San Angelños: Mexican Americans in San Angelo, Texas* (San Angelo, Texas: Fort Concho Museum Press, 1985), 19-21.

ungainly of build, features irregular and harsh to the point of ugliness, but not generally repulsive.” Paralleling Mexican Americans with African Americans McGowan stated that “they are dark to the point of blackness.” McGowan juxtaposed the homes of Mexican Americans with African Americans in his own state when writing that “they live in the forlornest [sic] looking huts on the edges of town – wretched cabins as the lowliest Tennessee negro would not put his pig in, do these curious people inhabit.” Drawing a reference point for his readers in Tennessee, McGowan seemed to place peoples of Mexican descent on a lower rung of the “race ladder” with regard to living conditions.²⁴

McGowan also engaged in racialized rhetoric when describing labor practices of Mexican Americans in the region. The Mexican American population were mainly employed by ranchers as herders of sheep and cattle. As if to put the nineteenth-century white reader at ease McGowan points out that the ranchmen employ whites to manage Mexican Americans: “All the more extensive ranchmen employ several white men putting the Mexican under the whites. The former live in the saddle, the latter go on foot.” McGowan argued that although Mexican Americans did their job well, they complain constantly. McGowan stated that the rancher expects discontent. “[W]hen his greasership has gone over his rigmarole, all the time with a far-away look in his eyes” he is told that if he wants to quit “he can go. The Mexican smiles, assents, gets his check,” and heads to town “chiefly for drink.” In the off-season, the “Mexican” is dejected and “half-naked” having

²⁴ *San Angelo Standard*, September 21, 1889.

spent all his money on alcohol. McGowan's "Mexican" searches for the next eight to ten month job in order to repeat "his season of carousing, dissipation and wanton waste."²⁵

McGowan found the intelligence of Concho country Mexican Americans' lacking. Mexican descent people "are industrious in a way, but of no account for house servants. They make passable field hands." If a "Mexican" is a land owner, "which is rare," McGowan continued, they tend to plow fields with a stick and rock fixed to the end of a board, in a primitive fashion. The writer relayed that despite living among "Americans," not many of the area's Mexicans can speak English; and as a result, cowboys and bosses are forced to learn Spanish.²⁶ McGowan's discussion of morality enhanced his portrayal of an unintelligent, savage, alcoholic Mexican American population.

In his attempt to convey the attitudes of San Angeloans regarding Mexican Americans, McGowan addressed the topic of morality. The Tennessee surveyor stated, "Of course these people are immoral, or rather they have no particular morals concerning sexual relations, except that mothers try hard to guard their daughters until marriage, or at least to the time of betrothal." The writer also accused the Mexican population of sexual promiscuity and an unacceptable notion of marital life: "Changing wives is not uncommon and neither partner has much regard for the proprieties when living together."²⁷

At times, McGowan seemed to sympathize with Mexican Americans. He observed, "The swarthy 'sons of the soil' have no rights the white man feels he must respect, when to

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ *Ibid.*

do so would in any degree inconvenience the master caste.” However, McGowan presented white San Angeloans as good employers. “[I]t is fair to say however, that the Mexican is paid fair wages, and seldom is he cheated in that respect,” McGowan stated.

Condescendingly, McGowan acknowledged the citizenship of Mexican Americans, “[T]hese people vote, they are American citizens.” However, he adds, “My reader can readily imagine what kind of voters they are.” For McGowan, ignorance of the “significance of the ballot” and the apparent alcoholism, made Mexican Americans easy to buy off.²⁸ McGowan claimed his source for “every statement...was based on information picked up from prominent citizens of San Angelo and from many I met in the vicinity.”²⁹

McGowan relayed his observations as a reflection of the racialized perceptions of white San Angeloans. However, it did not meet the approval of at least one resident of the Concho Valley. A week later, a letter, simply signed “Adios,” appeared in the *Standard*, responding to McGowan’s summations. It seems clear from the language used in the letter that a white man wrote it. It is interesting to note that a white man felt the need to use an alias when defending non-whites in his home town. This response by a white resident of the area provides another aspect of racial perceptions and an example of white supremacist notions in the late nineteenth-century.

Refuting McGowan’s statements, “Adios” argued that the writer from Tennessee had heard only unqualified statements from some residents, and that his evaluation was inaccurate. The author stated, “It not only does our Mexican *fellow citizens* [my emphasis] gross injustice, but also reflects most disadvantageously on the citizens of this section who

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *San Angelo Standard*, October 12, 1889.

has been his employer for years.” Although “Adios” identifies Mexican Americans as “fellow citizens,” he seems to be concerned here with labor unrest, rather than implying any kind of racial equality. The author admitted, “I have a good many Mexican friends of some fifteen years standing beside a number of friends who have employed for years from one to fifty Mexicans.” In response to McGowan’s accusation of white San Angeloans denying Mexican Americans their rights, “Adios” contended that white employers did respect the rights of “our adopted Mexican citizen,” at least enough to maintain a satisfied labor pool. When remarking on the issue of Mexican Americans’ intelligence, “Adios” asserted that they are “capable of education,” as evidenced in “their excellent thoroughness in all branches of labor which they have reason to learn.” The author further stated, “We all know well enough the Mexican as a rule ‘ain’t no saint,’ but he fills his place as well as most persons and we appreciate him and have a friendship for him in consequence.”³⁰ The underlying racialized, socio-economic class implications alluded to by “Adios” revealed the important role Mexicans and Mexican Americans played as laborers under white employers. In a second rejoinder to McGowan, “Adios” echoes the white paternalistic mindset of some in the area: “Still these people are our friends living in amity with us, grateful for kindness and true to their friend.”³¹

While Hispanic and African-American peoples composed the majority of the non-white population, a few Chinese families resided in San Angelo in the 1880s. They made a living selling Asian “notions,” operating a laundry service, and running a “chop house.”³²

³⁰ *San Angelo Standard*, September 28, 1889.

³¹ *San Angelo Standard*, October 19, 1889.

³² *San Angelo Standard*, 70th Anniversary Edition, August 29, 1954.

Mrs. R. A. Wyckoff recalled that “they were not exclusive rice eating people for I sold them plenty of chickens and eggs.”³³ However, sometime in the late 1880s, the Chinese families moved away. The threat of violence may have caused the exodus. Wyckoff provides a clue: “Two Chinese came in about 1889 and grew a lovely garden . . . [t]hat pair was run out.”³⁴

The population of San Angelo seemed ambivalent to the presence of African American soldiers, even though the town came into existence in order to service Fort Concho. Eugene McCrohan believed that the “negro soldiers” in the area “didn’t do no good...The citizens and negro soldiers had a few scrapes, one or two negroes were killed but no whites.”³⁵ Visiting Fort Concho, local rancher, Joe Tweedy complained of being detained by African American soldiers for “walking on the grass.” “I was amused and at the same time a little angry at being ordered around so by a ‘nigger’ – but it couldn’t be helped,” Tweedy continued, “a darky when he is a soldier is as good as a white man.”³⁶ Mrs. R. A. Wyckoff believed that “San Angelo didn’t mean much to the soldiers, when speaking of the town they would simply say across the river.”³⁷ As a child, Juanita Hernandez Garcia remembered the African-American soldiers with fear: “[N]egro soldiers from Fort Concho come near our house to make practice for shooting with guns. They throw whiskey and

³³ Ruby Mosley, *Mrs. R. A. Wyckoff, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 4, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:1:/temp/>.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Ruby Mosley, *Mr. Eugene McCrohan, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 11, 1938*, Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 2, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:13:/temp/>.

³⁶ Joe Tweedy to Mrs. O. B. Tweedy, May 24, 1877, Tweedy Letters, West Texas Collection, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas.

³⁷ Mosley, *Mrs. R. A. Wyckoff*.

drinking bottles high in the air and shoot them in pieces . . . We make run, hide, peep from little holes; they might shoot us. They no care for Mexican people, shoot Mexican as shoot animal.”³⁸ Soldiers, white and black, still spent their pay in town. And businesses catered their services to the fort and its troops.

Amidst the violence that plagued San Angelo in the late nineteenth-century, challenges to racial perceptions and the notion of white supremacy provided a catalyst for further hostility. Texas Ranger Noah Armstrong offered a thinly veiled double-meaning of his first impression of San Angelo. “There were six-hundred negro soldiers stationed at the post...and I thought it was the blackest town I ever saw, with nothing but saloons, gambling houses, and dance halls,” Armstrong remembered.³⁹ In 1877, Armstrong and some of his fellow Rangers may have helped incite a violent clash with racial overtones.

Armstrong’s Texas Rangers came to San Angelo to let off steam after a month of scouting Indians. Armstrong recounted, “We got into the Sarg. Nasworthy Saloon and all got to drinking and gambling...In one place we were dancing around and a negro soldier danced right into one of our boys. We looked around and saw a whole bunch of negroes dancing all around us.” This sparked a bar room brawl between the Rangers and the African-American soldiers. “There were about thirty of us rangers,” Armstrong claims, “we grabbed bottles, chairs, guns, anything at hand, and started knocking out negroes.”⁴⁰ Eventually the soldiers

³⁸ Ruby Mosely, *Juanita Hernandez [sic] Garcia, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 13, 1938*, Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 4, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:8:./temp/>.

³⁹ Elizabeth Doyle, *Noah Armstrong, San Angelo, Texas*, Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 2, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:8:./temp/>.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

escaped back to Fort Concho.⁴¹ According to the account provided by Armstrong, the next morning Colonel Grierson approached the Rangers at their encampment. Grierson demanded that Sparks “apologize to his negroes.” Possibly angered by this affront to the notion of white supremacy, Sparks’ reply was a resounding: “To Hell with your damn black skunks, I can take my thirty rangers and whip every damn negro in your whole fort.”⁴² That night, African-American soldiers sought revenge for the attack. Returning to Nasworthy’s saloon, soldiers opened fire inside the building, killing an innocent bystander. Grierson reported the ranger captain to his superiors. Rather than punish his rangers, Sparks quit the force.⁴³ According to Armstrong, Sparks “died seeking to get even with Grierson.”⁴⁴

A few months later, in 1878, another violent confrontation occurred between white cowboys and buffalo soldiers. At Morris’s saloon a group of white men surrounded an African American sergeant of the 10th Cavalry, and proceeded to deface his uniform, ripping the stripes from his sleeves. The disgraced sergeant retreated to the fort only to return with an armed group of soldiers. During the gunfight that ensued, a buffalo hunter and a soldier were killed. In the aftermath, nine African-American soldiers were indicted for the shooting.

⁴¹ Clemens, *The Concho Country*, 80; Gower, “Blacks in San Angelo: Relations Between Fort Concho and the City, 1875-1889,” in Glassrud, 76.

⁴² Doyle, *Noah Armstrong*.

⁴³ Barr, 87.

⁴⁴ Doyle, *Noah Armstrong*; Clemens, 80; Gower, 76; William H. Leckie and Shirley A. Leckie, *The Buffalo Soldiers: A Narrative of the Back Cavalry in the West* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003), 164-165.

One soldier, William Mace, received a death sentence for killing buffalo hunter, Fred Young.⁴⁵

Clearly the volatility of frontier life contributed to both confrontations in 1877 and 1878. However, the challenge to white supremacy as represented by African American soldiers may have been too much for some whites to accept. This could help explain why Texas Rangers assaulted African-American soldiers sharing a dance-floor, and why white cowboys felt compelled to rend the sergeant's uniform in Morris's saloon. The buffalo soldiers' responses in both cases were to resort to violence to exact justice for being dishonored and humiliated. Tensions between the town "across the river" and Fort Concho seemed to have eased following the shooting in 1878. However, the murder of a black soldier by a white shepherd shattered an uneasy peace, resulting in violent retaliation.

In the early morning of February 1, 1881, a gunshot rang out in front of Charlie D. Wilson's saloon in San Angelo. William Watkins, an African-American soldier, lay dead outside the saloon with a gaping hole in his head. Not long after, a post guard detained Thomas McCarthy, a local white rancher, as he attempted to cross the grounds of Fort Concho. According to the testimony of the guard on duty, McCarthy ran from the direction of the town. Examining the body of Watkins, Post Surgeon S. L. S. Smith determined that the

⁴⁵ Clemens, *Concho Country*, 80; Leckie, *Buffalo Soldiers*, 164-165; Quintard Taylor, *In Search of the Racial Frontier: African Americans in the American West, 1528-1990* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998), 175-176.

ball that killed the soldier came from the pistol found on McCarthy. The guards turned McCarthy over to the sheriff.⁴⁶

It is not entirely clear what motivated McCarthy to murder Watkins. Witnesses to the event allude to cordiality between the two. On the night in question, Watkins and McCarthy had been seen together in Wilson's saloon. Apparently, Watkins had been singing and dancing for money.⁴⁷ It is unclear as to what started the argument which resulted in Watkins's death.

After McCarthy's arrest, soldiers at the fort, black and white, demanded justice. A handbill appeared throughout town on February 3, which demanded respect and justice:

We, the soldiers of the U. S. army do hereby warn , for the first and last time, all citizens, cowboys, etc., of San Angela and vicinity, to recognize our right of way, as just and peaceable men. If we do not receive justice and fair play, which we must have, some one will suffer – if not the guilty the innocent. It has gone too far – Justice or Death. (Signed) U. S. Soldiers, One and All.⁴⁸

Having armed themselves, the troops went across the river looking for McCarthy. According to one report, the troops numbered more than one hundred strong, with some white soldiers having "blackened faces."⁴⁹ Believing McCarthy stayed at the Tankersly Hotel, the men gathered outside the building. The troops demanded Watkins's murderer. However,

⁴⁶ Tom Green County District Court, Criminal Case 162, *State of Texas v. Thomas McCarthy*, February 4, 1881.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ *San Antonio Daily Express*, San Antonio, Texas, February 11, 1881.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

McCarthy never appeared. Finally the soldiers dispersed when an officer and a detachment from the fort rode into town to retrieve the troops.⁵⁰ On February 4, McCarthy's hearing took place. After which, McCarthy sat in jail in the town of Ben Ficklin, a few miles from the fort, to await a grand jury. That evening McCarthy's twin brother rode into town. An unfortunate case of mistaken identity, word reached the post that McCarthy was walking freely through San Angela. The buffalo soldiers, again, took to arm themselves, believing McCarthy had been set free. Between 30 and 50 soldiers crossed the river looking to exact vigilante justice on the man accused of murdering their comrade.⁵¹

Once in town, soldiers heard rumors that McCarthy had a room at the Nimitz Hotel. The troopers surrounded the building and demanded McCarthy be turned over, to no avail. Angered, the soldiers opened fire on the hotel. According to reports, between 150 and 200 rounds were expended. The men vented on the rest of the town, firing into a number of other buildings. Hearing the bugle signaling roll call, the buffalo soldiers hurried back to the fort. Three non-commissioned officers charged in the attack suffered a reduction in rank. The next day a detachment of Texas Rangers arrived to keep peace. Ranger Captain Bryan Marsh threatened that if anyone from the fort crossed the river into town, they would be carried back "feet first." Marsh had even considered storming the post with his 21 men. Tensions

⁵⁰ Clemens, *Concho Country*, 80; Gower, "Blacks in San Angelo," 77; Leckie, *Buffalo Soldiers*, 239; *San Antonio Daily Express*, February 11, 1881.

⁵¹ Clemens, *Concho Country*, 80-81; Leckie, *Buffalo Soldiers*, 240; *San Antonio Daily Express*, February 11, 1881.

and tempers cooled and Grierson maintained control over his men. In Austin, McCarthy was quickly acquitted of murder.⁵²

Although McCarthy was found not guilty, many residents of San Angella blamed him for the attack on the city. R. J. Ferguson stated that many in San Angella felt that McCarthy “should be punished for bringing on this trouble and damaging their property.” The owner of the Nimitz Hotel, E. A. Nimitz believed that many in town thought McCarthy should be made an example and hanged, and that “McCarthy was the cause of all the trouble.”⁵³ What is interesting is that many in San Angelo were of the opinion that McCarthy should be punished, not for the murder of another human being, but for the resultant attack on the town. The citizens seemed to accept the murder of an African American federal soldier by a white man. Once again, tensions eased between the town and the fort.

Campaigning against Indians in West Texas, African American soldiers stationed in Concho country had done their job securing the area for settlement. By 1875, Texans relegated most Native Americans to Indian Territory and reservation life. Regarding Indian removal historian, Gary Clayton Anderson, has argued, that Anglo-Texans could not accept ethnic diversity and, therefore could not accept the existence of Indians in Texas. Through violence in the form of the Texas Rangers and the United States military, Texas followed a policy of “ethnic cleansing” to ensure that the state would be a white man’s country.⁵⁴ In

⁵² Clemens, *Concho Country*, 80-81; Gower, “Blacks in San Angelo,” 76-80; Leckie, *Buffalo Soldiers*, 240; *San Antonio Daily Express*, February 11, 1881.

⁵³ Tom Green County District Court, Criminal Case 162, *State of Texas v. Thomas McCarthy*, February 4, 1881, West Texas Collection.

⁵⁴ Anderson, *The Conquest of Texas*, 7, 360.

1938, Jesse Jolly of San Angelo recalled Native Americans as “not bad . . . not until the so-called whites started the killing and began destroying their country. Yes, that's right, they were ignorant, but happy. We came in, took their home land and put them on little reservations. We [white-people] would fight, kill steal or do 'most anything if some other color come to chase us off of the land that we have taken.”⁵⁵ Jolly’s perception of the reality of the West Texas frontier, though tempered with racialized language, was not shared by all in the region.

In 1882, the regimental headquarters for the 10th Cavalry moved to Fort Davis. Fort Concho became home for the all-white 16th Infantry. And in June of 1889, Fort Concho closed.⁵⁶ Some buffalo soldiers settled in San Angelo after their service had expired. By 1890, African Americans made up 3.9% of the total population of Tom Green County.⁵⁷

Racially-charged violence remained commonplace in west Texas. On the evening of June 19, 1889 an incident occurred at the picnic grounds south of San Angelo. Many African American West Texans gathered to celebrate the emancipation of Texas slaves that took place at Galveston on that day in 1865. Known as Juneteenth, festivities included dancing, eating and drinking as African Americans observed the historic transition from chattel to freepersons. In a seeming contradiction to the idea of whiteness, four white men, Charles Cooksey and his brother Henry, R.A. Ewing, and Willie Andrews attended the celebratory

⁵⁵ Ruby Mosley, *Mr. William Tell Jolly, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 10-16, 1938*, Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 4, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:19:./temp/>.

⁵⁶ Green, *The Dancing was Lively*, 114.

⁵⁷ *Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910*, Volume III, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), accessed July 11, 2015, www.census.gov/prod/www/decennial.html.

event. Accompanied by a “colored” friend, the four white men arrived to partake in the merriment. Later described as a “difficulty,” the evening ended with the shooting death of Charles Cooksey by Dave Young, an African American.⁵⁸

According to witnesses the trouble began when an intoxicated Charles Cooksey started an argument with Henry Baey, an African American. Cooksey had overheard Baey speaking Dutch to someone, which apparently incensed Cooksey prompting him to demand that Baey “speak United States.” Cooksey, feeling insulted by the “black son of a bitch,” approached Baey, shouting and brandishing his pistol. Dave Young, marshal of the celebration, stepped in to help defuse the row before it escalated further, as did Cooksey’s brother, Henry, and R.A. Ewing. As the situation worsened, the focus of Cooksey’s rage shifted to Young. The two men may have had previous entanglements as witnesses implied feelings of animosity. Witnesses testified to a scene of confusion and chaos and no one knew who fired the first shot. However, the result of the conflict left Cooksey with a bullet in the chest and Young unscathed.⁵⁹

Arrested and charged with murder, Dave Young stood trial. In court witnesses attested to the inebriated state of Cooksey and his seeming combative nature. Racial overtones highlighted the depositions from those present at the shooting. Some witnesses testified that, having felt slighted by a black man, Cooksey proclaimed: “I will kill the damn nigger!” In the end, Young was acquitted of murder in the spring of 1890.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ *SanAngelo Standard*, July 6, 1889.

⁵⁹ Tom Green County District Court Criminal Case 842, West Texas Collection.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

The case of Dave Young reveals much about white racial perceptions in San Angelo at this time. Evidence suggests that Young shot Cooksey in self-defense. However, Young still killed a white man. Many San Angelo residents were Southern in origin and retained their traditional Southern racial world-view of the supremacy of white men. How did Young get away with killing a white man? The answer may be tucked away in the language used by witnesses to the Juneteenth shooting, as well as the San Angelo *Standard* newspaper.

The local San Angelo paper reprinted an article from the East Texas *Tyler Democrat* that reflected the racial ideology of many Texans at that time. In regard to the shooting, the article seemed to place a substantial amount of blame on Cooksey. Not because he was intoxicated and seemed to initiate the fight, but because he was a white man out of his “place.” “When a white man goes prowling about where negroes are engaged in such business,” the *Democrat* opined, “he is out of his place, and it is not much matter if he does get hurt.” Reaffirming the color line that had been breached, the editor warned that both black and white should “attend to his own business” or “bad results” would no doubt follow.⁶¹ In a seeming betrayal of traditional white supremacist ideology the editor at once removed the implications of the superiority of whites by making the white men, who dared to cross the color-line, blame-worthy of the incident. This seems to imply that attending a celebration of the emancipation of the slaves made Cooksey and those like him less white.

Witnesses to the Juneteenth shooting and the *Standard* described Cooksey as “a gambler,” and pointed to his drunkenness. Many present described Cooksey’s behavior as provocative and hostile. At one point Cooksey took to a stage, hurling insults and acting

⁶¹ *San Angelo Standard*, July 6, 1889.

confrontational. In the minds of whites, had Cooksey dropped a degree of whiteness with his out-of-control performance that could be construed as behavior unbecoming of whites? Conveying the events that unfolded, the *Dallas Morning News* interestingly pointed out that besides Cooksey, “a number of whites were in attendance.” Young was described as “a negro” and marshal of the celebration. The editor plainly stated, “One Charles Cooksey, a gambler, becoming intoxicated, got into a row with Young who shot him.”⁶² The use of such language in the context of the death of a white man at the hands of a black man at a “colored picnic,” seems to imply that many white West Texans viewed this as an exception to the rule of white supremacy. By attaching labels that suggests immorality – “gambler” and “drunk” – as well as the fact that Cooksey crossed the color-line, perhaps West Texas Anglos removed a degree of whiteness from Cooksey in an effort to justify excusing a black man for killing a white man.

One month after the trial, June 7, 1890, an unknown assailant gunned down Young on Chadbourne Street in San Angelo. Interestingly, and uncharacteristic of late nineteenth century white racial perspectives, the San Angelo *Standard* provided a lengthy description of the assassination of Young, calling the event “dastardly.” The paper detailed how the “assassin” waited behind a fence along a route known to be taken by the victim and unloaded two barrels of buckshot into Young. Seeing that Young still breathed, the “merciless assailant” reloaded and fired again. The murderer rode away, seen by many witnesses willing to describe the perpetrator. Although witnesses’ depictions of the murderer conflicted with each other, the *Standard* revealed that “evidence has so far developed that a

⁶² *Dallas Morning News*, Dallas, Texas, June 21, 1889.

party has been secreted in the city watching the movements of [the] deceased and who is supposed to be a relative of Cooksey.”⁶³ Jack Coker, arrested for the crime, had his bond put up by members of the Cooksey family. However, due to an apparent lack of evidence, Coker was acquitted.⁶⁴

The type of language used to describe the murder of Dave Young raises more questions. Clearly the editor of the *Standard*, as well as witnesses, viewed the shooting of Young as immoral. The use of words such as “dastardly,” “merciless,” and “assassin” seems to remove the qualities of “humanness” as well as “whiteness” from Young’s murderer. The *Standard*’s representation of the scene also imposes a cowardly characteristic on the shooter, hiding and waiting to shoot Young in the back. The *Standard* also inadvertently endowed Young with a masculine respectability generally only afforded to white men by presenting him as a formidable opponent stating that “he was a very powerful man and considered dangerous to fool with.” Does the language used by the *Standard* and witnesses expose the presupposition of certain qualities necessary for an individual to possess to maintain the status “white?” Within the idea of whiteness, as well as white supremacy, certain qualities seem to be presupposed. These qualities were implied in the characteristics imposed upon non-whites. Simply stated, white people were defined by what they are *not*.

The Concho Country saw subtle changes in the ways whites perceived non-whites, as exemplified in the implications of the language used by the local paper. The idea of “race” played a prominent role in the way whites in the region dealt with living near a federal fort garrisoned by African-American soldiers, as well as peoples of Mexican descent residing and

⁶³ *San Angelo Standard*, June 7, 1890.

⁶⁴ Tom Green County District Court Criminal 932, West Texas Collection.

working in the area. And, racism remained a catalyst for an eruption of violent and deadly clashes. At the turn of the twentieth century, white West Texans' ideas of themselves within a racial framework broke through the surface with, at times, violent consequences.

CHAPTER III

LAW AND ORDER AND THE PERCEIVED THREAT TO WHITE SUPREMACY: 1900 - 1920

San Angelo celebrated the Old Settlers' Reunion in 1910 with a parade through downtown in remembrance of the past. The parade was divided into thirteen divisions representing parts of the history of the West, including sheep rustlers, stage robbers, Jay Hawkens, Grangers, and the Ku Klux Klan. Representing a period within the Reconstruction era, the division of "Klansmen," members of the community dressed up in costume as a visual personification of white supremacy's past and present.¹ In the early years of the twentieth-century white West Texans defended white supremacy. Their responses, at times, seemed to betray the sacrosanct ideal of law and order embedded in whiteness. Local newspapers provide a window into the often contradictory nature of whiteness.

In 1901, Theodore Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington to the White House for a meeting and dinner, an invitation that received criticism from those who held the ideology of white supremacy to be absolute in theory and in practice.² Responding to the occurrence in an open letter to the president published in the San Angelo *Standard*, Charles B. Metcalf of San Angelo voiced the consternation of many in Texas and the South, as well as concern for the "thirteen million people of African descent," for whom Metcalf took up the pen "in their behalf." Granting that Roosevelt had the right as a person to associate with whomever he

¹ *San Angelo Standard*, October 5, 1910.

² Loren Katz Williams, *Eyewitness: The Negro in American History* (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1971), 375-377.

wanted, even with African Americans, Metcalf condescendingly went further wondering if Roosevelt would allow his “daughters such freedom of association with male negroes as will engender passion, ravishment, and death to your girls or you may do any other thing which a southern white man would not do from fear of evil results to himself.” Metcalf believed that as the holder of the highest office in the United States, Roosevelt had essentially betrayed the people of the country. “As president of the United States you have no moral right to do any of these things because you are in a most high place; being there, it is your duty to conserve the welfare of all the people,” Metcalf stated.³

Metcalf also derided the president for setting an example that would lead African Americans down “a path that most certainly will lead them to destruction.” Metcalf believed that the president had created a false hope for African Americans that their social situation had improved. For Metcalf, this had the potential for violence on both sides, as well as bitter disappointment and “destruction with [Roosevelt’s] bauble of social equality.” Not only was it wrong to associate with African Americans in this manner, but it was also wrong to lead African Americans to believe that they had a chance at real equality. He lamented to Roosevelt “in none of your public acts or writings did you make it manifest that you thought it necessary for the negroes to be mixed with the whites socially, or that they would be benefitted by such mixing. The only hope for the negroes is that they be taught to foster good will on the part of their white neighbors.” Ominously, Metcalf conveyed that if any man associated with African Americans in the South in the way Roosevelt had, his life could

³ *San Angelo Standard*, February 28, 1903.

be forfeited.⁴ Even the President of the United States would not be safe once racial norms were violated.

In this example, Metcalf displayed a complex and schizophrenic side of whiteness and white supremacy. For many, Roosevelt was morally wrong for allowing Booker T. Washington in the White House. Interestingly, Metcalf displayed sexual insecurity as he leapt to conclude that miscegenation would result in any other meeting. He seemed to assume, naturally, that when near a white female, an African American man would ravage her, and thus Metcalf attempted to appeal to Roosevelt's whiteness.

Some whites in the Concho Country fretted over perceived threats to white womanhood. In 1907, the Ballinger *Banner-Leader* reported in an article entitled "Keeping Negro West Moving," that many white San Angeloans had complained of a "colored skinned devil" that came to the city after leaving Ballinger having "been entirely too intimate with a white woman." "This colored skinned devil has no place in San Angelo. The decent colored people do not want him and most certainly none of the respectable white citizens do," the editor continued. Some white citizens demanded that local law enforcement push this African American man to Mexico "where he can reside without hurting the self-respect of decent people," and will not "endanger the purity of their homes." Here the editor employed the language of whiteness to make his case. While at once reminding "decent" African Americans of their place with regard to "race" mixing, the writer addressed "respectable white citizens" as well. Those whites who accepted such practices besmirched the "purity" of whiteness, and, therefore, became less white. In addition, the editor racialized Mexicans

⁴ *Ibid.*

as inferior by their apparent acceptance of miscegenation and lack of “self-respect” and “decency.”⁵

According to the census taken in 1910, African Americans made up 6.3% of the total population of San Angelo. Six hundred and fifty-two African Americans reportedly shared the town with 8,160 whites.⁶ However, at times, white San Angelo residents felt their supremacy was under attack. In 1909, the Orient Railroad brought controversy to the West Texas town when the company shipped twenty African American laborers in from Tennessee to work on the new grade. Displaying a heightened racial sensitivity, many prominent citizens in San Angelo held a meeting to address the Orient railroad’s labor force. Seemingly concerned over the fact that the Orient apparently did not seek the labor of the white citizens of the community, the meeting took on white supremacist overtones that exposed the problematic attempt to reconcile law-and-order and whiteness.

Reporting on the mass meeting, the *San Angelo Standard*, reprinted the resolution reached:

Whereas, the Orient and Santa Fe railroad companies have shipped into our country negro laborers, to the detriment of the white laborers of our country, and that they are a drawback to the prosperity of our city, that his presence is a source of annoyance and dread to our families; therefore, be it [R]esolved, that copies of this resolution be given to the San Angelo papers for publication and a copy be carried to the parties responsible for their presence here.⁷

⁵ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, June 29, 1907.

⁶ *Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910*, Volume III, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), accessed July 11, 2015, www.census.gov/prod/www/decennial.html.

⁷ *San Angelo Standard*, October 13, 1909.

Having been called for the “purpose of peacefully deciding as to whether or not it was desired to let the ‘nigger’ remain in San Angelo or ask him to leave,” committee chairperson, J.W. Kincannon, stated at the beginning of the meeting that he “favored a white man’s town,” and that “San Angelo was well enough for white men without ‘niggers.’” He went on to suggest that “the negroes be banished without any disturbance.” He believed that if allowed to remain, the newly arrived African Americans would take all the available jobs leaving nothing for the white men of the town.

N.A. Douglas addressed the meeting to air his concerns. Comparing the recent influx of twenty African-American workers with a ship carrying bubonic plague or someone infected with smallpox being allowed to enter the town, Douglas concluded that “the coming of the negroes was a plague ten thousand times worse.” He then added that “he had always lived in a country where the white man was supreme and that he always wanted to. Douglas conveyed his fear of even leaving his wife and children alone “with so many ‘black devils’” in the area. It is not certain how the African American population already residing in San Angelo didn’t seem to warrant the same concern. Douglas concluded his address warning that any town “could not prosper” with the “black devil’s” in their midst, and that other towns where “niggers” reside are dead.⁸

In an attempt to clarify the purpose of the discussion, one attendee asked if “it was meant that all ‘niggers’ in San Angelo should leave or just those shipped in?” To which the chairman reinforced that he always had been in “favor of a white man’s town,” which was met with “ringing cheers.” Douglas answered this question by suggesting that the “new

⁸ *Ibid.*

negroes” be ejected first and “see what effect this would have in the town. And “the *others* be kept more *indefinitely*.” However, he suggested that eviction should occur lawfully.⁹

Passions inflated as the discussion continued. W.L. Wall, a street car employee and Presbyterian minister, spoke of his experience during Reconstruction. Formerly of Tennessee, Wall recalled in horror: “[T]he Republicans would stick their fingers under the noses of the people and tell them that the negro was their equal.” Northerners “tried to force the negro down their throats.” The minister threatened that he would “wade up to his chin in blood before he would be under the ruling of negroes.” Wall suggested that a committee be formed to address the Orient railroad people and “ask them in a quiet way . . . to send the negroes away.” And “if they won’t do this, then you know your business.”¹⁰

The implications of the use of violence to rid San Angelo of African Americans, as well as to coerce the Orient Railroad to meet the demands of the committee seem to indicate a deep-seated fear of any threat to white supremacy. However, calls for adhering to the law seemed to temper violent discourse. District Attorney L.H. Brightman stated that although he “didn’t like negroes as much as Teddy Roosevelt” he warned that if the citizens were to eject all African Americans from town they must do it legally and not in “violation of the law.”¹¹ The issue of labor may have been the catalyst to the meeting but what comes through is clear. These white men argued in favor of not only expelling the twenty African American workers shipped in by the Orient, but all African Americans. Attendees stated often that they

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

wanted San Angelo to be a white man's town and implied that violence be used to accomplish their goal.

In the early hours of October 13, the morning after the mass meeting, R.F. Caruthers, a 60-year-old porter for the San Angelo Bank & Trust, was assaulted by a few white men, and badly beaten. According to Caruthers, the men "cussed him repeatedly and stated that all the negroes in San Angelo would have to leave. The *Standard* stated that he still returned to work although Caruthers "not only had his face beaten out of normal size, but his back was injured and a rib broken." He soon fell into critical condition. J.B. Waddle was arrested and charged with aggravated assault. The county attorney Jeff Moore promised to "enforce the law to the letter." Connecting the assault to the mass meeting the night before, Moore stated "although people may differ in their opinion regarding the importation of negroes into this city to work on the Mertzson grade west of here, there is no cause for violence, especially to people not involved." The person that filed the complaint to the district attorney was a cashier at the Bank where Caruthers worked. Jeff B. Moore was not described as black, so one can assume that he was white due to his position and the lack of an adjective reserved for non-whites.¹²

The day after the mass meeting thirty-five "leading citizens" from the meeting the night before paid a visit to the local representatives of the Orient railroad to deliver their grievances. Expressing that "every man" has "the right to live in a community and work for a living," they also acknowledged that "the negroes had as much right in San Angelo as anyone else as long as they were industrious and law-abiding." Seemingly, the "leading

¹² *San Angelo Standard*, October 13, 1909; *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, October 29, 1909.

citizens” backpedaled a little from the heated rhetoric from the night before, perhaps due in part to the violence that occurred in the wake of the meeting. The Orient representatives argued that they had always used African Americans for the job, and that “they had been informed that white labor was scarce and that white men would not do the work negroes would.” However, they stated that they were willing to hire whites for different work. To reassure the committee, the Orient representatives promised that when the work was done they would “see to it that all the negroes left San Angelo,” and would be shipped back home. They also promised that the African-American workers “would not be kept in town and would not even come to San Angelo if it was desired that they buy their merchandise elsewhere.” Interestingly, the sheriff and city marshal attended the meeting to ensure that things didn’t get out of hand and that the law was obeyed.¹³

The mass meeting made news across the state, earning criticism and shining an unflattering light on San Angelo. The McKinney *Courier-Gazette* stated that with this event there is “no question but that there is something ‘doing’ all the time in Texas, especially at San Angelo.” An article in the Fort Worth *Star-Telegram* stated that the people of San Angelo “acted to suit their own local condition,” but that the African American workers should be returned home “in as good condition as they found them.” The *Standard* responded, saying that no one was told to leave “that, and nothing more.”¹⁴ The Coleman *News* assessed that “the people in San Angelo or at least a part of them” told African Americans to leave the town at a meeting “composed of rowdies.” The *News* stated that the Orient had shipped in African American workers because the white citizens of San Angelo

¹³ *San Angelo Standard*, October 13, 1909.

¹⁴ *San Angelo Standard*, October 20, 1909.

would not do the work. And that the leading citizens and police claim that the African American workers need not fear molestation “as long as they attend to their duties.”¹⁵ The *Standard* responded to this, again claiming that no one was told to leave and that a meeting of respectable citizens was called to “look into the matter.” An agreement being reached with the Orient representatives, the *Standard* argued that the African-American workers will remain “and will not be molested so long as they stay in a negro’s place.” The *Standard* derided the Coleman paper for reporting “hearsay.”¹⁶ Perhaps the editor at the *Standard* forgot that the paper reprinted the minutes from the meeting or reported the attack on Caruthers as a direct result of the meeting. The *Standard* also reprinted and responded to an article from the Cleburn *Enterprise*. The *Enterprise* suggested that the Texas Rangers be sent to San Angelo to deal with the “lawless opposition of a few men to the employment of negro labor,” arguing instead that gaming or gambling regulation “must be upheld though every other law is smashed beyond recognition.”

The *Standard* responded to criticism, claiming that the white men had every right to address the perceived threat to their whiteness: “Concholand is strictly a white man’s country and her citizens are going to see that it remains so.” The paper continued, “[S]o long as San Angelo is the home of white men and the abode of Texans it will remain a white man’s city and a white man’s country . . .” and that there will be “no law smashed beyond recognition,” and therefore San Angelo had no need for the Rangers. Further the *Standard* argued that San Angelo’s citizens had “seen negroes shipped into other sections of West Texas for cotton picking and other work and where ever these imported coons have been allowed to remain,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

there was trouble.”¹⁷ Assuring readers of San Angelo’s civility the *Standard* believed that its citizens were satisfied by the Orient representatives’ assurance that these workers would be banned from town and shipped out when the job was done. While defending San Angelo’s stance on white supremacy, many of San Angelo’s white residents argued that law and order would prevail.

In the early twentieth century, white Texans responded violently to any perceived threat to white supremacy. The use of violence to assert control over African Americans flourished in Texas at this time. During this period Texas ranked third in the nation in lynchings. Accusations of theft, assault, rape, and false rumors sparked violent acts against African Americans. Fear of racial labor competition prompted San Angelo whites to beat Caruthers and contemplate the removal African Americans.¹⁸

In the midst of an overreaction to the emigration of twenty African Americans into the area to work on the railroad, San Angelo citizens gave voice to their racial insecurities and hatred. The incident also reflected an attempt to adhere to the implied law and order of whiteness in the face of a perceived threat to white supremacy. For some, their whiteness seemed to be threatened with the mere presence of African Americans. Some, like the minister at the mass meeting, seemed to draw a logical line from emigrant African American labor to “Negro rule,” a scenario that would be met with violence. Yet white San Angelo citizens took umbrage at the accusations and portrayals of them as “rowdies” put forth by other communities. Did the appearance of a loss of control when addressing the racial situation embarrass white San Angelo citizens? The appearance of a loss of control could

¹⁷ *San Angelo Standard*, October 23, 1909.

¹⁸ Barr, *Black Texans*, 136-138.

have been perceived as a loss of a degree of whiteness. Clearly some white San Angelo citizens supported a complete removal of African Americans from the town.

Responding to the Orient incident in San Angelo, the Ballinger *Banner-Leader* stated, “The race war is disturbing peaceful San Angelo. We have long since been under the impression that it required all kinds of people to make a city. It seems that San Angelo people prefer a white man’s city.”¹⁹ Although towns like Ballinger derided San Angelo for their racial intolerance and violent reactions to race, and thus casting aspersions on their whiteness and white supremacy, Ballinger had their own history of intolerance toward non-whites. In the spring of 1909, the editor of the *Banner-Leader* chastised the white citizens of Ballinger who attended an African-American baseball game on a Sunday afternoon. The editor wrote, “Personally, we believe to encourage negro baseball by supporting the game with your presence, is bad any day in the week, but to disturb the peaceful quietude of pious Ballinger on Sunday with Coon yells mixed with the cheers of the white man seems to be just about the limit,” and the church would agree. The writer noted with a hint at white betrayal, that many of the “best people of the town” did not attend.²⁰ For the author, those whites who attended the game seemed to have momentarily turned their backs on their whiteness.

In an interesting exhibition on the contradictory nature of whiteness, the editor of the *Banner-Leader* voiced his opinion regarding the lynching of Will James at Cairo, Illinois in an article entitled “Outrage.” James, an African American, had been accused of murdering a white girl and was subsequently lynched, hung, riddled with bullets, dragged behind a car and finally burned. The editor stated that it was “nothing short of an outrage against civilized

¹⁹ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, October 22, 1909.

²⁰ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, April 30, 1909.

society. It was a veritable orgy of crime, the details of which are too disgustingly revolting to bear repetition.” He continued, “Mob law is perhaps never absolutely justifiable,” though many believe it to be. The author went on to argue that this kind of occurrence is an affront to civilization and the idea of law and order and that these acts only add “fuel to the flames that will burn away the barriers between civilized law and barbarian lawlessness.”²¹ In this instance, the editor seemed to draw a line between white supremacy and law and order. Were violent acts such as these an affront to the idea of whiteness as an adherence to law and order, even in the case of an alleged African American murder of a white girl? The author seems to imply a betrayal of whiteness in the form of “barbarian lawlessness.”

In July of 1910 an unknown person displayed a hand-written sign at the post office in San Angelo signed, “Mr. Nigar, Hunt Another Home. Your Days Are Short in San Angelo – W. Cap.” Responding to the sign the editor of the *Standard* displayed a paternalistic sentiment for African Americans while removing a degree of Whiteness from the “would-be whitecapper.”

²¹ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, November 18, 1909.

The Standard is for a white man's country, a white man's supremacy in all things, social and moral and political, and above all stands for the observance and the enforcement of the law without regard to age, sex, class or previous condition and the law extends its protecting arms over the honest, laboring negro to the same extent that it does the white man and so long as the negroes in San Angelo stay in their places and obey the behests of the law, they are going to be protected just the same as any other class of law abiding and decent citizens. There is no room in San Angelo for the anarchist and when the white capper makes a foot print in this city he will find a Nemesis on his trail that will either land him behind the bars or chase him out of the country.²²

In this instance, the editor parallels white supremacy with law and order. Conflating the “whitecapper” with the “anarchist,” the editor removed a degree of whiteness from the latter. Significantly, the author stated his stance with regard to white supremacy, before arguing its connection between the law and a paternalistic sense of responsibility to protect non-whites under the law, showing that law and order and white supremacy could coexist.

During the construction of the McBurnett hotel in San Angelo in 1917, eight white carpenters walked away from their jobs to protest the hiring of two African Americans employed to “push concrete wheel barrows.” After having been on the job for about fifteen minutes, the white carpenters went on strike and the African American laborers were temporarily dismissed. The superintendent of construction, Nathan Wohlfeld, stated that he “had shown no preference in employing men” at the site. He “believed a negro has as much right to make an honest living as a white man” and he would hire workers “irrespective of their color.” Wohlfeld assured those concerned that there was plenty of work available to all

²² *San Angelo Standard*, July 6, 1910.

once the concrete work began.²³ Feeling that their grievances were addressed, four of the eight striking workers returned after the temporary suspension of African American workers. Although his approach to the labor issue seems to have been pragmatic, Wohfeld displayed a lack of tolerance for the striking workers.

Some white West Texans' perceptions of racial origins placed whites at the top of a hierarchical list. However, an article in the *Banner-Leader* in 1906 entitled "The Mexican Race: It is a blending of the Indian with the Moro-Spaniard," analyzed the origins of races. Accepting the notion of biological-race as true, the author takes on a seemingly complimentary tone when describing the origin of certain races. Not surprisingly, the author attributes more significance to the "Anglo-Saxon" race as the more superior and accomplished. What is interesting is that the author concludes: "Curious that we should insist on our differences when we are all essentially the same."²⁴

Tracing the blood origin of contemporary Mexicans, the author harkened back to the impact the Moors had on Spanish blood-lines. For the author, moors were Arabic and therefore Semitic, "as are the Jews." However, the writer seemingly reassures his readers that "most of the blood in Spanish veins is Aryan." Having established a racial foundation for his analysis, the author imposes personality traits onto those sharing this particular heritage of blood. "The Mexican is a blend of the strong and sober Indian race melancholy, serious of thought with the Moro-Spaniard . . . It is a good stock that old Arab race – administrators, wonderful cultivators of the soil, chivalric...courteous, with an oriental

²³ *San Angelo Standard*, March 12, March 13 1917.

²⁴ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, June 30, 1906.

grateousness [sic].” Regarding “the Anglo-Saxon,” the author reserved accolades for the apparent intellectual and technical advancements of the “positive achievements” of the “railway and steamship, the telegraph and telephone, the consolidation of business, the active commercial conquest of the world’s markets.”²⁵

In the end, the author argued, “By magnifying our differences after all but our distinctive family traits, we draw apart. If we stopped to trace our origin we would see that we are not strangers but bretheren.” Granting such blood ties between the races in this manner belies white supremacist notions. The author further stated, “Spaniard and American [white Anglo-Saxons], Mexican and German, all are relatives, kinsmen longtime unaware of their blood relation.”²⁶

In 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo after the Mexican-American war placed former Mexican citizens in Texas in a racially ambiguous station. The treaty provided the opportunity for Mexicans residing in Texas to acquire American citizenship with its attending legal rights. However, the treaty did not address the creation of a separate racial category. Thus, Mexican American citizens became “white” by default, if only in the eyes of the law.²⁷ Socially, Mexican Americans still received bigoted treatment by white Texans.

In 1910, Mexican Americans in San Angelo demanded access to white schools, where, it was believed, their children would receive a better education. Florentina Muñoz

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ballinger Banner-Leader*, June 30, 1906.

²⁷ Scott Judy, “Mexican American Civil Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment,” *Texas Precedents: The Lone Star State, Supreme Court, & Law of the Land*, accessed July 25, 2015, <http://studythepast.com/texas/hernandez>.

argued that the system had failed Mexican American children, “We have the right to put our children in the white schools.” Responding to the critique, school board president, Sam Crowther replied, “The school board as a unit opposes the entrance of the Mexican children into the white schools.” He continued, “Their entrance would be demoralizing to our school system” creating a “world of discord.”²⁸ Ultimately, this segregationist policy stayed in place.

West Texans prominently displayed the contradictory nature of white supremacy and whiteness in the early years of the twentieth century. Maintaining the civilized persona that white-supremacist ideology seemed to demand often verged on betrayal of whiteness itself. Whites who reacted violently when dealing with racial issues were chastised for falling prey to the barbarity unbecoming of white men. Others received criticism for racially intolerant actions while being guilty of the same such intolerant rhetoric and practice.

²⁸ *San Angelo Standard*, June 20, 1910.

CHAPTER IV

VIOLENCE AND RHETORIC IN THE TURBULENT 1920s

In the midst of the violence that plagued the 1920s, West Texans voiced disapproval of racial violence happening in the nation while unambiguously approving of the ideology motivating the acts of violence. Racial terrorism through lynching, the Tulsa race riot of 1921, and the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan marked the decade. Although many white West Texans agreed with white supremacist ideology, some did not condone the violence perpetrated against African Americans as it seemingly betrayed the idea of the civilized white man. As racially motivated violence spread across the nation in the 1920s, some West Texans seemed to see the violent behavior as abhorrent and, perhaps, a betrayal of whiteness. In the 1920s, West Texas towns, like Ballinger, San Angelo, and Big Lake provided an example of the often disconnected nature of white supremacist rhetoric with regard to racial violence as an act unbecoming a “white man,” and giving in to such passions.

Some white West Texans believed whiteness could be lost, thus revealing the arbitrary and fluid characteristics of whiteness itself. Referencing a story of a white man living with African Americans in 1921, a commentator to the *Ballinger Banner Ledger* opined, “The fellow over at Denison who had been living with negroes and passing for a negro for ten years may make” some “believe he is a white man, but he is not a white man.” For the author “any man who associates with a negro that long can’t be anything but a

negro.”¹ Whiteness could be forfeited. Therefore, preserving one’s whiteness depended on proper behavior. Commenting on a case of racial identity in Fort Worth in which the defendant stood accused of “passing as a white man when the complaint alleges that he is a negro,” the *Banner Ledger* employed a violent pun to drive a widely held feeling amongst white West Texans: “the Fort Worth citizen who is not able to tell whether he is a negro or white man is in bad if he must depend on a Texas court to determine his race standing. Under the circumstances maybe the trial will result in a hung jury.”² In these instances the rhetoric of white supremacy reveals the arbitrariness and the fluidity of visual perceptions of whiteness, and yet society’s need to maintain this often arbitrary color line.

Perhaps due to the national attention being paid to racial violence and the Klan in the 1920s, some needed to clarify the ideal of whiteness as inherently civilized with an adherence to law and order, even if many whites agreed with the racial motivation behind the savagery inflicted on non-whites.

Tulsa, Oklahoma played host to one of the most horrific, single occurrences of racial violence in U. S. history. The Tulsa Race Riot of 1921 erupted out of accusations that nineteen-year-old shoe shiner, Dick Rowland, attempted to rape a white elevator operator, Sarah Page, on May 30, 1921. Although Rowland may have only stepped on Page’s foot causing her to scream, the incident rapidly evolved from “grabbing” to “rape” in a matter of hours, leading to Rowland’s arrest. Apparently incited by the local paper’s alleged call to lynch Rowland, a mob of hundreds of white men gathered at the courthouse demanding Rowland be turned over to them. Soon after, approximately 25 armed African American

¹ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, September 26 1921.

² *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, June 2, 1922.

men arrived to protect Rowland from the mob. Reportedly, as the African Americans stood down, a white man tried to disarm one of the men, causing an accidental discharge that sparked a deadly riot. From May 31 through June 1, whites descended upon Tulsa's African-American community, indiscriminately shooting, looting, and setting fires, destroying 35 square blocks, leaving thousands homeless. Although African American Tulsans bravely defended their community, an estimated 35 to 300 hundred people died in the riot, mostly African Americans. Whites laid blame for the riot squarely on the African American community. No white men were ever convicted of murder or arson.³

Some white West Texans viewed the Tulsa riot as a lawless overreaction. The editor of the *Ballinger Banner Ledger* stated that although Tulsa "may have a few less blacks within her gates" the town "has a black spot on her name." Arguing that "no time or mercy should be spared in punishing the black fiend who outraged the white girl [but] two wrongs do not make a right" and "it would have been far better to let him go unpunished than to sacrifice the lives of a half dozen innocent beings." With emphasis on civility and law and order, the editor concluded that "other communities should profit by the mistakes of Tulsa."⁴ In this example, the loss of control and civility on the part of white Tulsans could be seen by many whites as a betrayal of white supremacy.

In 1921, in the town of Winters, Texas, situated 50 miles northeast of San Angelo, two "boys" plead guilty to whipping an African-American and each received a fine of \$26.10. Although the reason for the assault remained unclear action against the assailants

³ Oklahoma Commission to Study the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921, *Tulsa Race Riot: A Report by the Oklahoma Commission to Study the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921* (February 28, 2001), accessed February 18, 2015 <http://www.okhistory.org/research/forms/freport.pdf>.

⁴ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, June 10, 1921.

came a month after the incident “when a number of good people of the Winters country, desiring that the good name of Winters be maintained, appealed to the officers to enforce the law.”⁵ Maintaining the image of white civility in the face of racial violence, the white people of Winters sought to uphold law and order.

In the 1920s, the Ku Klux Klan enjoyed a resurgence throughout the nation. Broadening their range of focus from white supremacy, the new Klan championed anti-Catholicism, anti-Semitism, and anti-immigration.⁶ Many white West Texans seemed ambivalent regarding the rise of the hooded order. Interestingly, many condemned the Klan while supporting the ideology that motivated the group to intimidate and take violent action against non-whites. Ballinger reflected the disconnect between ideology and action, and the difficulty of reconciling unlawful acts with white supremacist ideology.

As rumors circulated around the Concho Country regarding the presence of the Klan, some West Texans questioned the necessity of the group and the quality of character and Klan members. The editor of the *Banner Ledger* speculated, “If there are any” Klansmen around Ballinger, these “degenerates” haven’t found “any material to work on” or with. “Tar and feathers are not as plentiful here as back in the stick” but there might be “a few degenerates not so far away.”⁷ The author implied that only uncivilized, backward, uncultured, and ignorant people joined the Klan, calling them “degenerates” from “the sticks.” The *Ledger* seemed to accuse the self-appointed defenders of whiteness as being a

⁵ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, June 27, 1921.

⁶ Barr, *Black Texans*, 139; Hale, *Making Whiteness*, 144.

⁷ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, July 29, 1921.

little less-white. And due to the lack of “material to work on,” the editor believed the organization would “die a natural death if let alone.”⁸

Many white West Texans criticized the Ku Klux Klan’s practice of intimidation and violence while supporting the ideological motivation behind their actions. In response to a story out of Corsicana in 1921 where Klan intimidation of African American cotton workers who had been striking for better wages occurred, the *Banner Ledger* commented that “the Ku Klux Klan may intend well, but its methods will not work in a civilized country, and the order is doomed to die.”⁹ However, the critical tone began to change its form. Responding to the portrayal of the group in national papers, an editorial comment appeared in the *Ledger* with a slightly different tone. Believing that publicity given to the Klan “may have a tendency to prejudice many people against the order,” the author again stated that the organization would die off “or prove its good purpose.” Those who stayed in their, implied, racial place and “behaves himself is in no danger of being molested.”¹⁰ Some believed that there would be no need for a Klan if the legal system were not a “mass of loop-holes,” and, thus placed fault for violence on “law makers.”¹¹ The ambivalence toward the Ku Klux Klan echoed by white West Texans seemed to imply an uncomfortable acknowledgment of the problem of reconciling white supremacist ideology and the glaring contradiction of unlawful acts of racial violence in the name of white supremacy.

⁸ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, August 26, 1921.

⁹ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, September 9, 1921.

¹⁰ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, September 24, 1921.

¹¹ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, October 13, 1921.

As more evidence supported the rumors of Klan activity in West Texas, criticism of the order softened, ultimately voicing approval for its presence, perhaps due to local involvement. The appearance of the organization in Winters prompted the *Banner Ledger* to announce that the Ku Klux Klan's "fundamental principle and purpose is intended for nothing but good," and that "any American-born citizen who is 100 per cent American" and Christian would be eligible for membership.¹² In July of 1922 the Ku Klux Klan made their "official debut in Ballinger." A letter sent to the local paper stated that the order believed "in the absolute supremacy of the white race and in maintaining its social cast and dignity." Ironically, the letter announced the group's intention to uphold the law and "denounce and condemn all law breakers and all infractions of the law." Peppered throughout the official statement were references to purity, and the protection of white-womanhood.¹³ In this example, some white West Texans displayed the schizophrenic, contradictory nature of white supremacist ideology and the emphasis on "law and order" as an essential characteristic of whiteness.

Proclaiming to be a an order based on Protestant Christian principles and patriotism, the Ku Klux Klan garnered the support of some fellow West Texas Christians. In Miles, an evangelist orated that "the Ku Klux Klan was the hope of the country." According to reports, the audience hearing the proclamation agreed and "believe[d] what the minister said the Klan stood for to be just and right." The minister invited those who did not agree to leave as a group representing the local Ku Klux Klan appeared at a Christian revival in Miles to lead

¹² *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, March 10, 1922.

¹³ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, July 7, 1922.

the congregation in prayer. As the Klan members filed out, “the large congregation applauded.”¹⁴ To many, the organization personified white law and order.

In March 1921, with a vote of nine to six, the San Angelo Board of City Development resolved to oppose organization of the Ku Klux Klan in their city. However, it would seem that a group had already organized and the opposition came “about a month too late.”¹⁵ Ultimately, the Ku Klux Klan “officially” announced their presence in San Angelo in December, 1922. Interestingly, the Board declared that “the people [of San Angelo] were peaceful and law abiding and that there was no cause for the secret order to come into the city.”¹⁶ However, some white San Angeloans felt the need for the Ku Klux Klan as evidenced by its existence in the city.

In 1922, the editor of the *Ballinger Banner Ledger* stated, “As a rule the man who respects the moral laws of a country respects all laws, and he does not let fear of punishment be his guide in choosing between right and wrong.”¹⁷ However, eleven months prior to this proclamation the citizens of Ballinger took part in the plague of racial terrorism gripping the nation.

Three miles outside of Ballinger, shortly before noon, on November 30, 1921, whites lynched 15 year-old, African American Robert Mutore for allegedly raping a 9 year-old white girl.¹⁸ Only a few hours had elapsed between the time the alleged attack occurred and

¹⁴ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, October 20, 1922.

¹⁵ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, March 3, 1921.

¹⁶ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, December 15, 1922.

¹⁷ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, October 20, 1922.

the moment of Mutore's death at the hands of 25 to 30 masked assailants. The attack on Annie Kolesnikebic occurred the night before at the Park Hotel, leaving her "severely hurt" and "mutilated."¹⁹ Mutore worked at the hotel, as did the child's mother, who reported the assault. The child's mother told the hotel's superintendent who then detained Mutore until the sheriff arrived to make the arrest. Despite Mutore's pronouncements of innocence, he was taken to the city jail. Sheriff J. P. Flynt, hearing rumors of the formation of a lynching party, decided to remove Mutore from Ballinger to Abilene. In the rush to evacuate Mutore, Flynt apparently "did not have time to even arm himself or call on deputies to accompany him."²⁰ As Flynt drove toward Abilene, a convoy of masked men overtook the sheriff's car. They dragged Mutore from the car, chained him to a post and shot the 15 year-old boy to death.²¹

Following Mutore's execution, many in Ballinger expressed "regret that such a tragedy had been enacted in" the town. However, the "majority of the citizens" applauded "the short work made of the case, and all were of one mind that death was a cheap price to pay for such crime." Some believed that "red tape court procedure" would stand in the way of justice.²² A few people, however, recognized that this lawless act of racial violence could blight the ideal of civilized whiteness: "Ballinger may drop a letter out of the law occasionally, but there are some people here who do not believe in straining at a gnat and

¹⁸ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, November 30, 1921; *Dallas Morning News*, December 1, 1921; *San Angelo Standard*, November 30, 1921.

¹⁹ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, November 30, 1921; *San Angelo Standard*, November 30, 1921.

²⁰ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, November 30, 1921.

²¹ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, November 30, 1921; *Dallas Morning News*, December 1, 1921; *San Angelo Standard*, November 30, 1921.

²² *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, November 30, 1921.

swallowing a camel.”²³ Perhaps in an attempt to justify the lawlessness of Mutore’s murder, the editor of the *Banner Ledger* stated, “Only one felony case filed in this county in three months, and the accused got away. Runnels County people believe in obeying the law as well as enforcing the law.”²⁴ Conceivably, “law” in this case, refers to the unwritten law of white supremacy. However, acting outside the law to enforce the law is criminal. Thus, white supremacy had been defended, but at a cost to law and order and whiteness.

The next incident in the Concho Valley occurred in 1926 when a mob of twenty to thirty white men strode through the city of Big Lake with an ultimatum for the African American residents: “Clear out before six o’clock” or suffer violent consequences. The *Big Lake Wildcat* reported that many “industrious Negroes” had planned to leave the town. The editor expressed disapproval of the demand due to the negative impact it could have on local businesses, as well as the illegality of such a demand. Local businesses could lose their “efficient and dependable help.” “At best it is hard to get competent help at hotels and restaurants, and it is certain that reliable white help cannot be had at anything like the charges made by the negro help,” the editor argued. In short, African Americans were apparently needed to do the jobs white men in Big Lake believed beneath them. The editor also pointed to the betrayal of law and order. The *Wildcat* opined that the mob of white men acted “without authority of the law.” The paper observed, “Other interested citizens who believe in law and order and a free country where laborers can be protected.” The editor of the *Wildcat* reassured its readers that the publication was “not a negro-lover by any means and holds no brief for them.” However, the citizens would not stand for mob law as it is betrayed the idea

²³ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, December 2, 1921.

²⁴ *Ballinger Banner Ledger*, December 5, 1921.

of civilized society. Some even expressed a willingness to put up a reward for “the detention of any or all the mob.”²⁵

Aside from the negative impact such an exodus would have on the labor supply, many white Big Lake residents agreed with white supremacist ideology regarding the inferiority of African Americans, but refused to act unlawfully to support it in this case. Perhaps they believed that such uncivilized acts would remove a degree of whiteness or at the very least hurt local businesses, proving that economic concerns sometimes trumped racial ones.

Some whites in the Concho Valley did not see the presence of non-white labor as a threat to white supremacy. White employers valued Mexican Americans in the Concho Valley region as a source of cheap labor. In 1928, some San Angeloans protested federal immigration reform, the Box Bill, that limited the number of Mexicans coming to the United States. Many believed the Box Bill would harm the livestock and cotton industries, “which depends upon cheap Mexican labor.”²⁶ In this case, the removal of non-whites from the labor pool threatened economic white supremacy. In 1925, the editor of the San Angelo *Standard* responded to racial critiques of Mexican Americans as inferior stating, “Such declarations are insults to every Mexican.” The editor believed such criticism as “harmful to the growing friendship between the Mexican and American Republics, harmful to American business, and harmful to the peace of the world.”²⁷

²⁵ *Big Lake Wildcat*, Big Lake, Texas, May 1, 1926.

²⁶ *San Angelo Standard*, June 10, 1928.

²⁷ *San Angelo Standard*, May 20, 1925.

Many white West Texans supported the ideology of white supremacy, the ideal of whiteness, and white's supposed affinity for law and civility. However, when some whites, driven by the same sense of racial superiority, acted outside the constraints of the law, expressed white supremacy through racial terrorism, upstanding members of society claimed these ruffians theoretically betrayed the whiteness they claimed to champion. Complicit in condoning the lynching of Mutore in Ballinger as necessary, many white Ballinger residents perhaps believed that law and order was legitimately carried out and thus reconciled white supremacy and mob violence. However, such actions exposed the contradiction between white supremacist rhetoric of law and order and racial violence enacted in the name of whiteness.

CHAPTER V

THE DAUGHTERS OF THE LOST CAUSE AND WHITENESS

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, San Angelo, like many places in the South, witnessed a rise in Confederate memorial groups and events. The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), organized at Victoria, Texas in 1896, functioned as a benevolence society across the state, acting out of a sense of obligation to the families of those who fought and sacrificed for the Confederacy. Through memorial ceremonies and monument building, the UDC sought to preserve the history and memory of the Confederacy and its veterans, and its white heritage.¹ The San Angelo chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy chartered itself on September 3, 1909.² Galvanized by an almost religiously fanatical belief in Confederate Lost Cause ideology, the San Angelo chapter of the UDC championed a Southern white supremacist heritage that many believed God had ordained. Lost Cause ideology claimed that the Civil War was fought over state's rights and not slavery and that slaves were happy with their divine placement overseen by benevolent masters. The North attacked the honor of the South. Lost Cause proponents portrayed the war as good versus evil, the immoral North attacked a divinely created Southern society and culture fulfilling God's plan for mankind. Within Lost Cause ideology dwelled an ideal of whiteness and civility.

¹ Caroline E. Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008) 169-171.

² *San Angelo Standard*, San Angelo, Texas, October 13, 1912; Texas State Historical Association, "United Daughters of the Confederacy," accessed November 5, 2010 <http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/vsu01>

In Nashville, Tennessee, in 1894 the United Daughters of the Confederacy formed with the purpose of honoring the Confederacy and its antebellum heritage through memorialization, preservation of true Southern history, benevolence, and education. Similar in purpose to the Ladies' Memorial Association already in existence, the Daughters were younger, with members having come of age during Reconstruction. Founded at a time when whites in the south were rolling back civil rights legislation and passing new segregationist, the Daughters, according to historian Caroline Janney, seemed more in step with maintaining white supremacy than their predecessors, the Ladies' Memorial Association. For Janney, "many white women...used the Daughters to commemorate the traditional privileges of race, gender, and class by casting them as 'natural' parts of the region's history."³

The legacy and heritage of the Old South and the principles of the Confederacy, so dear to the hearts of the San Angelo Daughters, demanded the relegation of African Americans to a state of indefinite servitude. In the antebellum era, those who had defended slavery in Texas saw the legitimacy of the institution as part of the natural order that God had created. Many Texans believed that a divinely sanctioned, natural state of servitude befitted and benefitted African Americans. White masters simply carried out God's work, playing their role in the Almighty's great plan for humanity. Anyone who interfered with this sacrosanct design went against God.⁴ For many Texans, slavery had fostered equality, at least within the white community. The San Angelo Daughters sought to perpetuate this heritage, a heritage of white supremacy that the state of Texas fought to preserve in 1861.

³ Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past*, 171.

⁴ Randolph Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 212.

In the early twentieth-century, many San Angeloans exhibited the racist proclivity inherent in Lost Cause dogma. In response to the invitation of Booker T. Washington to the White House by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901, the San Angelo *Standard* reprinted a poem that graced the pages of many Southern papers. Entitled “Niggers in the White House,” the poem embodied Southern racist sentiment that rejected the perceived placement of African Americans on the same social plane as whites.⁵ In 1911, the *Standard* placed an article reviewing the semi-centennial celebration in Alabama of the founding of the Confederacy adjacent to a story on escaped African American convicts in Florida.⁶ The location of the two stories seems to be less than coincidental, as they served as an expression – or a reminder – of the Old Southern admonition that slavery was the proper state for African Americans. Pro-Slavery advocates suggested that African Americans could not be left to their own devices, else suffer self-destruction.⁷

Contradicting the Lost Cause narrative of the “kindly master and his faithful slaves,” white San Angelo resident William McNeill remembered a different antebellum scene. For McNeill, slaves “made many people rich and got nothing but punishment as a reward.” Taking issue with the traditional depiction of the “benevolent master,” McNeill explained that many “tell that some of the masters were good but I never did see a good one.” Recounting the brutality of the practice of whipping slaves, McNeill revealed that “there is never a day passes, that I don’t think things over and wonder if my own dear, dead mother went to heaven or not,” for he had witnessed her meting out punishment to a family slave.

⁵ *San Angelo Standard*, February 14, 1902.

⁶ *San Angelo Standard*, February 19, 1911.

⁷ James L. Roark, *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1977), 107.

However, when discussing fugitives, McNeill displayed white Southern mainstream perceptions of African American slaves. For Mr. McNeill, runaways “never got away, there were always some good slaves to tell on others.”⁸ Perhaps attempting to justify the antebellum past, McNeill and Confederate organizations in the early twentieth-century sought the fictional cooperation, within Lost Cause doctrine, of the loyal slave who “knew their place.” And the UDC became exemplars in the promotion of such ideological romance.

Within a year of its founding, the San Angelo UDC made a showing of its loyal support for the Cause and its leader, Jefferson Davis. Celebrating Davis’s one-hundred second birthday, the UDC hosted a memorial on the courthouse lawn. It treated some two thousand attendees to songs, marches, and speeches in honor of not only the Confederate president, but of the Confederacy and its heroes. As the program turned to memorializing the Confederate soldier an unidentified speaker addressed the animus under which the South fought. “Let no one say what the South did was a mistake . . . the defense of principle is never a mistake,” the speaker stated.⁹ The South, the orator continued, owed no apology for the existence of the Confederacy.

Maintaining a patriotic adherence to the principles of the Confederacy and the Old South became a familiar theme in UDC oratories. Addressing the reunion of the Mountain Remnant Brigade of Confederate veterans in 1912 San Angelo UDC officer Bettie Magruder declared that the Daughters sought to instruct a new “generation the name and fame and the

⁸ Ruby Mosley, *Mr. William McNeill, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 2, 1938*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers’ Project, 1936-1940, accessed January 2, 2011, <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:1:/temp/>.

⁹ *Dallas Morning News*, June 16, 1910; *San Angelo Standard*, June 5, 1910.

opinions and principles you set forth to the world . . . of a cause so dear to your heart.”¹⁰ In a speech given before the San Angelo UDC later that year, Magruder begged the Daughters to remain “loyal to the cause . . . and true to the principles for which” the Confederacy fought.¹¹ In both cases, Magruder spoke for many members who believed that these principles and truths would never die, regardless of the Cause’s detractors. The Daughters would continue to keep “the fires of patriotism forever burning on our hearthstones.”¹² In greeting the Texas division of the United Confederate Veterans at the state convention in San Angelo in 1927, Magruder assured those in attendance that the “women of the old south” were “helping to keep the spirit of the Confederacy alive” by perpetuating “in the history of the land the truth about the conflict between the states.”¹³ The Lost Cause perception of the patriotic principles of freedom and states’ rights espoused by UDC members as the impetus for which their fathers willingly risked life and limb saturated the rhetoric of memorial ceremonies, veterans’ reunions, and the San Angelo Daughters’ activities.

Through such oratorical hagiography, Betty Magruder expressed a commonly held romanticized view by many in the South toward the Confederate soldier declaring, “his splendid valor has tinted the firmament of the ages with unequalled and unparalleled glory.”¹⁴ In 1911, the San Angelo chapter honored the birthdays of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson at the local opera house. Evoking the language of religion the Daughters

¹⁰ *San Angelo Standard*, August 8, 1912.

¹¹ *San Angelo Standard*, October 9, 1912.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *San Angelo Standard*, October 6, 1927.

¹⁴ *Dallas Morning News*, June 19, 1910; *San Angelo Standard*, June 5, 1910.

invited locals to come “worship at the shrine of the past glory of the Southland.”¹⁵ The deification of Confederate heroes also engendered a romanticized discourse. Speaking in front of a reunion of Confederate veterans in San Angelo, a Daughter declared in August 1912, “From your knightly ancestors sprung that loveliest of flowers and sweetest of essences of all ages – chivalry to woman – Southern chivalry, the proud boast of all the world.”¹⁶ The idyllic, chivalric Southern gentleman, defending a morally correct society that honored women and paternalistically cared for their loyal slaves, permeated the speeches of the UDC.

Reveling in the “glory of the prowess of the splendid soldiery” that marked the Confederacy, members of the UDC, along with Confederate veterans groups in San Angelo felt obliged to protect and pass down “their most glorious heritage.”¹⁷ Many felt that the history of the South and the Civil War, and thus “truth”, were under attack by Northern writers. In 1909, the San Angelo camp of Confederate veterans objected to what they perceived as unfair accounts of the Civil War contained in books residing in the local high school library. For them, the objectionable books did not give “the South the credit it deserves.” The veterans took up the matter with the city superintendent. A committee, comprised of members of the local Confederate camp and the school board, formed to purge from libraries all opprobrious material.¹⁸ At the Texas state conference of the UDC in 1912, San Angelo chapter president, Faith Harrison Ledford, “won applause by the statement that

¹⁵ *San Angelo Standard*, January 18, 1911.

¹⁶ *San Angelo Standard*, August 11, 1912.

¹⁷ *San Angelo Standard*, June 5, 1910.

¹⁸ *Dallas Morning News*, August 10, 1909.

the Daughters in her home town had burned sixty-nine books in the public school library.”¹⁹ According to Ledford, thereafter the school board had sought the approval of the group before accepting texts: “Let the Daughters of the Confederacy pass on them.”²⁰

The sense of duty to the memory of the Old South, the Civil War, and Reconstruction led to the formation of local children’s auxiliary groups. The San Angelo Daughters organized a children’s auxiliary in 1911 “chiefly to teach the children history in a series of stories, so plainly and correctly told that they cannot fail to be benefited.”²¹ In 1912, an orator at a San Angelo chapter meeting declared that “a great deal is expected of the UDC . . . the old are looking to us to preserve the tradition of the South and the young are depending on us for truthful information.”²²

As a guide in the edification of the children in the auxiliaries, the UDC relied on Galvestonian Cornelia Branch Stone’s *Catechism for Children* (1904). Designed in a “question and response” format, the *Catechism* sought to inculcate Southern youth with the “correct” history of the South. Exemplary of the Lost Cause mythology, the *Catechism* painted a portrait of an oppressive North violating the God-given, Constitutional rights of the slave-holding South. When asked “what causes led to the war between the States,” children were to respond: “The disregard, on the part of the States of the North, for the rights of the Southern or slave-holding States.” When prompted to identify the violated rights, the proper response was “the rights to regulate their own affairs and to hold slaves as property.”

¹⁹ *Dallas Morning News*, December 5, 1912.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *San Angelo Standard*, March 20, 1912.

²² *San Angelo Standard*, October 13, 1912.

Interestingly, and contrary to some interpretations of the Lost Cause narrative, Stone acknowledged that the issue of slavery was the reason for the war.²³ The Lost Cause narrative, exhibited in the *Catechism*, now had been solidified in curricula.

The “principle” of the Old South, zealously and fanatically championed by the UDC and justified as a love for liberty, freedom and states’ rights represented at its core an almost religious devotion to the ideology of white supremacy. Many in the former Confederacy believed that the sacred principles of their Southern, white heritage had been threatened by the Civil War and Reconstruction, and fading memory. Nowhere was this demonstrated more than in an address by Faith Harrison Ledford, president of the San Angelo chapter of the UDC, at the reunion of the Mountain Remnant Brigade of Confederate veterans in 1912.

Ledford claimed credentials as a true Daughter of the Confederacy. Her father, General H.K. Harrison, had commanded the Twenty Third Georgia Cavalry in the Confederate army. Ledford had served as chapter president in San Angelo, as well as local president of the State Textbook Board Commission.²⁴

In a speech entitled “Our Heritage,” one the San Angelo *Standard* proclaimed to be a “literary gem that all readers will treasure,” Ledford laid bare the Southern legacy of white supremacy.²⁵ Believing the glorious and “noble heritage” of the ideal of the Confederacy to be a gift from God, Ledford echoed the racist ideology that permeated the Lost Cause mythology of the South. For Ledford, it was “God’s will that the white race should be the

²³ Cornelia Branch Stone, *U.D.C. Catechism for Children* (Galveston: J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C., 1912; originally published 1904).

²⁴ *Dallas Morning News*, July 23, 1910.

²⁵ *San Angelo Standard*, August 11, 1912.

ruling race,” and the purest of “the white race in the world exists in the South.” The existence of such a pure white race in the South came about, Ledford elaborated, “because that very ideal” which created the Confederacy, “has prevented the South from amalgamating its blood with the lower strata of other races.” Having the support of God’s love, the Almighty seemingly approved of the Confederacy and the white South’s anti-miscegenation practices. The finest, most pure “blood of the white races of Europe,” Ledford continued, had settled the South; the “lower strata” flocked to the North. Those of the baser, Northern sort were tainted by atheistic, anarchic, and capitalistic tendencies. Those in the East and North had intermarried and mixed with other, miscreant races, causing them to lose sight of God and to embrace commercialism. In short, Northern whites were less white. In contrast, Southern whites were “God fearing, God loving, God serving people,” of which, claimed Ledford, “is the very foundation of the ideal of the white race,” and thus, the foundation of the Confederacy. Therefore, the Civil War had been fought to protect racial purity. The South, Ledford asserted, “bled and died that this world might have this heritage of a perfected white race.” For the orator, God destined the Southern white race to be the saviors of the world as it fought to civilize and Christianize the globe. Drawing a parallel between the struggle to maintain “holy” racial purity in the endeavor to Christianize and civilize the world, and the one Confederate soldiers undertook, Ledford offered a narrative of a crusading South, fighting for God against tyranny, atheism, and anarchy. For Faith Harrison Ledford, and many white West Texans, the principles and ideals of the Old South, and the Confederacy, rested in white supremacy.²⁶

²⁶ *San Angelo Standard*, August 18, 1912.

Historian Rollin G. Osterweis, in his investigation into Lost Cause mythology, turns to the ideas of the philosopher Ernst Cassirer to help explain the phenomenon of the transformation of what Osterweis calls “antebellum Southern Romanticism” into the post-war Lost Cause myth. Cassirer argued that myth is born of deeply held emotion. “Myth cannot be described as bare emotion because it is expression of emotion” that becomes image and “active process,” Cassirer believed.²⁷ The development of Lost Cause sentiment in the Concho Valley can be understood, perhaps, as the emotional expressions of the mournful, sense of loss of a once great society based on the premise of white supremacy and white civility and the sense of betrayal within what Eugene Genovese saw in a paternalistic master/slave relationship of reciprocity.²⁸ The Old South crumbled before emancipation, but Lost Cause mythology rose from the ashes.

The San Angelo chapter of the Texas State United Daughters of the Confederacy sought to perpetuate the Lost Cause heritage by establishing local educational efforts (as in the Children’s Auxiliary), memorializing veterans and the Confederacy, and intervening in local libraries to promote the ideals of the Old South. The heritage was one of racial superiority. Arguing that the Civil War had been fought to preserve patriotic principles of liberty, freedom, and states’ rights, many Confederate remembrance associations attempted to remove the issue of slavery from Civil War memory. The UDC embraced white supremacist ideology as revealed in Faith Harrison Ledford’s speech. As Caroline Janney stated, the UDC looked to the past “as a means to shape race and gender relations in the New

²⁷ Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 43; Rollin G. Osterweis, *The Myth of the Lost Cause* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1973), 7.

²⁸ Eugene D. Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), 32.

South.”²⁹ Ledford and many white West Texans regarded Southern white people as more civilized and purer than other whites in the United States and, thus, more white. Attempting to justify the glorification of the Confederacy and its soldiers, San Angelo UDC members, like Ledford and Bettie Magruder, highlighted an ambiguous “principle” that their honored veterans had sacrificed to preserve and the arbitrary nature of whiteness. The principle of states’ right to hold slaves in order to maintain white supremacy and equality among whites, buttressed by a racist ideology of a people destined by God to civilize the world, seemed to be the foundation of the Lost Cause and the heritage treasured by the San Angelo United Daughters of the Confederacy.

²⁹ Janney, *Burying the Dead but Not the Past*, 171.

CONCLUSION

For many white West Texans in the Concho Valley, whiteness represented a shining beacon of civility and moral correctness endowed through the possession of a white skin tone. Most non-whites were seen as morally handicapped, with a tendency toward criminality and violence. On the surface of white supremacist ideology adherence to law and order seemed absolute in theory. However, ironically, in practice some white Texans in the Concho Valley acted outside the law in response to perceived threats to white supremacy and, therefore, betrayed civility and thus their own whiteness.

At times, attributes generally afforded to whites could be imposed on non-whites, thus displaying the ambiguity of whiteness. Conversely, whites could lose degrees of whiteness dependent on their actions, or where in the United States one was born. Even the Ku Klux Klan's whiteness could come into question due to acts of racial terrorism and brutality unbecoming a white man. Although many white West Texans agreed with the white supremacist ideology motivating racial violence, some stopped short of condoning the practice. Even living with African Americans could cause a white Texan to be considered "trash" and completely lose their whiteness.

The Concho Valley region of west Texas provides an interesting example of how racial perceptions and relations can develop. From the founding of San Angelo around a frontier fort that garrisoned African American soldiers tasked with providing a safe environment for white settlers, to eruptions of racially charged violence the region saw subtle changes to white racial attitudes.

In the first quarter of the twentieth century some whites in the Concho country exposed the contradictory nature of perceptions of whiteness in the ideal of the civility of white men. In San Angelo, whites flirted with the idea of complete removal of African Americans from their town, only to receive chastisement by other towns for such a lawless idea, and not before an elderly African American had been assaulted as a result. Violent reactions to perceived threats to white supremacy exposed a seeming betrayal of civilized whiteness. Some spoke out against lawless acts of violence directed at African Americans only to excuse such violence in their home town, as in the case of the lynching of Robert Mutore in Ballinger.

The question of whiteness seemed ever in flux. As in the example provided by Faith Harrison Ledford who felt Northerners lacked the true characteristics of whiteness, possession of white skin did not always grant one access into the group. At times maintenance of one's whiteness seemed crucial. Living a morally questionable life and associating in certain ways with non-whites could mean a loss in a degree of whiteness, as evidenced by the case of the death of Charles Cooksey at a Juneteenth celebration. White San Angelo residents seemed to excuse Cooksey's African American killer, in light of Cooksey's drunken carousing at an African American event.

Many white West Texans became guilty of the very lawless, immoral, and violent attributes afforded non-whites. The adherence to law and order as an inherent characteristic of whiteness rang true for many until white supremacy in their community seemed threatened. Violent and unlawful reactions to these perceived threats betrayed white supremacist ideology, and the white characteristic trait of civility. Thus, they exposed the

schizophrenic, contradictory nature of white supremacy, and the ambiguous and arbitrary notion of whiteness. In the process, they became less white, and, at times, inhuman.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival Collections

Tom Green County District Court Criminal Case Files, West Texas Collection, Porter Henderson Library, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas.

Tweedy Letters, West Texas Collection, Porter Henderson Library, Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas.

Newspapers

Ballinger Banner-Leader, Ballinger, Texas, 1907-1913.

Ballinger Banner Ledger, Ballinger, Texas, 1913-1955.

Big Lake Wildcat, Big Lake, Texas, 1925-1926.

Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Texas, 1870-1955.

Ozona Enterprise, Ozona, Texas, 1906-1910.

San Angelo Standard, San Angelo, Texas, 1889-1955.

San Antonio Daily Express, San Antonio, Texas, 1881.

Robert Lee Observer, Robert Lee, Texas, 1917.

Printed Primary Sources

Gammel, Hans Peter Mareus Neilsen. *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897 Volume 5, Book, 1898*, accessed September 7, 2012, <http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metaph6727/>

Hammond, James H. *Speech of Hon. James H. Hammond, of South Carolina, on the Admission of Kansas, under the Lecompton Constitution*. Washington: Lemuel Towers, 1858. Accessed September 19, 2012. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/loc.ark:/13960/t7jq19w4m>.

McDaniel, H. F. and N. A. Taylor. *The Coming Empire; or Two Thousand Miles in Texas on Horseback*. New York: A. S. Barnes & Company, 1877. Accessed July 15, 1877, <https://books.google.com>.

Notson, William M. *Fort Concho Medical History: January, 1869 to July, 1872*. San Angelo, Texas: Fort Concho Preservation and Museum, 1974.

Secession Convention of Texas, February 2, 1861. *A Declaration of the Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union*. Texas State Library and Archives Commission. Accessed July 26, 2015, <http://www.tsl.state.tx.us/ref/abouttx/secession/2feb1861.html>.

Stone, Cornelia Branch. *U.D.C. Catechism for Children*. Galveston: J.E.B. Stuart Chapter No. 10, U.D.C., 1912. Originally published 1904.

Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910, Volume III. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913. Accessed July 11, 2015, www.census.gov/prod/www/decennial.html

Interviews

Mosely, Ruby. *Juanita Hernandez [sic] Garcia, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 13, 1938*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 4, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:8:./temp/>.

----- *Mr. William Tell Jolly, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 10-16, 1938*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 4, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:19:./temp/>.

----- *Mr. Eugene McCrohan, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 11, 1938*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 2, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:13:./temp/>.

----- *Mr. William McNeill, San Angelo, Texas, Interviewed, February 2, 1938*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 2, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:1:./temp/>.

----- *Mrs. R. A. Wyckoff, San Angelo Texas, Interviewed*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 4, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:1:./temp/>.

Doyle, Elizabeth. *Noah Armstrong, San Angelo, Texas*. Library of Congress, American Life Histories: Manuscripts from the Federal Writers' Project, 1936-1940. Accessed January 2, 2011. <http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?wpa:6:./temp/>.

Secondary Sources

Books

Allen, Theodore. *The Invention of the White Race: Volume One: Racial Oppression and Social Control*. London: Verso, 2002.

Anderson, Gary Clayton. *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820-1875*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.

Barr, Alwyn. *Black Texans: A History of African Americans in Texas, 1528-1995*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.

- Baum, Dale. *The Shattering of Texas Unionism: Politics in the Lone Star State During the Civil War Era*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998.
- Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 2001.
- Buenger, Walter and Arnaldo De León, eds. *Beyond Texas Through Time: Breaking Away from Past Interpretations*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2011.
- Campbell, Randolph. *An Empire for Slavery: the Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- Cash, Wilbur J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.
- Cassirer, Ernst. *Language and Myth*. New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1953.
- . *The Myth of the State*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.
- Clemens, Gus. *The Concho Country: A History of the Concho River Region of West Texas*. San Antonio: Mulberry Avenue Books, 1980.
- Cox, Karen L. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of the Confederate Culture*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.
- Crouch, Barry A. *The Dance of Freedom: Texas African Americans During Reconstruction*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007.
- De León, Arnaldo. *Racial Frontiers: Africans, Chinese, and Mexicans in Western America, 1848-1890*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
- . *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes Toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983.
- . *San Angeleños: Mexican Americans in San Angelo, Texas*. San Angelo: Fort Concho Museum Press, 1985.
- Foley, Neil. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.
- Franklin, John Hope. *Reconstruction: After the Civil War*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Fredrickson, George M. *White Supremacy: A Comparative Study in American and South African History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Genovese, Eugene D. *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South*. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- . *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Glasrud, Bruce A., Paul H. Carlson, and Tai D. Kreidler, eds. *Slavery to Integration: Black Americans in West Texas*. Abilene: State House Press, 2007.

- Green, Bill. *The Dancing was Lively, Fort Concho, Texas: A Social History, 1867 to 1882*. San Angelo, Texas: Fort Concho Sketches Publishing Company, 1974.
- Hale, Grace Elizabeth. *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940*. New York: Vintage Books, 1998.
- Heyse, Amy L. "Teachers of the Lost Cause: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and Their Catechisms." PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2006.
<http://drum.lib.umd.edu/bitstream/1903/4060/1/umi-umd-3800.pdf> (accessed November 11, 2010).
- Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Janney, Caroline. *Burying the Dead but Not the Past: Ladies' Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1968.
- Lamkin, Patricia E. "A History of Blacks in San Angelo, 1869-1930." Master's Thesis, Angelo State University, 1990.
- Lipsitz, George. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Leckie, William H. and Shirley A. Leckie. *The Buffalo Soldiers: A Narrative of the Black Cavalry in the West*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1975.
- Nevels, Cynthia Skove. *Lynching to Belong: Claiming Whiteness Through Racial Violence*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.
- Oklahoma Commission to Study the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921, *Tulsa Race Riot: A Report by the Oklahoma Commission to Study the Tulsa Race Riot of 1921*. February 28, 2001. Accessed February 18, 2015. <http://www.okhistory.org/research/forms/freport.pdf>.
- Osterweis, Rollin G. *The Myth of the Lost Cause*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1973.
- Painter, Nell Irvin. *The History of White People*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010.
- Phillips, Michael. *White Metropolis: Race, Ethnicity, and Religion in Dallas, 1841-2001*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Ramsdell, Charles William. *Reconstruction in Texas*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1964.
- Roark, James L. *Masters Without Slaves: Southern Planters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1977.
- Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 1991.

- Shabazz, Amilcar. *Advancing Democracy: African Americans and the Struggle for Access and Equity in Higher Education in Texas*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Smallwood, James M. *Time of Hope, Time of Despair: Black Texans During Reconstruction*. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1981.
- Sokol, Jason. *There Goes My Everything: White Southerners in the Age of Civil Rights, 1945-1975*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.
- Takaki, Ronald T. *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.
- Taylor, Quintard. *In Search of the Racial Frontier: African Americans in the American West, 1528-1990*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1998.
- Trefousse, Hans L. ed. *Background for Radical Reconstruction*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.
- Weinberg, Meyer, ed. *W.E.B. Du Bois: A Reader*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Williams, Loren Katz, *Eyewitness: The Negro in American History*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Williamson, Joel. *A Rage for Disorder: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1980.
- Woodward, C. Van. *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Wray, Matt. *Not Quite White: White Trash and the Boundaries of Whiteness*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

Articles:

- Cashion, Ty. "What's the Matter With Texas?: The Great Enigma of the Lone Star State in the American West." *Montana: The Magazine of Western History* 55, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 2-15.
- Daniel, Wayne and Carol Schmidt, "FORT CONCHO," *Handbook of Texas Online* Published by the Texas State Historical Association. Accessed September 10, 2012.
<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/qbf11>.
- Fields, Barbara J. "Ideology and Race in American History." In *Region, Race and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward*, edited by J. Morgan Koussen and James M. McPherson, 143-177. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- , "Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America." *New Left Review* 181 (May/June 1990): 95-118.

Kolchin, Peter. "Whiteness Studies: The New History of Race in America." *Journal of American History* 89, no. 1 (June 2002): 154-173.

Moneyhon, Carl H. "Black Codes," *Handbook of Texas Online*. Accessed September 9, 2012.
(<http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/jsb01>).

