

THE TEXAS CAREER OF JOHN MARSHALL

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of History

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Thomas Watson Peebles

May 1972

620794

Preface

Many writers of Texas history have neglected the period between 1850 and the Civil War in their studies. However, in that decade the state witnessed a period of rapid growth and extensive change as Texans transformed their state from a frontier region into a part of the South. During the time they struggled to develop the resources of Texas, they became alarmed at the efforts to limit slavery, the basic labor force of the economic system most Texans preferred.

John Marshall moved to Texas in 1854 when he acquired an interest in the Austin State Gazette. As an editor, he took the opportunity to comment upon many of the events which transpired in Texas in that period. Because he maintained an active interest in politics, Marshall also became involved in many of the politically controversial aspects of pre-Civil War Texas.

A major problem which Marshall encountered was that of trying to work for progress while he protected slavery. He expounded several causes he felt beneficial to Texas, including plans to expand slavery. Those ideas, however well-intended, invited emotional, sectional arguments which tended to divert energy from progress.

Throughout his career as an editor and a politician, Marshall altered his original goals because of his involvement in efforts to expound both progress and slavery. As a

crusading editor, his constructive ideas led to emotional sectionalism. While he was a rising political worker, he compromised the issues he believed in for the success of the Democratic Party, and he became extremely partisan in his attacks upon opponents. When he achieved the position of Chairman of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party, he had the power to implement the ideas he advanced in behalf of progress and party unity. However, under his leadership, the Democratic Party offered few constructive issues in its platforms, and it became divided and disunited.

I wish to thank Professor Stanley E. Siegel for the time and effort he devoted in his direction of my thesis. Also, I thank Professors Jack A. Haddick, Richard D. Younger, and John Q. Anderson for serving on the committee which approved my work. The staffs of the University of Houston Library, the Barker History Center at the University of Texas, and the Texas State Library deserve special gratitude for their assistance.

THE TEXAS CAREER OF JOHN MARSHALL

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of History
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Thomas Watson Peebles
May 1972

Peebles, Thomas Watson. "The Texas Career of John Marshall."
Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Houston, May,
1972.

Abstract

Although John Marshall lived in Texas for only seven years, he had an intense interest in the activities taking place in the state in the 1850's. In 1854, he abandoned a career as an editor and political writer in Mississippi when he purchased an interest in the Austin State Gazette. Marshall controlled the Gazette until the outbreak of the Civil War, and he developed the newspaper into a journal which discussed many of the controversial events of the period while it served as a major spokesman for the Democratic Party in Texas.

Marshall desired to see Texas become the most powerful state in the South, and in his concept of progress, he spoke of progress within the slave system. He wrote extensively about the need for creating a good educational system in Texas, the necessity for the development of railroads in the state, and the possibilities of expanding slavery--three subjects he believed to be of great importance to the future of Texas. Also, he considered other issues when they arose. Local differences led to the defeat of many of his constructive ideas in the 1850's while the sectional emotional arguments he presented found many enemies in a period of growing antislavery feeling.

In Mississippi, Marshall became known as a forceful writer in behalf of the Democratic Party. Soon after reaching Texas, he supported the Democratic ticket in state elections and urged unification and organization within the party. When he endorsed the Democratic candidates, he compromised some of his goals by defending people with other views. The partisan attacks he delivered against the American Party and his energetic support for the Democrats led the 1856 state Democratic convention to select him as Chairman of the Central Committee.

As leader of the Democratic Party, he helped direct several successful campaigns with only one defeat. He did not consider the causes he had advocated as the principal issues in his campaigning. Instead, he centered his arguments on slavery, personal charges against Sam Houston, and other emotional issues. Ironically, the party he had worked to unify split during his leadership, thus allowing an opposition victory in 1859.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Preface | iii |
| Chapter One: John Marshall: Editor | 1 |
| Chapter Two: John Marshall: Political Strategist . . | 38 |
| Chapter Three: John Marshall: Political Leader . . . | 62 |
| Bibliography | 93 |

Chapter One

John Marshall: Editor

In February, 1854, a young Mississippi editor, John Marshall, left Jackson where he had developed a reputation as a forceful political writer to become editor of the State Gazette in Austin, Texas. Marshall was born in Charlotte County, Virginia, where he spent his youth. No record exists of his formal education, although his accomplishments in literature and journalism indicate that he was well-educated.¹ At the age of twenty, Marshall moved to Mississippi where he edited the Southern Reformer for a year. From 1846 until 1849, he worked for the Treasury Department in Mississippi. In June, 1849, he joined G. R. Fall as co-editor of the Mississippian in Jackson.² There he became friends with Jefferson Davis and John A. Quitman, two of the state's leading Democratic politicians.³ Marshall had already become well-known for his political writings as shown in the Louisville Democrat's characterization of him "...one of the ablest political writers in the Southwest."⁴ He developed his newspaper into the leading

¹W. S. Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XX (October, 1916), 134.

²Larry Jay Gage, "The Texas Road to Secession and War, John Marshall and the Texas State Gazette," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, LXII (October, 1958), 194.

³Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," 134.

⁴Gage, "John Marshall," 194, quoting Louisville Democrat, n. d.

party organ of the State. In 1851, Marshall assumed complete editorial control and changed the name of the paper to the Mississippian and State Gazette.⁵

Little information concerning Marshall's personal life is known. In 1850, he married Anna P. Newman, daughter of a wealthy cotton planter in Jefferson County, Mississippi. They had three children, but only two of them, Clara and Hudson, survived infancy.⁶ Mrs. Marshall appeared to have been in poor health, especially while living in Mississippi.⁷ Marshall measured only five feet seven inches in height, and he was fair complexioned. Marshall's conservative dress, usually a black or a brown suit, reflected his conscientious businesslike attitude. A contemporary remarked that he devoted his time to working instead of to pleasures such as smoking, drinking, hunting, or fishing.⁸

Before coming to Texas, Marshall studied law and obtained a license to practice. He did not exercise this talent, but he believed that citizens, particularly editors of newspapers, needed to be informed in the law.⁹ Marshall

⁵Gage, "John Marshall," 194.

⁶Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," 132.

⁷John Marshall to Elizabeth Irvin, December 29, 1855, Williamson S. Oldham Papers (University of Texas Archives). Hereafter cited as Oldham Papers.

⁸Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," 133.

⁹Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker (eds.), The Writings of Sam Houston (Austin, 1938), VIII, 217.

purchased part interest in the State Gazette in February, 1854, when he became a law partner with Williamson S. Oldham.¹⁰

The State Gazette, Marshall's newspaper, had several changes in ownership after its first publication on August 25, 1849, as the Texas State Gazette. William H. Cushney served as the first publisher and Robert G. Matthewson as the first editor of the newspaper. They intended their paper to be "thoroughly democratic" in politics. Matthewson ended his association with the newspaper on January 12, 1850. H. P. Brewster and Joseph M. Hampton served as the new editors. In January, 1851, Joseph W. Hamilton became Cushney's co-publisher. When Cushney died on October 24, 1852, Hampton and George W. Crawford of the Washington Lone Star became co-editors and co-publishers. Crawford left the paper in 1853, and William R. Scurry took his place in November of that year. After Hampton sold his interest to Marshall, he remained as editor until the end of May, 1854. Scurry sold his interest on August 19, 1854, to Williamson S. Oldham, one of Marshall's law partners.¹¹

The first editors of the Gazette established a policy favorable to the Democratic Party. In 1853, editorials called for organization and unity among the Democrats in the state to prevent the party from fragmenting and thus allowing the election of a Whig governor. The editor pushed for a convention to narrow the Democratic field to one candidate for each office.

¹⁰Austin State Gazette, January 2, 1854.

¹¹Gage, "John Marshall," 191-193.

On July 2, 1853, the paper formally endorsed Elisha M. Pease for governor since he was a strict-constructionist Democrat who favored the development of railroads and schools and because he could most easily unify the party to battle the Whigs. The Gazette applauded M. T. Johnson's withdrawal from the race to solidify Pease's campaign.¹² Scurry and Hampton rejoiced in the election of the state Democratic ticket.

Other important journals in the state with strong political views in that period included Willard Richardson's Galveston News, Hamilton Stuart's Galveston Civilian, and Edward Hopkins Cushing's Houston Telegraph. These papers, along with the Gazette, expressed many economic and political views during the 1850's. In that decade, Richardson's and Cushing's papers became defenders of slavery while the Civilian, under the editorship of one of Sam Houston's closest friends, developed into a journal representing views more favorable toward the Union than toward sectional aims.¹³ Marshall's editorship of the Gazette added another point of view, and his paper increased its circulation as it became an organ of widespread political influence.¹⁴ On May 27, 1854, Hampton wrote his farewell editorial and placed the name of John Marshall on the

¹²Austin State Gazette, April 16, July 21, 1853.

¹³Earl Wesley Fornell, The Galveston Era (Austin, 1961), 141-153.

¹⁴Francis R. Lubbock, Six Decades in Texas (Austin, 1900), 193.

masthead of the paper along with that of William R. Scurry.¹⁵

As editor of the State Gazette, John Marshall wrote about many issues that concerned Texas in the 1850's. Through editorials, he expressed his ideas which he supported with news articles favorable to his beliefs. Often Marshall's editorials became quite lengthy, and many times he carried several similar articles in successive issues. However, in spite of his nineteenth century prose, Marshall developed clear positive goals which he believed were beneficial to the South and to the state of Texas. At different times specific issues arose which Marshall deemed important; however, several occupied his attention throughout his tenure on the Gazette. They included education, the development of railroads, expansionism, and the controversy resulting from the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. His beliefs, therefore, combined plans for progress with a desire to strengthen the institution of slavery. The divergence resulted in few accomplishments of progressive changes.

John Marshall expressed great concern about the subject of public education in his comments about the lack of facilities for education in the South, more especially in Texas. Marshall printed a list of the number of children of public school age in the United States in his newspaper on October 13, 1855. This table contained the number of children and the number enrolled in school in every state. It illustrated that the South lagged far behind the North in the percentage of children in

¹⁵Austin State Gazette, May 27, 1854.

school. In Texas, fifty-six of every one hundred youths grew up without any education. He argued that this 56 percent must be children whose parents did not have the means to send their children to some other state to attend schools. He praised those few schools that did exist, such as the Austin Male High School and Austin Select Male School which was headed by William L. Kidd, "a qualified instructor." Marshall called on the legislature to canvass the state to determine more changes which needed to be made in the existing school system. He asked that body to devote more of the state's resources to the school fund than it previously had.¹⁶

Since the South lacked many public schools, Southerners who wanted their children educated had to send them elsewhere. Marshall objected to southern children being educated in the North where instructors using northern textbooks condemned southern institutions. He referred to Yale as a university where a professor had vowed to fight the spread of slavery. Marshall applauded a speech made at a state education convention by the Reverend C. K. Marshall who said that out-of-state education could result in wreckage of families if a child returned home and asked his parents to free their slaves. On October 27, 1855, he printed an article by former Congressman John Perkins, Jr., of Louisiana which said that southern legislators had the duty to circulate information about southern institutions through approved textbooks. Perkins called proper

¹⁶Ibid., October 13, 1855, January 26, 1856.

textbooks stronger barriers against northern fanaticism than any law. He described the character of youth as the "bulwark of the State" upon which depends "our political as well as social prosperity." He recorded the proceedings of an educational convention held in Austin in June, 1856. It called for southern texts and teachers and a state university. Marshall remarked that the usefulness of schools could be achieved only when their leaders had proper education and when the students were supplied books written by Southerners. Although Marshall wanted to suppress certain ideas popular on college campuses in the North which condemned slavery, he did stress the need for Texas to develop an educational system.

Marshall continued his fight against northern scholastic influences in his battle for the construction of a state university. He referred to the proposed university as an institution to combat the work of such schools as Harvard which had helped shape the opinions of courts and legislatures into a pro-northern position. However, most of his editorials about higher education were not sectional. He referred to the university as a place to train architects, planters, botanists, and builders of railroads--a place of common benefit for all Texans. Marshall called for the various sections of the state to put aside their quarrels over the location of such a school, but he did call for a site near the capitol to allow the legislature to scrutinize the university. For support of his position, he cited an 1821 speech of Thomas Jefferson about

the need for a state university in Virginia.¹⁷

In November, 1855, the Gazette carried a history of the failure to build the university. In 1839, the Congress of the Republic of Texas passed a bill that required the establishment of a state university, and President Mirabeau B. Lamar called for the creation of two universities, one for men and one for women, at the seat of government to train young people to become "enlightened patriots."¹⁸ In 1841, the Congress of the Republic of Texas appropriated fifty leagues of land for the creation and support of the college. Marshall condemned the succeeding congresses and legislatures for not following up the plans of Lamar's administration.¹⁹

Continuing his efforts for the state university, Marshall furnished his readers with reports of similar institutions in other states. Marshall used the University of South Carolina, founded in 1805, as one of his examples.²⁰ Among that schools' alumni, he noted 5 civil engineers, 5 college presidents, 18 professors, 9 Army officers, 7 foreign ministers and consuls, 76 ordained ministers, 175 doctors, 383 lawyers, 25 judges, 10 United States Senators, 188 state representatives, 9 state senators, and 27 United States Congressmen.

¹⁷Ibid., October 27, 1855, July 12, 1856, October 31, 1857.

¹⁸William Mc Craw, Professional Politicians (Washington, 1940), 70-73.

¹⁹Austin State Gazette, November 3, 1855.

²⁰Clement Eaton, A History of the Old South (New York, 1966), 422.

Marshall also applauded similar institutions in Mississippi and Virginia. As for the scene in Texas, he reminded his readers that only private colleges existed, such as the Austin Collegiate Female Institute. He hailed that school for offering French, Spanish, and Italian--three subjects he considered necessary for the well-rounded education of a young Austin lady. However, Marshall informed his readers that the existing schools were not numerous enough to educate very many students.²¹

Marshall criticized the 1857-1858 session of the Texas Legislature in its study of proposals for the creation of the badly-needed institution of higher education. He charged that the establishment had been "...unfortunately procrastinated too long." Marshall declared that Texas had the means and the land to build a college to elevate the education of teachers in the state; so, he hoped that Texans would no longer be content to accept inferior instruction. He then challenged that session of the legislature to provide a "fresh impetus" for the cause of education. In November, Marshall reported that most legislators preferred one institution instead of branches for each sex. He urged that appointed trustees and education committees solve such minor details as location to enable the legislature to devote its time to the allocation of funds and other necessary actions. The editor praised the executive department for requesting one hundred fifty thousand dollars for the university's building fund to complement the schools' two hundred

²¹Austin State Gazette, November 3, 1855, February 16, 1858.

thousand acres. In December, Marshall remarked that enemies whom he called the "Jackson Democracy of Sam Houston" were at work to defeat the university bill.²²

Marshall did not abandon hope that a university would be created, although he reported on January 9, 1858, that he feared the measure to be dead at that session of the legislature. To bolster his faith, he quoted the Galveston News' article concerning the availability of funds for the institution.²³ On February 6, Marshall reported one last hope by citing a report from Colonel Louis T. Wigfall which indicated that the legislature might act on the university bill. This prediction proved to be incorrect, and the session ended without the creation of a state university. Yet, the editor did not abandon his goal, and in June, 1858, he said that he never doubted that the creation of the institution was one of the highest considerations of public policy since the state deserved the good teachers which a university would provide. Again, he warned against squabbles by localities over the site for the school.²⁴

John Marshall considered another cause beneficial to the entire state when he began his crusade for the development of railroads in Texas. He fought to develop a system of

²²Ibid., December 19, 1857.

²³Ibid., January 9, 1858, quoting Galveston News, n. d.

²⁴Austin State Gazette, February 6, July 3, 1858.

transportation to connect all sections of Texas with each other and with the rest of the Union. While he strove for the construction of roads, Marshall continually criticized sectional jealousies and unregulated railroad companies.

Efforts to construct railroads had hardly begun in Texas before Marshall's arrival in the state in 1854. In 1850, the legislature had granted power to the United States to build a national railroad through the state from Marshall to El Paso and hence to the Pacific Ocean. It established gifts of alternate sections of 640 acres along the route in return for track being laid. This offer expired the next year after the government had taken no action.²⁵ Texas Senators, Sam Houston and Thomas J. Rusk, urged Congress to aid in the construction of railroads in their state, and Houston toured the state asking that grants of land be awarded as payment for construction. However, the people in Houston did not favorably receive his idea since the proposed route bypassed their city.²⁶ From 1852 to 1854, the Texas legislature chartered nineteen railroad companies with offers of six to eight sections of land as bonuses, but only the Buffalo Bayou, Brazos, and Colorado Company and the Houston and Texas Central Railroad Company actually matured. In January, 1854, a bill sponsored by Governor Pease which allowed companies alternate sections of thirty-two acres of

²⁵S. G. Reed, A History of Texas Railroads (Houston, 1941), 141.

²⁶Llerena Friend, Sam Houston, The Great Designer (Austin, 1954), 224.

land for twenty-five miles or more of track laid and put in working order passed the legislature. Forty companies received charters under this act, but only nine completed sufficient mileage to entitle them to the benefits.²⁷

Marshall's interests in railroads led to enthusiastic comments soon after his arrival in Texas. He attended a meeting in New Orleans in 1854, and on June 9, he wrote an optimistic letter to his newspaper concerning the construction of a railroad from Texas to California, through Jefferson and Marshall. He relished the idea of employing some of the many Germans in Texas as construction laborers, and he detailed the public with pictures of many of the benefits it could enjoy from railroads. In his editorials, he recalled the tremendous growth of three states--Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina--after they constructed railroads.²⁸

The chief benefit Marshall proclaimed concerned the effect railroads had upon the shipment of crops. He noted that farmers with large crops and merchants complained about the lack of money available. He found this lack further emphasized by the abundance of foreclosures and eviction notices posted by sheriffs and constables. However, Marshall replied that other parts of the nation needed Texas' crops and that cities in other states had supplies for merchants. He saw the remedy for permanent prosperity as the construction of a

²⁷Reed, Texas Railroads, 141, 269.

²⁸Austin State Gazette, June 21, 1854.

railroad system which could serve as an outlet for excess crops. For capital, he favored private subscriptions and taxes in the counties where the road would lie. This system would allow planters to quadruple their income by selling their crops outside the state with reductions in transportation and depreciation costs. He foresaw the shipment of wheat and corn to New Orleans markets, the disposal of animals in the interior of the state, and a savings of about twenty dollars on every half-ton of lumber shipped.

Marshall also emphasized the necessity for railroad construction as a state-wide project. He remarked that the people in north and west Texas would have the final decision concerning railroads. The editor stressed that the people in the interior depended upon their cooperation with the rest of Texas to achieve full prosperity and should realize the gains Texas would achieve through better commerce.²⁹ Marshall hailed the Lamar Enquirer's article which said that if the people of Texas wanted an outlet to the great market, they must "eschew all merely local interests."³⁰

After relating railroad benefits and the need for state-wide interests, Marshall and his contemporaries spoke of the need for definite plans for construction and regulatory laws. One of the first plans discussed in Texas, the Lorenzo Sherwood idea, or the State Plan, endorsed by Willard Richardson in the

²⁹ Ibid., March 22, March 31, 1855.

³⁰ Ibid., January 17, 1857, quoting Lamar Enquirer, n. d.

Galveston News, called for a harnessing of state credit to construct railroads. Richardson supported the State Plan for five years. Sherwood became a controversial figure in the 1850's because of his political activity on behalf of candidates supporting his ideas and because of his alleged anti-slavery views.³¹

Marshall opposed the State Plan, and he used the condition of the railroads in Georgia as an example of a poorly-developed system in his editorial concerning the role of the state in railroad construction. There, the legislature had the power to manage the railroads. However, Marshall called it incompetent to supervise effectively since that body contained many members with diverse points of view, and various conflicts had to be settled before the legislature could act. At the time of his editorial, April, 1856, the state of Georgia had suits pending against it in Tennessee courts because of the handling of some of the company's lines. Marshall viewed this as proof of the weakness of the State Plan. Instead, he pointed out the merits of the corporate plan.³²

Marshall lauded corporations which operated effectively in his comment about the Houston Railroad. When Judge Longscope, one of the railroad's promoters, came to Austin to discuss the line's plans to lay rails to Columbus, Marshall took the opportunity to publicize the enterprise. He complimented

³¹Fornell, Galveston Era, 170-174.

³²Austin State Gazette, April 5, 1856.

the citizens of Wharton and Colorado counties for pledging one thousand dollars and twenty-five thousand dollars respectively to bring the road to their areas. Then, he chastised Travis County residents for raising so little and warned that they needed to help finance the railroad to prevent the line from bypassing Austin on its way from Columbus to San Antonio. He comments that "God helps those who help themselves." Upon hearing of the completion of track to Hempstead by November 22, 1857, Marshall praised the people of Houston for "prosecuting their railroad enterprizes [sic]" as an important step toward independent trade for the state.³³ He called for modifications in the existing laws which required a company to grade twenty-five miles beyond the laying of track to receive payment from the state. The statute he referred to hindered the Houston-based firm which needed additional capital to complete its annual goal of constructing fifty to seventy-five miles of track.³⁴

Marshall became concerned about the lack of sufficient laws to regulate railroad corporations, and he offered examples of ineffective companies. He criticized the Texas Western Railroad, backed by Colonel W. T. Scott of Harrison County, for its idleness and for its refusal to give state officials reports of its financial affairs. Marshall stressed that the people of Texas should make railroads and other corporations hold

³³Ibid., September 19, October 24, 1857.

³⁴Reed, Texas Railroads, 70-71.

themselves to strict accountability. This would end the opportunity for speculators and profiteers who gained while the masses of the people did not receive the benefits of railroads.³⁵

The Gazette's attack upon another corporation, the Pacific Railroad of Colonel C. A. Harper, resulted in a battle of personalities. Marshall defended his paper and the Galveston News from Harper's charges that they fought railroad construction. He replied that the Gazette and the News had exposed nonresident and bankrupt speculators and had fought only corruption and graft among contractors. Marshall said that he had never advocated the State Plan instead of the Pacific Railroad as Harper charged. In fact, he had published more attacks on the state system than anyone else in Texas. He believed that he successfully answered Harper, and he remarked that the Gazette would continue to recognize and support honest intention and "apply the lash" to corruption. He thanked the Marshall Texas Republican for defending the Gazette from Harper's charges.³⁶

Marshall applauded the legislature's call for a state railroad convention scheduled for Austin on July 4, 1856, as a show of concern by the legislature about the public's demand for the establishment of railroad laws. A convention provided

³⁵ Austin State Gazette, May 24, 1856.

³⁶ Ibid., May 10, 1856, quoting Marshall Texas Republican, n. d.

the people of the entire state an opportunity to show their interest in a good operating railway system. He called upon the leading citizens of every county to call local conventions to help foster popular opinion, and he offered to publish the proceedings of local meetings in the Gazette. The main goal of the convention was to compromise the various plans for routes into one or two lines connecting the interior to the coastal markets. The editors of the Washington Ranger, Cherokee Sentinel, Central Texian, and the Star Spangled Banner endorsed Marshall's sentiments concerning the convention. They also called for public meetings to instruct the delegates. In June, shortly before the convention, Marshall reported that the several local meetings had overwhelmingly endorsed a loan system. He commented that the effectiveness of the convention would depend greatly upon the character of the delegates.³⁷

The convention at which A. G. Weir of Austin served as chairman saw its recommendation fulfilled. Most delegates had been instructed to favor a system of state loans for one-third the amount of construction of twenty-five miles with a six thousand dollar maximum for each loan. They asked the legislature to endorse the system because they viewed it as more stable than the State Plan which required contracts creating large state debts.³⁸ On August 13, 1856, the Loan Bill passed both houses of the legislature. Therefore, private corporations

³⁷ Austin State Gazette, April 5, June 28, 1856.

³⁸ Ibid., July 12, 1856.

with state aid constructed railroads in Texas.³⁹ Marshall approved this course of action since he had said that if the loan system failed, then the State Plan could be employed. Later, he remarked that he had not actually disapproved of the state system, but he considered the loan system to be more efficient.⁴⁰

Marshall did not find complete satisfaction with the bill authorizing state loans for railroad corporations, and he again called for stricter regulation of the construction companies and an end to bogus corporations. He wanted new laws to completely end the system of land bonuses which he blamed to a great extent for the failure of the Harrisburg Railroad. In December, 1857, he enumerated the gains resulting from additional legislative action. They included the following: immigration of enough white and Negro population in ten years to pay for the construction debts, quadrupled value of property, and more aid to the cause of education. As a result, Texas would become the most powerful southern state. Marshall expected an enlightened legislature to act upon the wishes of the people to make the system of state loans more efficient.⁴¹

He cited the Southern Pacific Railroad as one of the chief violators of the existing arrangements. Saying that the worthless corporation would continue to apply for more relief

³⁹Fornell, Galveston Era, 179.

⁴⁰Austin State Gazette, June 7, 1856, November 28, 1857.

⁴¹Ibid., December 6, 1857.

to the legislature, he called for the enactment of a common law to prevent it and similar monopolies from operating in the state. Marshall remarked that much study revealed to him that the corporation would never build a railroad to the Pacific since the only rails the northern-based company had laid came after residents of Smith and Harrison counties donated money for the construction costs.⁴² Some minor adjustments did take place, but Texas railroads remained quite primitive throughout Marshall's lifetime. The Southern Pacific Railroad, however, acquired new stockholders and management in 1858.⁴³

In contrast to the constructive elements Marshall discussed in his efforts to create better educational and railroad systems in Texas, he also made the Gazette a spokesman for efforts to expand slavery into the Caribbean and into Kansas. He argued that expansion of slave territory would ensure protection for the institution of slavery which he felt was essential to his concept of a powerful Texas. Ironically, the emotionalism generated by the debate about slavery tended to divert many people from constructive causes.

As part of his desire to protect slavery, Marshall became interested in another issue of the 1850's--filibustering and expansionism in the Caribbean. The island of Cuba and the country of Nicaragua occupied most of his attention on this matter. In 1854, the Gazette remarked that it rejoiced that

⁴²Ibid., January 23, 1858.

⁴³Reed, Texas Railroads, 100-102.

movements existed in Spain for the overthrow of the Spanish crown. Since the existing monarchy had negotiated the treaty in which the United States recognized Spanish control of Cuba, Americans would not be obligated to hold the agreement valid if another government ruled in Madrid.⁴⁴

As the next step in his desire for Cuba's independence, Marshall entertained the thought held by other Southerners when he spoke of the advantages the United States would obtain from occupation of the island. He said that the United States had a long east coast line nearly two thousand miles in length. Cuba which lay very close to the south of the American shore was twice the size of England and contained many potential resources. Marshall likened the passage between Florida and Cuba to a "mouth of a river" where vessels from the Caribbean, Central America, South America, and Europe could enter the United States. With the island in the possession of the United States, it could become a building block for American imperial power. However, it could pose as an obstacle if an opposing power decided to close the passage between it and Florida.⁴⁵

In addition to listing the advantages which annexation would bring, Marshall spoke of the island's connection with slavery. He approved of the Dallas Herald's editorial which called for Cuba's becoming an independent republic before joining the Union. The editor of the Herald remarked that slavery

⁴⁴Austin State Gazette, July 29, 1854.

⁴⁵Ibid., November 29, 1856.

could not exist in the American possessions in the west; so, only the islands to the south offered possible expansion of that institution. The paper recommended that the United States should ask Spain to sell the island, but it must risk war only as a final resort. If Cuba did not become a state, more compromises (such as the Compromise of 1850 which severely restricted the limits of slavery) would result.⁴⁶ Under James Buchanan's presidency, Marshall remarked, the administration pledged itself to obtain Cuba. He said that balance between the sections offered the best prospect for the cessation of the demagogic activity in the North. Therefore, Marshall proclaimed the acquisition of Cuba as a "fixed and inexorable necessity."⁴⁷

In another part of Marshall's argument for Cuban annexation, he published a series of articles called "Cuba" in which he recalled the advantages other countries enjoyed because of their Caribbean possessions. He listed three chief benefits France, England, and Holland enjoyed: the value of import and export trade, the possession of a large number of Negroes capable of producing southern staple crops, and bases for offensive and defensive operations. As examples, he mentioned the benefits the British enjoyed from Tobago, Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados, and the excellent harbor of Port of Prince in Trinidad--a center for overseas trade and a base for military positions. He also recalled that the British owned Barbuda, St.

⁴⁶Dallas Herald, November 29, 1856.

⁴⁷Austin State Gazette, November 21, 1857.

Kitts, Nevis, Anguilla, part of the Virgin Islands, the Bahamas, and Jamaica. The last island, he noted, was particularly valuable because of its abundance of pure water, its long coast line, its many crops, and its Negro population of 312,000, larger than that of Mississippi. He also commented on the wealth of the French, Danish, Swedish, and Dutch possessions.⁴⁸

Marshall's other main area of concern, Nicaragua, presented a different story since William Walker had created in that country a government which was ruled mainly by Americans and natives loyal to him. He involved the tiny country in several destructive wars in his efforts to control more territory. Walker played the two quarreling factions within Nicaragua, the aristocratic Legitimists and the more revolutionary Democrats, against each other for support. His empire depended on an agreement with Cornelius Vanderbilt's Transit Company to bring supplies through the country on its route between New York and California. Confusion resulting from a power struggle in Vanderbilt's company caused termination of the agreement. Then, Vanderbilt began aiding rivals against Walker.⁴⁹

As early as April, 1856, Marshall defended Walker. He declared that the reports that Walker had annulled the charter of the Vanderbilt company should be studied closely since he did not believe that the Nicaraguan leader would violate property rights as established by contracts. Marshall also defended

⁴⁸ Ibid., January 24, March 14, 1857.

⁴⁹ Achmed Abdullah, Dreamers of Empire (Freeport, New York, 1968), 261, 266.

Walker's wars as unfortunate but necessary to successfully terminate his country's problems with neighboring Costa Rica. He declared that proper treaties would end European intervention in the republic, and he called England the power behind Costa Rica. As further defense of the Walker regime, Marshall applauded the visit to Austin of Colonel S. A. Lockridge who tried to create interest in Nicaraguan emigration. Lockridge called for patriotic Americans to join together to help spread the American Republic to the Caribbean.⁵⁰

After calling for support for Walker, Marshall called for American possession of the Republic. He blamed the Whig administrations of Taylor and Fillmore for the existing difficulties in the Central American country since they did not ask for ratification of the treaty negotiated under the presidency of James Knox Polk which gave the United States exclusive rights to canals, railroads, and other connections between the Atlantic and the Pacific in Nicaragua. He equated ratification to the creation of an American protectorate, one step toward possession. Instead, Marshall claimed that the Whigs contented themselves with admitting California as a free state. The editor insisted that Nicaraguan desire for affiliation with the United States led to the Walker affair.⁵¹

Marshall editorially defended Walker in his legal battles. Because of his activities in the wars between Central

⁵⁰ Austin State Gazette, April 12, 1856, August 29, 1857.

⁵¹ Ibid., February 6, 1858.

American countries, Walker found himself on trial for the violation of American neutrality laws when he returned to New Orleans in May, 1858.⁵² Marshall rejoiced that Walker was not convicted but was acquitted by a ten to two vote. He congratulated Walker for winning his freedom from an unjust arrest.⁵³ The adventurer returned to Central America, but his later wars led to his capture and execution by Honduras in September, 1860.⁵⁴

Marshall discussed another measure to expand slavery, the controversial question of the fate of slavery in Kansas, as a constructive issue. Sam Houston's negative vote in 1854 on the proposal of Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois to repeal the Missouri Compromise and allow the settlers in Kansas and Nebraska territories to decide the fate of slavery in their territories created much turmoil in Texas. Many Southerners viewed his vote as a threat to the extension of slavery and the way of life of the elite. Twenty Texas counties passed resolutions condemning their senator, and many of his political enemies, pro-slavery advocates, and anti-Union men joined together to prevent Houston's reelection to the Senate and hopefully to press for his resignation. His friends, such as J. Pinckney Henderson, Francis R. Lubbock, and Ashbel Smith, did not defend his vote. Marshall had not yet moved to Texas at the time of the Kansas-Nebraska Act; so, he did not

⁵²Abdullah, Dreamers, 284.

⁵³Austin State Gazette, June 19, 1858.

⁵⁴Abdullah, Dreamers, 290.

editorialize in the Gazette when the bill passed. However, his future partner, Williamson Oldham, joined with Louis T. Wigfall to demand Houston's immediate ouster, although his term did not end until 1859. The Clarksville Northern Standard, the Galveston News, and the Gazette began working to prevent his reelection, and the Texas Legislature responded by informing Houston that his current term would be his last one.⁵⁵

Despite missing the immediate Kansas-Nebraska battles, John Marshall wrote extensively about conditions in Kansas. He deplored the violence among the settlers which gave the territory the name "Bleeding Kansas." At first, he printed objective accounts such as on January 19, 1856, when he reported the burning of an antislavery man's house and condemned the release from jail of the arsonist. Later, he insisted that only the Free-Soilers caused the lawlessness, and he supported his claim by reporting the murder of the sheriff of Lawrence by abolitionists.⁵⁶

Marshall believed that slavery should exist in Kansas. He favored the plans budding in the South for the colonization of the territory by slave holders with their properties. Marshall remarked that money did not hold the answer to saving Kansas, but he contended that only its admission as a slave state insured that Yankees would cease moving up Missouri rivers to create a Free-Soil domain. If the Free-Soilers

⁵⁵M. K. Wisheart, Sam Houston, American Giant (Washington, 1962), 558.

⁵⁶Austin State Gazette, January 19, 1856.

secured Kansas, he feared that the Indian Territory on Texas' border would be the next target. Because of his fear, he urged voters to elect men who would resolve to admit Kansas as a slave state. Marshall continued to give reports of northern aid to prevent the establishment of southern institutions in Kansas, and he cited Gerritt Smith, who contributed \$ 1,500, as an example.⁵⁷ He also told of such noble southern efforts to combat the Free-Soilers as the committee in Brazoria which vowed to raise fifty men and \$ 12,500 to send to Kansas.⁵⁸

One of the most provocative episodes in the Kansas story concerned the events after Buchanan appointed his territorial governor, Robert J. Walker of Mississippi. At first, John Marshall defended charges levied against Walker since he remembered the governor as a fellow Democrat from Mississippi. He insisted that the charges that Walker acted in a manner unfriendly to the South had arisen from perverted statements. Marshall reminded his readers that neither Buchanan nor the people of Kansas expressed any desire to remove Walker. At that time, he expressed his opinion that the Lecompton Constitution, a document to admit Kansas as a slave state, should be approved by Congress.⁵⁹

Arguments concerning the Lecompton Constitution became quite bitter throughout the nation. Stephen A. Douglas broke

⁵⁷ Ibid., May 24, August 2, 1856.

⁵⁸ Ibid., September 20, 1856, quoting Brazoria Democrat and Planter, n. d.

⁵⁹ Austin State Gazette, September 5, 1857.

with the Democrats, as did many other party members in the North, because he did not view the convention which drafted the constitution as representative of the people.⁶⁰ Marshall and other Southerners contended that Congress had no right to deny statehood unless it could prove that the Lecompton Constitution was undemocratic. He expressed fear that Kansas voters might delete the slavery clause, and all promise of balance between the sections would end. If Congress denied statehood for reasons that were not justified, he demanded that the legislature authorize Texas to cooperate with other southern states to determine their future positions concerning slavery and the Union. Marshall viewed the Lecompton Constitution as a legal document since it was created by a constitutional convention which had been summoned by a legal territorial legislature. He argued that the rival Topeka government, an organ of the Free-Soilers, created its own defective constitution and had no rights since it subverted the legal authorities.⁶¹

Declaring opposition to the doctrine of Congressional intervention in territories as a violation of the beliefs of Calhoun and Jefferson, Marshall claimed that the South upheld the Constitution by allowing Kansans to decide their own internal affairs. He claimed that the South did not desire legislative advantage, but it merely wished to combat the northern

⁶⁰Paul M. Angle (ed.), Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858 (Chicago, 1958), 12-13.

⁶¹Austin State Gazette, December 6, 1857, February 2, 1858.

aims which expressed opposition to the institution of slavery. If the South did not receive promises that insured its Constitutional rights, it would bargain for its own protection.⁶² In spite of the pleas of Marshall and other Southerners, the Lecompton Constitution never became reality. The English Bill required its submission to the voters of Kansas, and the people defeated it.⁶³

Marshall's principal ideas were never implemented. Political differences and poor planning defeated much of the railroad and educational legislation in the middle of the 1850's. By the end of the decade, the Gazette found itself very much preoccupied with the issues concerning slavery. Its editor had been diverted from concentrating his efforts for progress. Although Marshall found numerous supporters for his positions concerning slavery in the Caribbean and in Kansas, public opinion throughout the nation opposed him.

While striving for progressive changes, Marshall remained in step with many in the South on questions about the South's stability and the institution of slavery. His inability to implement many of his ideas, then resulted from his attempts to embrace both progress and slavery. When he completed the eighth volume of the Gazette in August, 1857, he reflected upon his work and promised not to abandon his struggles to aid

⁶²Ibid., February 6, February 20, 1858.

⁶³William Frank Zornow, Kansas: A History of the Jayhawk State (Norman, 1957), 78.

agriculture, education, and commerce.⁶⁴ Regardless of his position, he interpreted his ideas as the most effective ways to aid Texas and the remainder of the South.

Marshall did not allow his newspaper to become a spokesman for only a few broad interests. It also covered many other issues as they arose during his editorship. As with his basic questions, he did not refrain from controversy when he deemed it necessary and in the best interest of Texas. Three of the later issues: opposition to banks, comments about the Mexican Cart War, and a push for the reopening of the African slave trade, illustrate various types of concerns Marshall considered significant.

On the issue of banking, John Marshall's rigid opposition reflected the popular position in the South. The 1845 State Constitution prohibited the chartering of any banks. Therefore, the only bank in Texas was the Commercial and Agricultural Bank at Galveston which had received its charter from the Mexican government.⁶⁵ However, various groups had advocated changes permitting banks. Marshall announced in a lengthy editorial that he intended to stand up to the true principles of popular government and meet the monster banking system. He criticized the banking editor of the Galveston News for referring to Thomas Jefferson's and, by inference, Andrew Jackson's views against banks as being "old-fogy." To help develop his

⁶⁴ Austin State Gazette, August 15, 1857.

⁶⁵ George P. Garrison, Texas (Boston, 1905), 274.

his point, Marshall published five antibanking articles written by Jackson.⁶⁶

In addition to political arguments, Marshall employed constitutional logic to explain his reasons for opposing banks. He advocated a State-rights, strict constructionist, approach which vetoed all changes in state fundamental law which might allow banks to be chartered. Marshall claimed banks to be at war with the principle of equality of citizens by tending to divide society into classes which he considered unconstitutional and in opposition to the Declaration of Independence. To fight aristocratic privileges, Marshall proclaimed "The Constitution of Texas must be preserved against banks" in bold letters.⁶⁷

Also, he offered some practical reasons for opposing banks during the panic of the late 1850's. He blamed much of the crash on overlending paper money in times of bounteous crops and then calling in the loans and depriving people of all possessions bought on borrowed money. Marshall cited reports from papers in Mississippi and Arkansas that rejoiced over the good status of the economy in their states because they forbade banking. Also, he printed articles from Tennessee and Pennsylvania journals which blamed banks for the terrible financial situation of their localities. He claimed that states should maintain only banks of "Discount, Deposit [sic] and sale of Exchange." Marshall blamed the drop of the price of cotton

⁶⁶ Austin State Gazette, April 18, 1857.

⁶⁷ Ibid., May 2, 1857.

during the panic upon the North which drew southern money since the high tariff prevented free trade with the use of cotton as a stable currency. He recommended making the medium of currency as fixed and stationary as possible, direct trade made possible by the reduction of the tariff, railroad development in the South, the concentration of labor and capital in the cotton producing states, and the abolition of banks of circulation.⁶⁸

Others supported his stand about banks. In 1859, Marshall pointed with pride to the Houston Telegraph's remark that it no longer favored such banking systems as those in South Carolina and Louisiana which it had praised two years previously. The Houston paper said that banks were subject to human law; so, the only useful ones were banks of deposit and exchange. The Gazette claimed that no paper in the state which belonged to the party organization sustained banks of circulation.⁶⁹ His view on this issue prevailed since Texas did not charter any banks in the 1850's.

Another subject Marshall discussed, the Mexican Cart War, illustrated his concern for upholding the law and his respect for the rights of men. Texas teamsters found their jobs of hauling freight from the Gulf of Mexico to San Antonio were being taken over by Mexicans working for lower wages. In

⁶⁸ Ibid., October 24, November 21, 1857.

⁶⁹ Ibid., February 12, 1859, quoting Houston Telegraph, n. d.

October, 1857, a group in Karnes County attacked several of the Mexican cartmen, seized the cargo, and killed many of the drivers. The Mexican minister in Washington then protested the action to the United States government.⁷⁰

After the incident, the Gazette applauded Governor Pease for sending seventy-four men into the south Texas area for sixty days to protect the rights of the Mexicans driving their carts to and from the Gulf. Marshall regretted that the action became necessary, but he expressed gratitude to Pease for showing outlaws that they lived in a state which considered life and property sacred. Failure by the executive, Marshall remarked, would have amounted to surrender by Texas. Pease's actions provided security until the legislature could act to provide peace and tranquility to the area. Marshall expressed indignation over the Rusk Enquirer's "terrible cock and bull story" which used as a source a nameless Karnes County resident. The article declared that the cartmen's conduct provoked the attacks. The Gazette editorialized that reliable people reported that the Mexicans had actually been in the right when they were attacked. Marshall chastised the Know Nothing journal for seizing any opportunity to attack foreign-born people who enjoyed protection under the Constitution. He praised the legislature's bill designed to prevent similar occurrences by giving additional power to local law enforcement bodies. Marshall also

⁷⁰ H. Y. Benedict and John A. Lomax, The Book of Texas (Garden City, 1916), 283-284.

approved the propositions to divide Karnes County between Goliad and Bexar counties.⁷¹

Marshall's view triumphed in the bank and cart war situations. However, on another later-developing point, the reopening of the African slave trade, his ideas never developed beyond the discussion stage. He again spoke of the benefits the trade would bring to Texas. Although the idea spread throughout the South, Congress never lifted the restriction against it, but an illegal trade flourished after the 1808 deadline. He pursued the battle for legalization of the trade with his usual vigor despite the tremendous odds facing him in a period of growing abolitionist and Free-Soil ideas.

Settlers had brought Negro servants and slaves to Texas since 1821.⁷² In the 1850's, however, the slave trade became a controversial issue in Texas and in the rest of the South. Many people contended that repeal of the Texas laws outlawing the importation of foreign slaves would undermine and possibly cause repeal of the federal prohibition. In 1857, John Henry Brown, a legislator from Galveston, introduced the Joint Resolution in Relation to the Importation of African Slaves which proposed that the Governor of Texas and the state's congressional delegation press for the repeal of all laws and treaties hampering African slave trading. For political expediency, this

⁷¹Austin State Gazette, October 10, December 6, 1857.

⁷²Eugene C. Barker, "The African Slave Trade in Texas," Texas Historical Association Quarterly, VI (October, 1902), 149.

measure was left in committee, although Governor Hardin R. Runnels had been elected on a pro-slave trade ticket. Texas delegates at a commercial and slave trade convention in New Orleans in 1856 voted unanimously to legalize the slave trade. They repeated their vote at similar conventions in 1857, 1858, and 1859. Hamilton Stuart of the Galveston Civilian advocated repeal of the restrictions since they placed dual conflict upon customs collectors who tried to enforce laws and prohibit the trade. However, he changed his view in 1859. Other papers favoring the reopening included the Houston Telegraph and the Galveston News.⁷³

John Marshall expounded various reasons in the Gazette's fight to reopen the slave trade. For one thing, he alleged that a respectable number of people in the North supported importation of African apprentices. He realized that possibly that section of the country might not willingly accept the foreign trade in 1858, but he believed northern willingness to discuss the matter indicative of tolerance for slavery in the United States. Also, Marshall expected the conversion of Negroes to Christianity, commercial gains, and beneficial labor resulting from the increase in the number of Negroes to sweep away the barriers against the trade. He charged that France and England, two nations who opposed the trade, introduced slavery to America. For additional support, Marshall published a letter written by C. Lovejoy, a Boston attorney, which said

⁷³Fornell, Galveston Era, 215-219.

that although the South had not defended the institution of slavery as morally right, its slave labor system had provided the nation with considerable wealth.⁷⁴

In addition to offering support for his reasoning, Marshall spoke of the need for additional slaves in Texas. He informed the public that many immigrants moved to Texas each year by land and by sea. Severe winters in the older states and disease in Louisiana and Mississippi helped account for the new settlers.⁷⁵ Marshall feared that if the new settlers could not obtain slaves, the state might develop a large white labor force similar to the one Maryland had developed over the previous twenty years. He labeled an apprenticeship system an acceptable substitute if reopening the slave trade were deemed impractical.⁷⁶ He used quotations from the Bastrop Advertiser to support his belief that Texans desired the cheaper slaves the foreign trade would supply, a savings of one thousand dollars on each slave.⁷⁷

After establishing the need for slaves in Texas, Marshall recalled some of the benefits the new laborers would bring to the state. He described the wealth of a state as the end of all political economy. The many different regions of

⁷⁴Austin State Gazette, July 3, 1858, April 23, 1859.

⁷⁵Ernest Wallace, Texas in Turmoil (Austin, 1965), 13-15.

⁷⁶Austin State Gazette, July 17, 1858.

⁷⁷Ibid., January 29, 1859, quoting Bastrop Advertiser, January 22, 1859.

the state--wheat, cotton, rice, and cattle--would all profit by the increase in slave-produced crops since the overall economy of a state affected each region. He declared that many thousands of men lived in Texas who were capable of owning slaves. Also, he remarked that no one in the state need again complain about a shortage of slaves if they could be imported from Africa cheaply. Marshall thought that a man too poor to own slaves at the time could afford to buy cheaper slaves to help him in his work and to lessen the hardships on his family. He predicted that an increase of settlers would follow the increase of slaves, and new towns would develop and new jobs would be created.⁷⁸

John Marshall also wrote about other issues too, but those discussed in this paper help to show the various kinds of ideas he developed in the Gazette. He relentlessly presented his ideas in his weekly newspaper, regardless of the probable reactions to them. Personal attacks did not slow him down. He once challenged A. B. Norton, editor of a rival journal, the Austin Southern Intelligencer, to a duel. They planned to meet at Talleguah, Indian Territory. Marshall arrived there, but an informed sheriff arrested Norton in Bonham. Thus, a possible tragedy was averted.⁷⁹

John Marshall devoted many pages of the State Gazette to editorials concerning issues which he felt were beneficial

⁷⁸ Austin State Gazette, February 5, 1859.

⁷⁹ Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," 136.

to Texas. Unfortunately, his ideas about progress often conflicted with the growing antislavery sentiment of the 1850's. Marshall's efforts to expand the limits of slavery and to reopen the African slave trade led to blatant sectional arguments which actually diluted efforts for progress.

He did work to make the public aware of the lack of educational facilities and the need for establishing a good transportation system in Texas. Marshall showed a concern for mankind in his fight against banks, institutions which he felt benefited the rich and hurt the general public, and in his activities to aid the Mexican cartmen. Unfortunately though, the issues he expounded about slavery caused the most attention.

Chapter Two

John Marshall: Political Strategist

John Marshall met several defeats in his struggles to establish effective educational and railroad systems and in his work to expand slavery. He achieved a greater degree of success in his efforts as a political strategist. While he lived in Mississippi, he edited the Jackson Mississippian, the Democratic Party organ in the state. Upon purchasing the Gazette, Marshall acquired a journal which had supported Democrats in most of the previous elections. He used his paper to discuss election campaigns, to report the activities of the party, and to editorialize in the party's favor.

As a political writer, Marshall worked for the success of the Democratic Party. In addition to supporting its candidates, he applauded efforts to create unity and organization within the party. His desire for the party's success led him to compromise some of his constructive issues for party unity. By the 1856 presidential election, Marshall had nearly abandoned constructive ideas as campaign issues and had substituted attacks on the opposition American Party and emotional arguments concerning slavery. Because of his efforts to aid the Democratic Party, he was selected by the party's state convention to serve as Chairman of the Central Committee.

Texans had not established definite political parties at the time Marshall invested in the Gazette. In the first

years of statehood, the New Mexican boundary dispute and the public debt were the primary political questions. However, after they settled the basic issues, Texans aligned themselves with the national political parties. Democrats were in the majority, but they failed to unify. Therefore, several candidates ran for office, splitting the vote and damaging prospects for victory.¹

The Democrats made an attempt at unification in 1853 after the Whigs had met in April, 1852, at Tyler to select delegates to their national convention.² Democratic papers, such as the Gazette, supported the idea of a convention since at least four men had announced their candidacies for governor. On the other hand, the Houston Telegraph expressed reservations, hoping to have county conventions held first, and the Huntsville Item and the Whig Galveston Journal opposed the convention as an organ dominated by the legislature. On February 22, 1853, W. D. Miller, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party, selected Austin as the site for the Democratic convention.³

Yet, very little organization was accomplished that year. Only one county sent delegates to the meeting since the legislature adjourned on February 7 and its members did not

¹Francis R. Lubbock, Six Decades in Texas (Austin, 1900), 193.

²Ibid., 195.

³Ernest W. Winkler (ed.), Platforms of Political Parties in Texas (Austin, 1916), 29-31.

return to Austin for the convention, the candidates were jealous of each other, and sectional fears arose. After pleas from the Gazette, Miller issued a call on April 4 for a convention to be held at Washington-on-the Brazos on June 15, 1853, to promote harmony and to concentrate the party's vote. Delegates from seven counties were represented, and although no nominations were forthcoming, a new central committee was appointed which called for a convention to be held in Austin on January 8 1854.⁴ Elisha M. Pease, a former Comptroller of Public Accounts and state senator, led the troubled Democrats to victory with a 13,091 to 9,178 margin over the Whig nominee, W. B. Ochiltree, in the gubernatorial contest.⁵

The Democrats improved their organization slightly the next year. Following Miller's request, the state convention met in Austin on January 9, 1854. The body set no policies since few elections would take place that year. However, it endorsed the national Democratic platform and appointed a central committee to prepare for the 1855 convention. Sixty-two counties sent delegates to the 1854 meeting.⁶ As freshman editor of the State Gazette, Marshall urged voters to go to the polls and support Democrats in the August elections. He also advocated adoption of an amendment preventing licenses from

⁴Ibid., 32-34.

⁵Ernest Wallace, Texas in Turmoil (Austin, 1965), 36.

⁶Winkler, Platforms, 35-36.

being granted for the sale of liquor in quantities less than one quart.⁷

In the fall of 1854, a very controversial party entered Texas politics, the American or Know Nothing Party. Originating in the northern states, the hotbed of political innovation, its secrecy fascinated many. The party's anti-Catholic and anti-foreign planks appealed to those prejudiced against Roman Catholics and to those who desired education as the basic requirement for suffrage.⁸ Since the order became active in Texas late in 1854, the Know Nothing movement had no opportunity to test its strength at the polls for another year. Thus, the Texas Know Nothings spent their first months organizing their party and increasing their membership to enable them to battle the Democrats.⁹

The new faction attracted an assortment of people. Many who joined the order in Texas were Democrats who saw the organization as a social group. They had no desire to create a new political party and abandoned the movement when it became a political force. Various other people remained in the secret order: former Whigs, Union Democrats, people objecting to the influence of Catholics whose leaders resided in a foreign country, and those who feared corruption from an uneducated foreign

⁷Austin State Gazette, July 15, 1854.

⁸Dudley G. Wooten, A Comprehensive History of Texas, 1685 to 1897 (Dallas, 1898), II, 36.

⁹William Darrell Overdyke, The Know Nothing Party in the South (Baton Rouge, 1950), 62.

population. Opponents cried that America needed immigrants to develop the country, that religion should not be introduced into the government, and that the order violated freedom of religion.¹⁰ The Know Nothing Party became a bitter political issue in Texas for the next several years and inspired many of John Marshall's editorials in the State Gazette.

Texas Democrats achieved their first real show of unity in 1855. John Marshall remarked in March that the time had come to prepare for the selection of delegates to attend the convention. He emphasized, "Democracy is not a mere name. It is the great idea of social progress...."¹¹ Marshall declared that he planned to abide by the decision of the convention, or he would support the reelection of Governor Elisha M. Pease if there were no convention. In addition to the Gazette, the Cherokee Sentinel and the Marshall Texas Republican favored the idea of a convention as a unifying factor.¹²

The April 15 meeting at Huntsville had only a small degree of success. In spite of the favorable editorials, delegates from only twelve counties attended. They reaffirmed the national platform and recommended the reelection of Governor Pease and Lieutenant Governor D. C. Dickson.¹³ The convention expressed patriotic joy concerning the unrest in Cuba. The

¹⁰Wooten, History of Texas, 36-37.

¹¹Austin State Gazette, March 31, 1855.

¹²Marshall Texas Republican, February 24, 1855.

¹³Wallace, Texas in Turmoil, 37.

Democrats declared that regularly-scheduled conventions which discussed federal and state policy were the best devices to organize the Democratic Party. Before the convention adjourned, the delegates called for the next year's meeting to be held in Austin on January 9, 1856, and urged all good Democrats to attend.¹⁴

Marshall honored his pledge. He reported that the convention recommended Pease and Dickson for office; so, he placed their names on the masthead of the Gazette. The editor observed that Dickson disagreed with Pease about the land grant system to railroad companies and, therefore, agreed with the Gazette that a loan plan was preferable. However, Marshall approved Pease's ideas concerning education since the governor called for the establishment of a school system.¹⁵ Pease recommended that the legislature appropriate two million dollars for school maintenance, but he could not decide whether one or two state universities should be established.¹⁶ Marshall called Pease a worthy man despite their differences involving railroads, and he hailed his election as in the best interest of the people and the party. The critical comments, the editor replied, were not meant as opposition but as further expressions of the ideas the Gazette previously adhered to.¹⁷ Therefore,

¹⁴Winkler, Platforms, 63.

¹⁵James T. De Shields, They Sat in High Places (San Antonio, 1940), 201.

¹⁶Lubbock, Six Decades, 195.

¹⁷Austin State Gazette, April 28, 1855.

when Marshall compromised some of his beliefs for the success of the Democratic Party, he placed partisanship above issues.

In contrast to the unproductive Democratic convention, the newly-formed Know Nothing Party held a successful meeting on June 11, 1855, at Washington-on-the-Brazos. Despite the fact that the party had existed for only a few months, its members gave the Democrats cause for alarm by electing the Mayor of Galveston in March, 1855.¹⁸ When the secret order met, it made the following nominations: Lemuel D. Evans for Congress in the eastern part of the state and John Hancock in the western district, W. G. W. Jowers for Lieutenant Governor, and Stephen Crosby for Land Commissioner. However, the biggest surprise came when the public discovered that the convention had nominated Lieutenant Governor D. C. Dickson, elected as a Democrat, for governor. The meeting also set up subordinate councils to advance the principles of the party and to help elect its candidates.¹⁹

Knowledge of the Know Nothing convention prompted the frantic Democrats to hold another convention. Many editors of Democratic newspapers had pledged their support to reelect Dickson after the April convention. John Marshall was among the first to endorse the candidate as part of his image as a leading party spokesman.²⁰ However, he immediately abandoned

¹⁸Wallace, Texas in Turmoil, 37.

¹⁹Winkler, Platforms, 63.

²⁰Wallace, Texas in Turmoil, 38.

Dickson after the Washington convention.²¹ Other editors removed the Lieutenant Governor's name from their mastheads and joined in the Gazette's call for another meeting to be held in Austin on June 16. The delegates to the Austin assembly denounced all secret factions and branded the Know Nothings as enemies of the people. They pledged support for the reelection of Governor Pease and endorsed Peter H. Bell for Congress in the western district. Before adjourning, Dickson was denounced as the candidate of another party, but no nominee was substituted to run for Lieutenant Governor. However, Hardin R. Runnels became the unofficial candidate of the party when he received Marshall's endorsement on June 30.²²

The Know Nothings altered the existing political situation since their activities gave the Democrats encouragement within a few months' time. Their speeches labeling the non-slave owning Germans and Mexicans as abolitionists instantly drove the naturalized Americans into the Democratic Party.²³ The new faction helped draw party lines, and although it obscured the important issues, the new order furnished the main political arguments for the following year.

The Gazette's attitude toward the new group changed from tolerance to hostility in 1855. In February, John Marshall announced that he wished to investigate the Know Nothings

²¹Austin State Gazette, June 14, 1855.

²²Winkler, Platforms, 64.

²³R. L. Bieseke, The History of the German Settlements in Texas, 1831-1861 (Austin, 1930), 203.

thoroughly before he formed his opinion of the new political force. He presented his readers with impartial articles about the group and reminded them that good Democrats should remain silent until enough facts were uncovered to facilitate a calm judgment of the order.²⁴ However, after the Washington convention, Democratic editors in Texas began using their papers to condemn the Know Nothings. Marshall became one of the leaders in the editorial movement which sought to guide the Democrats to victory over their secret opponents. He received aid from A. J. Hamilton, Williamson S. Oldham, J. Pinckney Henderson, Louis T. Wigfall, John H. Reagan, and Oran M. Roberts. They battled to expose the secret order for its own ideas and because it received aid from Sam Houston who had been under attack by many Texans since his vote against the Kansas-Nebraska Act.²⁵

Several factors explain the rapid rise of the Know Nothing movement in Texas. The large number of Germans and Mexicans furnished nativist leaders with an obvious target, and the immigrants' protest of the activities of the order added charges to the attacks.²⁶ Sam Houston's alienation from the Democratic Party compelled him to join the organization providing it with an effective leader. Houston had first been exposed to nativism while he recovered from his San Jacinto wounds in the New Orleans home of William Christy, a nativist

²⁴Austin State Gazette, February 10, 1855.

²⁵Wooten, History of Texas, 85.

²⁶Wallace, Texas in Turmoil, 37.

sympathizer. He announced his formal adherence to the Know Nothing Party in the midst of the 1855 campaign. Another boost to the new party came from the chairman of the Democratic state committee, John S. "Rip" Ford, who changed the Austin Texas State Times from a Democratic newspaper into the Know Nothing Party organ.²⁷

The campaign of 1855 emphasized emotionalism and name-calling while ignoring issues. John Marshall unleashed the verbal assault on the Know Nothing-Houston coalition. He reminded Texas that they had a senator who had allied himself with abolitionists and Free-Soilers.²⁸ Powerful foes such as the Galveston News, Louis T. Wigfall, and Anson Jones joined in the attacks.²⁹ Houston, at first, ignored the charges but then informed his listeners in a speech at Rusk that the existing Democratic Party offered no remedy against papal influences. Therefore, the American Party offered the only opportunity for reform and protection from dangers. Since Houston hated the Papacy which he felt was a foreign ruling body, he saw merit in the movement since several Popes had fought secret orders. Houston warned Americans that they would be under the Pope's influence if they did not maintain their principles.³⁰

²⁷Overdyke, Know Nothing Party, 115-116.

²⁸Llerena Friend, Sam Houston, The Great Designer (Austin, 1954), 238.

²⁹Ibid., 239.

³⁰Lubbock, Six Decades, 198, 206.

In spite of Houston's rhetoric, most Texans listened to Marshall, and the Democratic ticket carried the state. Pease defeated Dickson by eight thousand votes, and Bell easily won reelection to Congress in the western district. However, Houston's influence accounted for the close election of Lemuel D. Evans to Congress in the eastern district over Matthias Ward.³¹ Also, the Know Nothings captured one-third of the seats in the legislature and several precinct offices throughout the state. Stephen F. Crosby, reelected as Commissioner of the General Land Office, received support from both parties.³²

John Marshall continued his onslaught on the Know Nothings throughout the remainder of the year. In September, he rejoiced that President Franklin Pierce had denounced the Know Nothings in a speech at White Sulphur Springs, Virginia, by referring to the order as antagonistic to the Bible and against the progress of the American nation. The editor published a series of three articles by John D. Freeman on the legality of the Know Nothings which condemned the group for its secret organizations, denial of the rights of naturalized citizens, and opposition to religious freedom.³³ Marshall found proof of the order's religious intolerance by its refusal to seat Catholic delegates from Louisiana at its national

³¹Ibid., 206.

³²Overdyke, Know Nothing Party, 117.

³³Austin State Gazette, September 16, September 22, 1855.

convention in Philadelphia.³⁴ In November, the editor declared that the Know Nothings were allied with northern Free-Soilers who conspired to outlaw slavery in Kansas as they did in California. He maintained that the August elections had cleansed the Democratic Party of its corrupt members who were anti-Catholic and antisouthern.³⁵

The final events of Marshall's political activity in 1855 concerned the municipal elections in Austin. On October 7, Edward Peck, a Know Nothing, defeated B. M. Gill for mayor by seven votes.³⁶ Marshall blamed the Democratic defeat upon the property qualification for voting. In the December aldermen elections, the Democrats won only two of six races, and Marshall attributed that defeat to a low-voter turnout, but he rejoiced that the city voters abolished the property qualification for suffrage.³⁷

The Know Nothing gains on the state and local levels added to Marshall's previous concern about the lack of unity among Democrats. Therefore, he applauded the Organization of Young Democratic Men of Travis County which was founded in 1855. The group, led by capable men, would add strength to the party, and Marshall urged every county in the state to organize a similar group. Also, Marshall reminded his readers that the name

³⁴Overdyke, Know Nothing Party, 128.

³⁵Austin State Gazette, November 3, 1855.

³⁶Overdyke, Know Nothing Party, 117.

³⁷Austin State Gazette, October 13, December 15, 1855.

"Democrat" was hallowed even to the opposition; therefore, the party members should remember their heritage and work to promote Democratic interests. He stressed the accomplishments of such Democratic presidents as Thomas Jefferson who acquired the Louisiana Purchase, and he urged all Democrats to support their party's ticket.³⁸ Finally, in a further attempt to stimulate party unity, Marshall began as early as October 6, 1855, to publish notices announcing the Democratic state convention scheduled for Austin on January 8, 1856, and called for organization in every county to ensure success for the party.³⁹

The convention which assembled on January 18, 1856, in Austin was the first state-wide Democratic gathering in Texas to successfully complete its work.⁴⁰ Before the convention, Marshall pointed out that Democrats must prepare to frame a platform in accordance with the principles of the party and vow to canvass the state actively against the Know Nothings.⁴¹ At the meeting, 245 delegates represented 90 counties. The delegates elected the unsuccessful 1855 Congressional candidate, Matthias Ward, as president.⁴² The convention selected eight delegates, including Marshall's partner Williamson S. Oldham, to the national convention at Cincinnati, and it

³⁸Ibid., December 8, 1855.

³⁹Ibid., October 6, 1855.

⁴⁰Louis J. Wortham, A History of Texas from Wilderness to Commonwealth (Fort Worth, 1924), IV, 247.

⁴¹Austin State Gazette, January 12, 1856.

⁴²Lubbock, Six Decades, 201.

designated four presidential electors. The terms of three state officials expired that year; so, the delegates nominated James Willis for Attorney General, James B. Shaw for Comptroller, and James H. Raymond for State Treasurer.⁴³

In addition to nominating candidates, the delegates considered various resolutions and worked to create better organization of the party. The convention passed fifteen resolutions including reaffirmation of the 1852 Democratic platform, faith in freedom of religion, and opposition to secret orders.⁴⁴ However, the most controversial resolution, offered by George W. Chilton of Smith County, castigated Sam Houston's negative vote and praised Thomas J. Rusk's affirmation of the Kansas-Nebraska Act. This carried over the objections of Oldham, Ashbel Smith, and Francis R. Lubbock. Lubbock then offered an alternative motion refusing to endorse anyone not fully united with the Democratic Party on all questions.⁴⁵ John Marshall attended the convention as a delegate from Travis County, and the party selected him as Chairman of its Central Committee for the campaign, a position he maintained until 1861.⁴⁶ Before adjourning, the delegates selected Waco as the site of the 1857 convention.⁴⁷

⁴³Winkler, Platforms, 65.

⁴⁴Wortham, History of Texas, 247-248.

⁴⁵Lubbock, Six Decades, 202.

⁴⁶Winkler, Platforms, 40.

⁴⁷Ibid., 68.

Marshall responded to the convention as a loyal Democrat who wished his party to be victorious. On January 22, 1856, he placed the names included on the party's ticket on the masthead of the Gazette. He expressed pride in the work of the meeting with editorials discussing the most talented convention in the state's history. Marshall praised the candidates selected as well as the delegates to the national convention and the electors. He printed more than one thousand copies of the proceedings of the convention to be spread throughout the state. However, he warned Democratic leaders to begin uniting their county organizations immediately while reminding them that "Nothing is safe till won."⁴⁸

Not to be outdone by the Democrats, the Know Nothings also used the Capitol as the site for their productive state convention which opened on January 21, 1856. It was the first convention of the order held in Texas that was open to the public. Fifty-three counties sent representatives, and six delegates were selected to attend the American Party national convention while four men were designated presidential electors. Nominees for state office included William Stedman for Attorney General, Sterling C. Robertson for Comptroller, and William A. Tarlton for State Treasurer.⁴⁹ After hearing numerous speeches about the principles of the American Party, the delegates passed twelve resolutions emphasizing nativistic

⁴⁸ Austin State Gazette, January 26, 1856.

⁴⁹ Winkler, Platforms, 68-69.

concepts, opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and the abolition of the party's code of secrecy.⁵⁰ One plank the convention endorsed called for an extension to twenty-one years of the period of residence required for the naturalization of immigrants, an idea Sam Houston had endorsed in December, 1855. However, the proceedings never mentioned the name of the hero of San Jacinto.⁵¹

Democrats in Texas organized their campaign soon after their convention adjourned. Marshall reported the efforts of the Young Men's Democratic Association to organize an effective program and to create interest in the election. The group declared that previous Democratic reversals in Texas had been caused by poor organization. Marshall praised their efforts and called for organized Democratic clubs composed of party members of all ages throughout the state. He vowed to print news of their proceedings in the Gazette to which he offered reduced subscription rates for the party's clubs.⁵²

Marshall declared that never before in Texas had as many people stood behind the party.⁵³ He based his assertion upon the effort being supplied by Francis R. Lubbock, a former Comptroller of Public Accounts and respected politician, who

⁵⁰Ernest Wallace and David M. Vigness (eds.), Documents of Texas History (Austin, 1963), 186-187.

⁵¹Friend, Sam Houston, 243.

⁵²Austin State Gazette, March 22, May 10, 1856.

⁵³Ibid., April 12, 1856.

reentered the political scene in 1856 by canvassing the area of Texas east of the Brazos River.⁵⁴ Because of the efforts of the Young Men's Democratic Association, Lubbock, and others, Marshall found the party to be more unified than it had ever previously been.

John Marshall and John H. Reagan proved themselves ardent Democratic Party workers in 1856, a year of both federal and state elections. Although Marshall occupied most of his time with national issues, he also devoted considerable effort to the state canvass. He reported that one of the main functions of his newspaper was to furnish Texans with reports of the state's domestic affairs. In May, he published notices of the August elections for state and county offices, and on June 21, Marshall endorsed the Democrats running for election in Travis County.⁵⁵ According to the campaign style of the period, opposing candidates engaged in debates at various towns. Judge John H. Reagan proved a capable Democrat in East Texas because of his mastery of the art of campaigning.⁵⁶ Marshall praised the incumbent Attorney General Jim Willis for his willingness to meet his opponent at any time as long as he would not be forced to neglect his official duties. The editor also lauded the Democratic candidates with terms including "sterling Democrat" and flowery descriptions of their performances.⁵⁷

⁵⁴Lubbock, Six Decades, 206.

⁵⁵Austin State Gazette, May 24, June 21, 1856.

⁵⁶Ben H. Procter, Not Without Honor (Austin, 1962), 94.

⁵⁷Austin State Gazette, May 10, July 5, 1856.

Although the election of his party's state-wide ticket greatly pleased Marshall, he did not find complete satisfaction with the outcome. Congratulations were bestowed on the Democrats of Travis County for soundly defeating the Know Nothings and repudiating the order's nativism as indicated by the reelection of James B. Costa, an Italian-American, as judge of one of the county's courts. Upon the basis of the returns, he confidently predicted complete success for the Democratic ticket in Texas in November. Rarely content with an existing situation, John Marshall found cause for alarm over the results. The issues of railroad legislation and the control of lobbies were of minor importance in the legislative elections. Marshall feared that local interests which had delayed until 1856 the passage of the bill authorizing state loans for railroad construction might influence the new legislators. He complained that local interests might cause the legislature to further delay passage of bills to implement his ideas about schools and railroads.⁵⁸

In contrast to the state elections, the national presidential contest inspired much controversy in Texas. Marshall devoted many pages of the Gazette to the activities of both the Democratic and Know Nothing parties in their endeavors to carry Texas. He also gave reports of the campaign in other states. As usual, Marshall did not content himself with merely

⁵⁸ Ibid., August 9, September 6, 1856.

reporting about the activities of the candidates, but he editorialized about both parties.

As Chairman of the Democratic Central Committee, Marshall's comments about the Know Nothings were highly critical. In his report of the party's national convention held at Philadelphia on February 19, 1856, he referred to some of the delegates as "doodle bugs."⁵⁹ The meeting nominated former President Millard Fillmore for President on the second ballot, and it chose Andrew Jackson Donelson of Tennessee for Vice President.⁶⁰ Marshall remarked that Sam Houston had gambled on the nomination and had lost.⁶¹

He commented that the Black Republicans must have swallowed the Know Nothings in the North. Both parties' important leaders were abolitionists. Marshall remarked that those who opposed the Kansas-Nebraska Act in the North had developed the secret order to create the issue of nativism, which ignored slavery, as a disguise to persuade Southerners to join. Therefore, Marshall found no security for the South in the American Party platform.⁶²

Fillmore's identification with antislavery interests became the focal point of the campaign. Marshall recalled that Fillmore had supported petitions to end the slave trade in

⁵⁹ Ibid., March 8, 1856.

⁶⁰ Marquis James, The Raven (Indianapolis, 1929), 387.

⁶¹ Austin State Gazette, June 7, 1856.

⁶² Ibid., May 3, 1856.

Washington, D. C., in 1837, 1838, and 1839. He accused the former President of trying to disrupt the Union by driving slaveholders from American territory. Therefore, he saw a vote for Fillmore as a vote for John C. Fremont, the Republican candidate. To support his stand, Marshall cited reports that in Indiana, Fillmore and Fremont had the same list of electors.⁶³ Because of the alleged connections between Fremont and Fillmore, many former southern Whigs, including Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana, would not endorse Fillmore as an heir to their old party. In Texas, such Know Nothings as D. C. Dickson and Judge W. B. Ochiltree abandoned their party because of Fillmore's candidacy.⁶⁴

The Democrats held their national convention in Cincinnati on June 2, 1856. They nominated James Buchanan for President and John C. Breckenridge for Vice President.⁶⁵ Marshall's partner, Oldham, attended the convention, and upon his return, he supplied much information to Marshall about the proceedings of the convention which the editor neglected to publish until August 30.⁶⁶ In his comment about the convention, Marshall reminded his readers of some of the programs the Democrats had endorsed. He included the doctrine of nonintervention by

⁶³Ibid., August 9, September 13, 1856.

⁶⁴Overdyke, Know Nothing Party, 148-152.

⁶⁵Clement Eaton, A History of the Old South (New York, 1966), 485.

⁶⁶Marshall Texas Republican, June 21, 1856.

Congress in the territories and attacks on banks, monopolies, and tariffs.⁶⁷

In contrast to his treatment of the Know Nothing ticket, Marshall strongly praised the Democratic nominees. On June 21, 1856, he placed the names of James Buchanan and John C. Breckenridge on the masthead of the Gazette. In his editorial endorsement, the editor complimented Stephen A. Douglas for withdrawing from the balloting in favor of Buchanan, a veteran of fifty years of public service. Marshall remarked that the nominee had been a loyal Democrat since 1820 and had opposed the Know Nothings. He referred to Breckenridge as a statesman closely aligned with progress as shown by his service in the Mexican War and by the record of his two terms in Congress. In an emotional plea for support, Marshall placed a testimony by the late John C. Calhoun on the masthead "Mr. Buchanan has habitually indicated on the dangerous question of slavery correct feelings." Later, he added Buchanan's picture to the caption.⁶⁸ He did not, however, explain the source for Calhoun's statement.

Marshall offered several reasons for his endorsement of the Democrats. He declared that of the three candidates, only Buchanan promised to defend the rights of the South insisting that the only manner in which slavery could be excluded from a territory was by the action of a constitutional convention. The editor claimed that Fillmore could not win; so, he

⁶⁷ Austin State Gazette, August 30, 1856.

⁶⁸ Ibid., June 21, August 23, 1856.

urged former Know Nothings to support the Democratic ticket of Buchanan and Breckenridge.⁶⁹ However, Sam Houston, the most popular Know Nothing in Texas, announced that he could accept neither the Democratic nor the Republican platforms and would support Fillmore and Donelson.⁷⁰

The Democratic campaign on local levels interested Marshall. He praised local party leaders who accepted the opposition's challenge to public discussion of the issues. On October 4, the editor quoted a banner from a New York City parade which read "First we Polked them, then we Pierced them, now we'll Buck them."⁷¹ Before election day, Marshall warned his fellow Democrats to supply themselves with plenty of ballots since the enemy planned to issue counterfeit and fraudulent tickets. He offered to print ballots at the cost of seventy-five cents per one hundred or six dollars per one thousand.⁷² Finally, Marshall reported that Buchanan received additional support from such papers as the Houston Telegraph.⁷³

In October, Marshall attempted to forecast the outcome of the presidential race. He reported that Democratic victories in local elections in Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Delaware

⁶⁹ Ibid., July 26, 1856.

⁷⁰ Friend, Sam Houston, 245.

⁷¹ Austin State Gazette, October 4, 1856.

⁷² Ibid., October 25, 1856.

⁷³ Warner E. Gettys (Director), Bureau of Research in the Social Sciences of the University of Texas, Houston (Houston, 1942), 68.

indicated those states as safe for Buchanan. New Jersey, California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Connecticut, and New Hampshire seemed to be good prospects. Marshall also found hope for Buchanan in New York where leaders had reorganized the party under the direction of Governor Horatio Seymour.⁷⁴ In the South, the divided Know Nothing Party supplied the major opposition to the Democrats since the Republican strength there was negligible.⁷⁵

He rejoiced over the results of the election. On November 8, Marshall reported that early returns indicated that Buchanan had carried Florida, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Ohio. He saw a gain of twenty-four Congressmen from the Northwest. The next week, the Gazette carried the caption "Glorious News, bring out the gun once more" surrounded by a flag and a cannon. Fillmore carried only Maryland, and Marshall attributed that vote to violence in Baltimore which kept many voters from the polls. He also found cause for elation on the local level since the people of Austin elected Democrats to the office of mayor and to four of the eight alderman seats.⁷⁶

As his strength in the Democratic Party increased, his reliance upon the constructive issues he endorsed lessened. In 1855, he willingly compromised his ideas about railroads to

⁷⁴Austin State Gazette, October 25, 1856.

⁷⁵James, The Raven, 387.

⁷⁶Austin State Gazette, November 8, November 15, November 22, 1856.

aid the reelection of Governor Pease. Although he mentioned the need for state-wide concern for issues such as railroads in 1856, Marshall primarily relied on emotionalism found in slavery and attacks on the Know Nothings as his political arguments that year. Therefore, the weight of the constructive issues became lighter as Marshall leaned more heavily upon party unity and emotionalism. Again, his basic intentions became modified and had different outcomes. Slavery began to outweigh constructiveness to Marshall as he assumed command of the machinery of the Democratic Party in Texas.

Chapter Three

John Marshall: Party Leader

By 1856, John Marshall had risen to the position of Chairman of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party. That post and the editorship of the Gazette served as mediums for him to influence many of the party's operations. Marshall had the power to help shape the party into the organized body he had advocated for several years. As chairman, he continued to emphasize unity among Democrats. Slavery, partisanship, the necessity for conventions, and other emotional elements practically replaced constructive issues as subjects for his political writings. He directed successful campaigns in 1856, 1857, and 1858. Ironically, under his leadership, the Democratic Party John Marshall had worked to strengthen weakened because of internal quarreling, and the Democrats lost the elections of 1859.

In spite of his pride in having helped guide the victorious Democratic ticket in 1856, John Marshall did not allow the party to reflect upon its previous victories, but he began concentrating on the 1857 state elections within a month of Buchanan's victory. In January, acting as Chairman of the Central Committee, he called attention to the coming state convention scheduled for May 4 in Waco. He urged adequate preparation to ensure a large attendance at the meeting since candidates

needed to be nominated for Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Commissioner of the General Land Office, and Congressmen.¹

Marshall stressed the importance of creating a unified party in his preconvention editorials. He reminded Democrats that at their last meeting they had used the convention system to subordinate men and personalities to issues and the principles of democracy. He charged editors of all Democratic journals with the duty of creating sufficient interest in the convention to make it successful. The journalist predicted a tremendous amount of unity and harmony at Waco. As a token reminder of the issues he had once stressed, he asked the delegates to endorse effective measures to provide for the development of potential state resources, especially railroads.²

The Gazette discussed prospective candidates for office. Newspapers endorsing Middleton T. Johnson for Governor included the Lamar Enquirer, the Trinity Advocate, and the Tyler Reporter. The Washington Ranger supported Colonel A. M. Lewis while the Jefferson Herald favored Hardin R. Runnels. Marshall liked Runnels, then serving as Lieutenant Governor, because of his cool judgment, his many years of service in the legislature, and his conduct as presiding officer of the Texas Senate where he proved himself to be a true southern Democrat. He formally endorsed the candidate on January 24, 1857, but he promised to support the nominee of the convention.

¹Austin State Gazette, January 10, 1857.

²Ibid., January 17, 1857.

Marshall also reported the activities of several county conventions. In February, he remarked that the Hays County Democratic convention's endorsement of Runnels for Governor served as proof that an East Texan could find support in the western part of the state. Also, he announced that county conventions in Fort Bend and Brazoria had recommended Guy M. Bryan, a well-qualified States-rights Democratic member of the legislature, for Congressman in the western district. Francis R. Lubbock, endorsed for Lieutenant Governor by the Harris County Democrats, received favorable support from Marshall. The editor called for the secretaries of the various county conventions to supply the Gazette with reports of their meetings for publication. On April 18, 1857, Marshall remarked that the proceedings from various counties throughout the state favored Runnels in his race since he drew a majority of delegates in East Texas and a plurality in West Texas.³ Before the Waco convention, the political scene in Texas provoked much excitement, and John Marshall found himself involved in many of the activities.

At the May 4 meeting, the delegates made some of their selections with little controversy. Three hundred people from ninety counties attended the convention making it the largest in the state's history. The Democrats again named John Marshall as Chairman of the Central Committee. After Runnels received

³Ibid., January 24, April 18, 1857.

the unanimous nomination for Governor on the eighth ballot when Middleton T. Johnson, A. M. Lewis, and George Symth withdrew, the delegates chose Lubbock for Lieutenant Governor on the first ballot. The nomination for Comptroller also involved little discussion as C. R. Johnson gained approval on the first vote. Guy M. Bryan and Judge John H. Reagan received the party's endorsement for Congress.⁴

On the other hand, the contest for Land Commissioner became very controversial. The incumbent Stephen Crosby, a popular man throughout the state, had joined the Know Nothing movement and planned to support the opposition for Governor if he failed to receive renomination. The lengthy debate about Crosby divided into two groups. Dr. J. M. Steiner led the fight for Crosby while Lubbock headed the group which triumphed with the naming of Francis M. White.⁵

Despite the squabbles about nominations, the convention ended in a more harmonious manner. The delegates approved five resolutions, including support for the 1856 Democratic national platform as the only doctrine to save the Union. They praised Marshall for his work as Chairman of the state Central Committee.⁶ On May 9, Marshall apologized to his readers that his attendance at the convention prevented him

⁴Ernest W. Winkler (ed.), Platforms of Political Parties in Texas (Austin, 1916), 72-74.

⁵Francis R. Lubbock, Six Decades in Texas (Austin, 1900), 200-213.

⁶Winkler, Platforms, 73-74.

from writing an editorial for that edition of the Gazette, but he did endorse the Democratic ticket in that issue.⁷

Although the Democrats encountered vigorous opposition in 1857, they did not battle the Know Nothing Party since that faction began losing ground in Texas after its defeat in the 1856 election. Additional events weakened the party further. In March, 1857, the editorial staff of the strongest American journal in the state, the Austin Texas State Times, divorced itself from the party. In May, John S. Ford, its editor, joined the Democrats because of his southern loyalties.⁸ Another blow came in March when W. C. Walker, the former Know Nothing City Marshal of Austin, fled the country because of his debts.⁹

Since the opponents of the Democrats refused to call a convention, they declared their intentions to run independently. On May 12, Sam Houston announced his candidacy for Governor as a Jacksonian Democrat.¹⁰ He claimed that he entered the race because many delegates at the Waco convention denounced him.¹¹ He stressed his desire to be a governor for all Texans and not merely to represent a political party.

⁷ Austin State Gazette, May 9, 1857.

⁸ William Darrell Overdyke, The Know Nothing Party in the South (Baton Rouge, 1950), 271-274.

⁹ Austin State Gazette, March 14, 1856.

¹⁰ Lubbock, Six Decades, 213.

¹¹ Llerena Friend, Sam Houston, The Great Designer (Austin, 1954), 248.

Jesse Grimes entered the race for Lieutenant Governor and Stephen Crosby decided to run for Land Commissioner with Houston.¹²

One of the primary issues of the campaign evolved when Sam Houston and other Independents protested the decision of the Waco convention. The Senator opposed conventions in 1855 when the candidates the Know Nothings nominated met defeat. Marshall charged Houston with refusing to abide by a written platform and for making the campaign one of personalities. Many Texans, including the editor of the Nacogdoches Chronicle, opposed the convention for its refusal to endorse Crosby.

Marshall defended not only the Waco convention but also the system of nomination by conventions. He recalled that conventions had gained favor in 1832, during the presidency of Andrew Jackson. Marshall also remarked that the delegates at Waco banished the Land Commissioner because he refused to pledge his support to the Democratic ticket. The Gazette reminded its readers that Crosby had used his office to establish Know Nothing patronage and had secured the American Party nomination in 1855.¹³

In addition to his defense of conventions, Marshall praised the nominee for Land Commissioner, Francis M. White. He lauded White for his service to Texas in many public offices, especially in the legislature. As Chairman of the Central

¹²Winkler, Platforms, 74-75.

¹³Austin State Gazette, May 30, 1857.

Committee, Marshall issued a lengthy editorial reporting that White met all the standards of an efficient officer as required by Jeffersonian rule. He reminded his readers that Crosby's opposition to conventions developed only after his failure to secure renomination in Waco. Marshall did not object to Crosby as an individual, but since the Land Office dispensed much patronage, he preferred a Democrat in the office. On July 25, he declared, "The issue: Houston, Crosby and Co., vs. the People of Texas."¹⁴ Marshall, thus, helped to answer the Know Nothing charges against conventions and defended those Democrats who had been nominated by them.

However, Marshall did not consider conventions to be the real issue; therefore, he began concentrating on emotional issues. Primarily, he saw Sam Houston's voting record as the most important matter. He reminded voters that Houston and John Bell were the only southern Senators to vote against the principles of Congressional nonintervention in the territories when they declared against the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The August election, Marshall insisted, offered Texans a chance to express their opinions on Houston's vote. On June 24, 1857, Marshall began publishing the Gazette semiweekly to provide additional coverage of the campaign. The editor remarked that Senator Houston had opposed a bill to create four new regiments to protect the Texas frontier. He repeatedly commented on Houston's vindication of three thousand

¹⁴Ibid., July 25, 1857.

abolitionist preachers who tried to speak to Congress about their antislavery views.¹⁵ Also, Houston continued to endorse the Missouri Compromise after the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional in the Dred Scott case.¹⁶

As another major point in his campaigning, the editor condemned Houston's religious views. Marshall recalled that in joining the Know Nothing Order, Houston endorsed its anti-Catholic views.¹⁷ The Senator later called for legislation forbidding Catholics from holding office. Also, Houston remarked that the cruelty at the Alamo resulted from Catholic influences in Mexico.¹⁸ Therefore, throughout the campaign, Marshall levied personal attacks on Sam Houston because of his voting record and his alleged religious intolerance.

Senator Houston matched Marshall's emotional appeal to the voters. The highlight of his emotionalism came in a speech at Lockhart. Williamson S. Oldham had been stumping the state in behalf of Runnels. That day he read a statement calling for the defeat of all traitors and listed Sam Houston in the group.¹⁹ Houston responded by reading a list of the men who signed the report of the Waco convention. When he

¹⁵Ibid., June 6, July 1, 1857.

¹⁶Friend, Sam Houston, 388.

¹⁷Austin State Gazette, July 18, 1857.

¹⁸Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker (eds.), The Writings of Sam Houston (Austin, 1938), VIII, 386-387.

¹⁹William Mc Craw, Professional Politician (Washington, 1940), 41.

read Oldham's name, he charged that as a Judge in Arkansas, Oldham had pilfered some bank books and had thrown them into the White River.²⁰ Several other encounters in the campaign also resulted in personal attacks against Oldham. Marshall condemned these, but after the election, he remarked that assaults by one of Sam Houston's moral caliber should hurt no one.²¹

John H. Reagan also engaged in the lively campaign. Judge Reagan actually preferred to retain his judicial post since his term had five years to run, but the Democrats drafted him to oppose the incumbent Lemuel D. Evans. The issues centered upon charges by Reagan that Evans favored nativism and upon Evans' insistence that Reagan advocated the reopening of the slave trade and secession. Reagan seized the advantage at Jefferson by reading a letter from Evans to Mrs. J. M. Clough of Marshall exposing the Congressman's advocacy of disunion at the Nashville convention in 1850.²² The challenger claimed that religion should not be involved in politics, declared that place of birth had no political bearing, and called secret political societies unwise.²³ Marshall applauded

²⁰A. W. Terrell, "Recollections of General Sam Houston," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XVI (October, 1912), 119-120.

²¹Austin State Gazette, October 24, 1857.

²²Ben H. Proctor, Not Without Honor (Austin, 1962), 96-97.

²³John H. Reagan, Memoirs (New York, 1906), 64.

Reagan's consistency and believed him an excellent choice to oust Evans.²⁴

Francis R. Lubbock, Runnels' running mate, proved himself to be a vigorous campaigner. Since Runnels was a poor speaker, Lubbock was compelled to campaign throughout the entire state in support of the Democratic ticket.²⁵ In Sumpter, Trinity County, Lubbock attacked a personal friend, District Attorney A. T. Branch, Houston's local speaker, for joining the Whig Party in Virginia. In July, John Marshall asked Lubbock to take his campaigning to Central Texas where the need was particularly great. During the canvass, Lubbock visited one hundred counties while his opponent, Jesse Grimes, did little campaigning.²⁶

During the course of the campaign, Marshall predicted the results of the election. He remarked that mail from old Houston strongholds in Nacogdoches and San Augustine indicated the Democrats to have considerable strength in East Texas. If the Independents could not carry those counties, Marshall believed that a Democratic victory was assured.²⁷ Marshall could support his claim of Democratic strength by the effective aid given to the party by Willard Richardson, the editor of the Galveston News. Richardson used his Democratic political views

²⁴Austin State Gazette, May 30, 1857.

²⁵Ernest Wallace, Texas in Turmoil (Austin, 1965), 42-43.

²⁶Lubbock, Six Decades, 216, 221.

²⁷Austin State Gazette, July 1, 1857.

to help increase his paper's circulation by intensely attacking Houston who had the support of the News' biggest rival, the Galveston Civilian.²⁸

The results of the 1857 election sustained Marshall's optimistic predictions. He claimed that Texans had been redeemed from the party of Sam Houston.²⁹ Runnels defeated his opponent by a vote of 32,552 to 23,628.³⁰ The final tabulation found the Democrats victorious in all state-wide races and in the Congressional contests. Marshall devoted nearly one complete page to coverage of the election returns on August 15. Above the county-by-county returns, he placed a large crow. He found the reasons for Houston's defeat quite obvious: his Kansas-Nebraska Act vote, his identification with northern political associates, and his support of Fillmore. Marshall praised the work of the Waco convention for creating an atmosphere conducive to a successful Democratic campaign. He compared the covention to the Magna Carta since both intended to limit tyranny and demagogues by expressing the political rights of the people.³¹

The chairman of the Democratic Central Committee enjoyed the results of the 1857 elections since he had helped

²⁸Earl Wesley Fornell, The Galveston Era (Austin, 1961), 147.

²⁹Austin State Gazette, August 15, 1857.

³⁰Vincent G. Hopkins, "Secession in Texas" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1960), 52.

³¹Austin State Gazette, August 15, 1857.

direct a very successful campaign. Marshall congratulated and complimented the winners. His position as the leading party spokesman proved effective in the 1856 and 1857 elections. By directing the successful campaigns, he had placed himself in a position to demand reappointment to his office at the next Democratic convention. In addition to securing control of the Democratic Party, Marshall assumed sole ownership of the Gazette when Williamson S. Oldham left the newspaper on August 22, 1857.³²

Shortly before the 1857 elections, there occurred one of the most tragic events in Texas political history, the suicide of Senator Thomas J. Rusk. Marshall admired Rusk, and he suggested the senator as a candidate for President in 1856. Since Marshall considered him as a possible nominee in the future, he urged Rusk to remain in the Senate where he could gain additional supporters.³³ In March, 1857, he praised the Senator for his benefits to the western section of the state including improvements in the wagon roads and mail service.³⁴

Rusk's position in the election of 1857 became a source of much speculation and worry for Marshall. Houston wrote to Rusk soon after he announced his candidacy to explain his reasons for deciding not to retire to private life.³⁵

³²Ibid., August 22, 1857.

³³Friend, Sam Houston, 246.

³⁴Austin State Gazette, March 28, 1857.

³⁵Williams and Barker, Writings, VIII, 444.

When asked to choose between Houston and Runnels, Rusk replied that he would vote for the Democratic ticket. He never voted since he committed suicide on July 29, 1857.³⁶ Marshall lamented Rusk's death which he attributed to a long state of mental depression resulting from his wife's death, a recent illness, and pain from a growth on the back of his neck. He eulogized the Senator for being a "sterling Democrat," a hero at San Jacinto, an Indian fighter, and an advocate of annexation.³⁷

Rusk's death opened another avenue of political controversy since both of the state's Senate seats became vacant. Marshall remarked that a great number of distinguished Texans could fill the seats. He urged the legislature to consider the platform of the Democratic Party as a guideline for the selection of Senators. Some of the candidates he recommended included Matthias Ward, A. J. Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson Chambers, Anson Jones, R. N. Williamson, David G. Burnet, and George W. Smyth.³⁸ The Houston Telegraph supported Elisha M. Pease, and the Huntsville Item endorsed Middleton T. Johnson and J. Pinckney Henderson.³⁹ Marshall launched an attack against Houston on October 3, 1857, reminding the readers of

³⁶Friend, Sam Houston, 250-252.

³⁷Austin State Gazette, August 18, 1857.

³⁸Ibid., September 19, 1857.

³⁹Herbert Gambrell, Anson Jones, The Last President of Texas (Austin, 1964), 432.

the former's aid to the Free-Soilers and Know Nothings. He reemphasized the need to elect good party members by reminding the public that great personalities often did not adhere to party doctrine.⁴⁰

When the legislature met in November, 1857, the selection of the men to represent the state in the United States Senate took top priority. On November 8, the legislature elected J. Pinckney Henderson to succeed Rusk, but only after balloting for ten hours did the members choose Chief Justice John Hemphill to replace Houston.⁴¹ Marshall commented favorably on the selections by referring to Henderson as a defender of the party and of the people. He said that the lengthy vote for Houston's successor resulted from the incumbent's efforts to divide the Democrats, thus preventing a Senator from being chosen. The editor praised Hemphill for his logical mind which he used to defend southern institutions.⁴²

In December, 1857, Marshall commented on the existing political situation. He remarked that while he often disagreed with Governor Pease on such issues as railroad construction, he respected the latter's sincerity and levelheadedness. The editor found satisfaction in the fact that Pease owed his position to the Democratic Party and credited the governor with saving the state from much harmful legislation. Marshall praised the

⁴⁰ Austin State Gazette, October 3, 1857.

⁴¹ Gambrell, Anson Jones, 433.

⁴² Austin State Gazette, November 14, 1857.

new chief executive for his inaugural speech in which he stressed the national Democratic Party's fight for the maintenance of the Union. However, both Runnels and Marshall agreed that Texas would join a southern confederacy if her rights were abused.⁴³

The 1857 convention had set Austin as the site for the state convention, and Marshall began to rally support for the meeting with his first notice of the convention published on October 10, 1857. His mail indicated that many Texans eagerly desired another successful convention. Since the Democratic Party was one of the few remaining links between the North and South, Marshall felt that its destruction would disrupt the Union.⁴⁴

The 1858 Democratic convention which stressed party affiliation had sectional overtones. Seventy-nine counties sent representatives to it. To secure additional party adherence, the Democrats nominated candidates for judicial office at that assembly. Marshall served as President pro tempore and also as a vice-president of the convention. The delegates nominated the following candidates: M. D. Graham for Attorney General, C. R. Johnson for Comptroller, C. H. Randolph for State Treasurer, Royal T. Wheeler for Chief Justice, and C. W. Buckley for Associate Justice.⁴⁵ The convention passed eight

⁴³Ibid., November 7, December 26, 1857.

⁴⁴Ibid., October 10, 1857.

⁴⁵Winkler, Platforms, 75, 161.

resolutions which included a reaffirmation of the platforms of the 1856 Cincinnati and 1857 Waco conventions as true expressions of political faith and the only doctrines which could preserve the integrity of the Union. Also, the delegates expressed their fear that some Democrats in the North were advocating causes which conflicted with the doctrine of non-intervention. Finally, they urged the legislature to grant the governor power to send delegates to a proposed convention dealing with southern institutions.⁴⁶ Again, Marshall was elected Chairman of the Central Committee.⁴⁷

Immediately after the convention, Marshall began directing his party to victory. He remarked that recent meetings in Bee, Smith, and Burnet counties endorsed the convention system. Also, the editor believed that the meetings offered proof that Democrats continued to favor conventions as the best means of proving to the opposition that they could choose leaders embodying party ideals. He published the proceedings of the convention in the following issue. Marshall also printed a public letter expressing appreciation for his reappointment as Chairman of the Central Committee. Although he dwelt extensively on emotional issues, Marshall did beseech the party to establish a definite program to serve as a guide for the legislature.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Louis J. Wortham, A History of Texas from Wilderness to Commonwealth (Fort Worth, 1924), IV, 252.

⁴⁷Winkler, Platforms, 77.

⁴⁸Austin State Gazette, January 16, 1858.

Two journeys to Mississippi in 1858 caused gaps in Marshall's editorial writings and political activity. He left Austin in March, and the Gazette reported on April 24 that his friends in Vicksburg and Jackson had received him with cordial welcomes.⁴⁹ His old associates continued to share his political views as evidenced by the Vicksburg Daily Sun's comment that Marshall was fully aware of the South's resistance to further encroachments by the federal government. Marshall returned to Austin late in May, but he did not resume his position as editor until June 5, 1858.⁵⁰

Not only did his journey to Mississippi cause a vacancy in Marshall's editorials, but it also compelled him to make a return trip in August. While on the spring vacation, Mrs. Marshall became quite ill, and she could not return to Texas with her husband. She and their children remained with her parents until Marshall could make another journey to accompany them home.⁵¹

During his summer in Texas, he actively engaged in politics. His first editorial included the Democratic platform and the names of the party's candidates for various offices. Also in that issue, he commented on the Independent Democrats who remained dissatisfied unless they governed the party. He did not deny their right to organize and challenge the regulars,

⁴⁹Ibid., March 13, April 24, 1858.

⁵⁰Ibid., May 1, 1858, quoting Vicksburg Daily Sun, n. d.

⁵¹Austin State Gazette, August 28, 1858.

but he claimed the same right of organization by the loyal Democrats when they out voted the independent group at party conventions. To add color to his editorials, he compared the arguments of the independents to the old lady who sold her butter "at short weight" but objected when the merchant incorrectly weighed her coffee for trying to impose upon a "poor simple minded woman!"⁵²

Marshall did not write many editorials on behalf of the party's nominees that year, but he did issue some warnings. He cautioned election judges about bogus slates and reported that the Gazette printed many official tickets as authorized by the convention. The editor criticized the northern Democrat, Stephan A. Douglas, whom he had admired before the Illinois Senator's fight against the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution. Marshall predicted a merger between the northern Democrats and the Republicans, and he urged southern Democrats to watch their northern brethern carefully before 1860.⁵³ Although the Chairman of the Central Committee did not editorialize as extensively as he had in 1857, the Democratic ticket won every state-wide race except Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.⁵⁴ Marshall again rejoiced with a triumphant message while reporting the results of the many contests.⁵⁵

⁵²Ibid., June 5, 1858.

⁵³Ibid., July 3, 1858.

⁵⁴Dudley G. Wooten, "The Life and Service of Oran M. Roberts," Texas Historical Association Quarterly, II (July, 1898), 8.

⁵⁵Austin State Gazette, August 28, 1858.

Although most of the Democrats prevailed, much dissatisfaction within the party began to surface about the time of the election. A. J. Hamilton and other former allies of Marshall joined the Independents and promoted the candidacy of James H. Bell who defeated C. W. Buckley for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. On July 31, 1858, Hamilton addressed a meeting in Austin where he applied names to Democratic leaders such as "Pop Corn" for Governor Pease and "Goober Pea" for Guy M. Bryan.⁵⁶ Marshall charged Hamilton with berating the Democratic Party while not offering any principles or national policy. He did not believe the "traitor" could truly expound any party principles since he had embraced Whiggery, Know Nothingism, Democracy, and Squatter Sovereignty. After the meeting, the group gathered at Busas' Garden for a party at which it was alleged that many became very drunk. Also, various groups led by the Austin Southern Intelligencer charged Marshall with leading a clique from Austin in domination of the Democratic Party of the state.⁵⁷

Marshall's second absence from Texas began with his departure for Mississippi on August 21, 1858. Unfortunately, the criticism of Marshall's leadership had just begun, and his absence prevented a detailed defense. When he left, he predicted that he would be gone for six to eight weeks. On October 23, the Gazette printed a letter from Marshall saying that

⁵⁶Dallas Herald, August 14, 1858.

⁵⁷Austin State Gazette, August 21, 1858.

as of October 11, he was near Trinity, Louisiana on his way to Texas. However, when he returned from his trip in November, he could not resume his duty as editor since he had nearly lost the hearing in his left ear from the effects of a tumor. Previously, he had become deaf in the right ear. The Gazette wished him a speedy recovery enabling him to return to his position on the paper.⁵⁸

Marshall finally resumed his position as editor on January 8, 1859, after an absence of more than four months. He thanked William Byrd for his brilliant editorials during his vacancy, and he expressed gratitude for the many expressions of sympathy he received while he was ill. His return did not mean complete recovery since he felt a "little shattered," but he had faith that his physicians would soon restore his health.⁵⁹

The events which occurred soon after he assumed his old position on the Gazette did not tend to speed Marshall's recovery since opponents accused him of dishonesty. Because of his aid to the Democratic Party, the 1855 legislature awarded the contract for legislative printing to the Gazette. In 1857, the principal Know Nothing paper, the Austin Texas State Times edited by John S. Ford, charged the Gazette with failure to meet legislative deadlines.⁶⁰ Marshall replied that he met all

⁵⁸ Ibid., August 28, November 20, 1858.

⁵⁹ Ibid., January 8, 1859.

⁶⁰ John S. Ford Papers, IV, 661 (Archives of Texas, Austin).

required deadlines, although the legislature had extended them when it ordered additional printing. He observed that his predecessor's deadline had also been extended. Maintaining that one of the basic principles of the Democratic Party was accountability of public office, he invited anyone who desired so to examine the records pertaining to public printing. However, the legislature approved Marshall's work and awarded him the contract in 1857.⁶¹

George W. Paschal, the owner of the Southern Intelligencer, purchased the Times in 1858 and continued Ford's attack on the public printing during Marshall's absence, thus beginning a bitter personal newspaper war.⁶² When he resumed his position as editor, Marshall replied that he had only recently learned of the charges, but the Comptroller of Public Accounts could prove Paschal a liar. He accused Paschal of lumping many separate items into one account and insisted that the editor of the Intelligencer admitted he had acted out of revenge against the Gazette. Marshall vowed to publish his reply in pamphlet form, and the defense occupied much of his time during the year.⁶³

In January, Marshall began preparations for the state convention. He commented that counties should choose delegates who would work to create a platform devoted exclusively to

⁶¹Austin State Gazette, March 28, November 7, 1857.

⁶²John S. Ford Papers, IV, 661 (Archives of Texas, Austin).

⁶³Austin State Gazette, January 8, 1859.

federal rights. The August election would serve as a referendum on the state Democratic platform and as an instruction to the delegates to the 1860 national convention. He issued the call for the state convention to be held in Houston in May and insisted that anyone who reflected upon the accomplishments of the Democratic Party would want the party perpetuated. He found Democrats awake to the crisis generated by the Free-Soilers' claim of a law higher than the Constitution.⁶⁴

The harmonious body represented sectional interests. Two hundred delegates from sixty-nine counties attended the convention at Houston. Again, they chose Marshall to serve as President pro tempore and as Chairman of the Central Committee.⁶⁵ For the state offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Commissioner of the General Land Office, the convention renominated three incumbents: Hardin R. Runnels, Francis R. Lubbock, and Francis M. White.⁶⁶ The delegates passed nine resolutions specifying adherence to the doctrines of the Cincinnati and Waco conventions, recognition of the Dred Scott decision, and denial of the rights of a territorial legislature to forbid slavery in its domain. Finally, the delegates decided to hold the next state convention in Galveston on the first Monday in April, 1860.⁶⁷

⁶⁴Ibid., January 16, April 2, 1859.

⁶⁵Winkler, Platforms, 78-80.

⁶⁶Dudley G. Wooten, A Comprehensive History of Texas, 1685 to 1897 (Dallas, 1898), II, 53.

⁶⁷Winkler, Platforms, 79.

As in 1857, the independent group which challenged the regular Democrats did not hold a convention. Sam Houston announced in a letter dated June 3, 1859, that he would again oppose Runnels and he commented that the main issues of the election were the "Constitution and the Union."⁶⁸ A. J. Hamilton, a former prominent Democrat, decided to oppose T. N. Waul for Congress in the western district, and W. B. Ochiltree challenged the incumbent, John H. Reagan, in the eastern district. The Independents charged the Democrats with favoring a renewal of the African slave trade, although the party's convention had tabled resolutions concerning the subject, and Reagan definitely opposed it.⁶⁹

In his analysis of the Houston convention, Marshall remarked that most Democrats he spoke with on his journey from Houston to Austin were satisfied with the results of the meeting. He proclaimed that freedom of discussion and harmony defeated the efforts to break up the party at its convention. T. N. Waul appeared to be true to the principles of the Constitution, and he vowed to canvass the entire western district if necessary. Marshall complimented the incumbent candidates for their service to the Democratic Party and to the state.

⁶⁸Annie Laurie Kurtz Lyon, "Slavery as an Economic and Political Factor in the Texas Gubernatorial Elections of 1857 and 1859" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1964), 59, Donald Day and Harry Herbert Ullon (eds.), The Autobiography of Sam Houston (Norman, 1954), 260.

⁶⁹Lubbock, Six Decades, 245-246.

Also, he commented that the platform adhered to the principles which accounted for Democratic triumphs in the past.⁷⁰

Marshall's assault on the opposition included four main points. First, he found advocates of the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty guilty of having aided the enemy since the theory allowed the "Black Republicans" to control Kansas. Marshall claimed that many arguments about slavery arose from the doctrine, and the disagreements might destroy the Union if they were not settled before 1860. The large German element in Texas constituted a second point. Republicans claimed them to be Free-Soilers since they owned few slaves, but Marshall found few abolitionists among the Germans who lived on the frontier where slavery rarely flourished. He reminded the Germans of the opposition's nativistic elements. Also, party affiliation meant as much to Marshall in 1859 as it had in the past. He recalled the need for the election of Democrats in Congress to prevent an opposition majority from controlling the House of Representatives, and he revived charges of membership in the Know Nothing Party against Sam Houston. Finally, Marshall berated Houston's Indian policy. He cited the Hero of San Jacinto's refusal to condemn a recent Indian raid as proof that Houston favored Indians over whites.⁷¹

Despite the editor's many statements calling for unity, the party began to falter under his leadership partly because

⁷⁰Austin State Gazette, May 14, 1859.

⁷¹Ibid., March 5, June 18, 1859.

the campaign of 1859 did not inspire much enthusiasm. On May 21, Marshall proposed to publish the Gazette semiweekly throughout the campaign, as he did in 1857, if interest warranted. The failure to publish the extra editions reveals the lack of interest in the campaign.⁷² Marshall's diminished enthusiasm resulted from his illness, his time spent in the defense of the charges about public printing, and changing conditions in the Democratic Party.

In addition to a lack of spirit among Democratic leaders, the party lessened its chances for success by internal disputes. The fragmentation of the party was caused by the struggle over the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the impact of the Know Nothing Order, anticonvention feelings, and the fact that the opposition was led by the popular Sam Houston. Charges of domination by the Austin clique intensified. Many farmers were unhappy with Marshall's leadership which they felt neglected their interests, and they temporarily left the party to express their dissatisfaction.⁷³ Marshall's long absence because of vacations and illness resulted in a lack of leadership in the preelection days and left the party's chief spokesman out of touch with many local politicians. His preoccupation with the charges about the public printing also caused some neglect in his duties as Chairman of the Central Committee.

⁷²Ibid., May 21, 1859.

⁷³John E. Campbell to his brother (no name) July 8, 1859, John E. Campbell Papers (Archives Collection, University of Texas Library).

Criticism of Governor Runnels added to the division in the party. Many Texans accused Runnels of neglecting frontier defenses, but Marshall defended the Governor by reminding the public that Runnels had frequently called out the Texas Rangers for protection from the Indians and had also created a commission to research frontier difficulties.⁷⁴ On July 27, the Southern Intelligencer incited further disunity by printing a letter allegedly written by Runnels to "G. W." of Bowie County objecting to Reagan's advocacy of the international slave trade. The letter also charged Runnels with desiring Reagan's defeat.⁷⁵ Marshall was indignant and labeled the letter a forgery. A further blow came when former Governor Pease endorsed Edward Clark, Sam Houston's running mate, for Lieutenant Governor.⁷⁶

As the political divisions foretold, the party lost the 1859 elections. Houston defeated Runnels by a vote of 36,277 to 27,500.⁷⁷ The Independents captured all major offices except Land Commissioner and Congressman in the eastern district.⁷⁸ However, the Democrats retained control of the

⁷⁴Victor James Nelson, "Francis Richard Lubbock" (Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1954), 50, Austin State Gazette, July 2, 1859.

⁷⁵Ibid., July 30, 1859, quoting Southern Intelligencer, July 27, 1859.

⁷⁶Austin State Gazette, July 9, July 30, 1859.

⁷⁷Mc Craw, Professional Politicians, 45.

⁷⁸John E. Campbell Papers (Archives Collection, University of Texas Library).

legislature. Despite attempts to prevent a quorum from assembling, the legislature met on December 5, 1859, and elected Louis T. Wigfall, a States-rights Democrat, to fill the Senate seat left vacant by the death of J. Pinckney Henderson.⁷⁹

Verbal assaults between Marshall and Houston continued after the 1859 elections. On December 14, Marshall proposed a contract with the legislature for its printing, but Houston opposed the proposal as contrary to the Act to Regulate Public Printing because the editor's prices were higher than those set by the bill.⁸⁰ Houston then spoke at a barbecue in Montgomery County where he charged Marshall with advocating disunion in Mississippi before moving to Texas to further his views. The governor-elect also accused him of violating the Constitution with his proposals to reopen the African slave trade. He then charged him with stealing twenty thousand dollars from the state and observed that the events should be expected since Marshall was a "crook" by vocation.⁸¹

The 1859 election proved a supreme irony to John Marshall. By that year, the constructive issues he had once endorsed played no significant part in the campaign since emotional charges were leveled by both sides. The Democratic Party machinery he had worked to develop was subject to intense criticism under his leadership. Sam Houston's election

⁷⁹Lubbock, Six Decades, 256-258.

⁸⁰Savante Papers (Archives of Texas, Austin).

⁸¹Williams and Barker, Writings, VII, 377.

signified twin defeats for the issues he proposed and for the political party he loved. Yet, much of the defeat can be blamed on the emotional issues Marshall introduced into the campaign.

Despite the Democratic reversals in 1859, the party recovered somewhat by the next year. Marshall retained his position as Chairman of the Central Committee when the state convention met April 2 in Galveston. In his address, he commented on the existing political situation by stressing the necessity of leadership by the Democratic Party to preserve the Union.⁸² The delegates selected nominees for Attorney General, Comptroller of Public Accounts, and State Treasurer, all of whom proved victorious. They also chose delegates to the national convention at Charleston and presidential electors.⁸³ The Southern Democratic candidate John C. Breckenridge carried Texas against his opponent John Bell, the Constitutional Union nominee, who advocated a platform similar to Houston's of 1859.⁸⁴

Marshall's role in politics declined after 1859. He campaigned for the Democratic ticket in 1860 principally by raising emotional charges that the election of a Republican President would signal the end of the Union. After the election of Abraham Lincoln, he avidly expounded secession as the

⁸²Winkler, Platforms, 80-84.

⁸³Wortham, History of Texas, 91.

⁸⁴Wooten, History of Texas, 84.

means to protect the rights of the South. He had no direct influence on the secession convention, however, since family responsibility forced him to journey to Mississippi at the time of the meeting.⁸⁵

Marshall enlisted in the Confederate Army in Austin on July 26, 1861, and reached Virginia on September 29, 1861.⁸⁶ He was appointed to the position of Colonel of the Fourth Texas Regiment in March, 1862. His regiment which fought under General John Hood was part of General Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia.⁸⁷ He was killed at Gaines Mill on June 27, 1862.⁸⁸ The Gazette continued under various editors and eventually became a Radical Republican journal. It ceased publication in 1871.⁸⁹

John Marshall developed several ideas in his newspaper. From his arrival in Texas, he discussed various issues including education, railroad development, and the expansion of slavery which he felt were beneficial to Texas. He filled many

⁸⁵Larry Jay Gage, "The Texas Road to Secession and War, John Marshall and the Texas State Gazette," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, LXII (October, 1958), 37.

⁸⁶W. S. Oldham, "Colonel John Marshall," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XX (October, 1916), 137.

⁸⁷Gage, "John Marshall," 196, Battles and Leaders of the Civil War (New York, 1888), II, 315.

⁸⁸John B. Hood, Advance and Retreat (New Orleans, 1880), 27.

⁸⁹Mary Starr Barkley, History of Travis County and Austin, 1839-1899 (Waco, 1963), 211.

issues of the State Gazette with the benefits of his ideas and ways to implement them. Also, he considered such other issues as the merits of banking as they arose. As the discussion about slavery became more intense during the 1850's, Marshall emphasized emotional arguments concerning slavery and neglected the constructive ideas he once advocated.

In addition to his journalistic career in Mississippi and Texas, Marshall became a political strategist. He had the opportunity to meet numerous political figures of the period including Jefferson Davis and Sam Houston. While editing the Gazette, Marshall editorialized in behalf of the nominees of the Democratic Party and urged the Democrats to develop a unified organization. From 1856 until the outbreak of the Civil War, Marshall served as Chairman of the Central Committee of the Democratic Party directing the party in the state to victory in all but one contest. In his role as a politician, Marshall neglected the constructive ideas he had advocated because of his desire for party unity and because emotional arguments concerning slavery began to dominate Texas politics in the late 1850's.

Irony dominated Marshall's life in Texas. The constructive ideas he advocated degenerated into sectional arguments about slavery. Given the opportunity to press for his goals in the field of politics, he compromised his beliefs for party unity. When he assumed control of the party's machinery, the Democrats divided and ruined the unity Marshall had striven to develop. After claiming to love the Union, he fought

against it. He died at the age of thirty-six--long before reaching the end of his potential period of productivity.

Unlike some of his contemporaries--Reagan, Lubbock, and Hamilton--Marshall did not live to help supply the South with the leadership it greatly needed after the Civil War. Consequently, his name became buried with others who had been representative of a bygone era. His memory faded as younger men arose to fill the many positions needed to guide Texas toward a more progressive state. However, the post-Civil War leaders may not have realized that the public schools they created, the railroads they built, and the railroad legislation they demanded had been advocated in the 1850's by John Marshall in the State Gazette. His work to build a strong Democratic Party also became the goal of many Texas politicians after the Civil War who had to fear not only the Republicans but also occasional Greenback and Populist successes. Lubbock, Reagan, and even Oldham because the heroes of Texans who named streets, schools, and counties after them while Marshall's name remained only on the yellowed pages of the State Gazette and in the editorial columns of rival newspapers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Critical Essay on Sources

Few sources exist which contain a great deal of information about John Marshall. A biographical study has never been written, and only two articles appear in the Southwestern Historical Quarterly concerning Marshall. One was written in 1916 by his son-in-law W. S. Oldham who was the son of Marshall's partner. Although the article is interesting, Oldham fails to list any sources which allows one to question the reliability of the article despite Oldham's comment that he has not depended entirely upon personal recollections. Larry Jay Gage's article in 1958 supplies some insight into Marshall's personal life, but it primarily concerns the political scene in Texas. The Writings of Sam Houston, edited by Eugene C. Barker and Amelia W. Williams, also offers facts about the editor's life. A few of Marshall's private papers appear in the Savante Papers in the Archives of Texas. The papers of Williamson S. Oldham contain scant information pertaining to events in the 1850's

Biographies of important Texans of the period have occasional references to John Marshall. However, Llerena Friend's Sam Houston, The Great Designer presents an interesting picture of politics in Texas in the 1850's. Six Decades in Texas, the memoirs of Francis R. Lubbock, supplies detailed information concerning political events in the state prior to

the Civil War. Good general histories of the period include A Comprehensive History of Texas, 1685 to 1897 by Dudley C. Wooten, A History of Texas from Wilderness to Commonwealth by Louis J. Wortham, and Texas in Turmoil by Ernest Wallace. William Darrell Overdyke's The Know Nothing Party in the South is very helpful for information about the growth and development of the secret order.

Copies of the State Gazette serve as the best principal source for insight into Marshall's political and economic views. His opinions can clearly be seen in editorials and news articles. Two excellent books are Earl Wesley Fornell's The Galveston Era and Platforms of Political Parties in Texas edited by Ernest W. Winkler. Fornell presents political, economic, and social scenes in Texas before the Civil War while Winkler's book contains many valuable facts that are quite useful in interpreting Texas politics. A History of Texas Railroads by S. G. Reed is an interesting and detailed account of the Texas railroad development.

Bibliographical Entries

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections

- John E. Campbell Papers. Archives Collection, University of Texas Library.
- John S. Ford Papers. Archives of Texas, Texas State Library, Austin.
- Williamson S. Oldham Papers. Archives Collection, University of Texas Library.
- Savante Papers. Archives of Texas, Texas State Library, Austin.

Government Publications

- Laws of Texas, vol. 3-4. Austin, 1847-1861.
- Texas, House Journals of the Legislature of Texas. Austin, 1850-1860.
- Texas Senate Journals, Austin, 1850-1860.

Printed Diaries, Reminiscences, and Collections of Letters

- Gulick, Charles Adams, Jr. (ed.), The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, 6 vols. Austin, 1922.
- Hood, John B., Advance and Retreat. New Orleans, 1880.
- Houston, Sam, The Life of Sam Houston. New York, 1855.
- Linn, John Joseph, Reminiscences of Fifty Years in Texas. New York, 1883.
- Lubbock, Francis R., Six Decades in Texas. Austin, 1900.
- Reagan, John H., Memoirs. New York, 1906.
- Williams, Amelia W. and Eugene C. Barker (eds.), The Writings of Sam Houston, 8 vols. Austin, 1938.

Newspapers

Austin Southern Intelligencer, 1856-1858.

Austin State Gazette, 1853-1861.

Dallas Herald, 1855-1859.

Galveston Civilian, 1854-1859.

Marshall Texas Republican, 1854-1859.

San Antonio Times, 1858-1859.

Secondary Sources

Theses and Dissertations

Buller, Talmadge Lovell, "The Life and Times of George T. Wood," Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1950.

Butler, Andrew M., "Transportation in Texas, 1820-1860," Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1952.

Friend, Llerena, "The Life of Thomas Jefferson Chambers," Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Texas, 1928.

Hopkins, Vincent G., "Secession in Texas," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1960.

Lyon, Annie Laurie Kurtz, "Slavery as an Economic and Political Factor in the Texas Gubernatorial Elections of 1857 and 1859," Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1964.

Nelson, Victor James, "Francis Richard Lubbock," Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Houston, 1954.

Biographies

Abdullah, Achmed, Dreamers of Empire. Freeport, New York, 1968.

Bruce, Henry, Life of General Houston. New York, 1891.

- Carr, Albert H., The World and William Walker. New York, 1963.
- Day, Donald and Harry Herbert Ullon (eds.), The Autobiography of Sam Houston. Norman, 1954.
- De Shields, James T., They Sat in High Places, San Antonio, 1940.
- Friend, Llerena, Sam Houston, The Great Designer. Austin, 1954.
- Gambrell, Herbert, Anson Jones, The Last President of Texas. Austin, 1964.
- Greene, Lawrence, The Filibuster. Indianapolis, 1937.
- James, Marquis, The Raven. Indianapolis, 1929.
- Mc Graw, William, Professional Politicians. Washington, 1940.
- Procter, Ben H., Not Without Honor. Austin, 1962.
- Seale, William, Sam Houston's Wife. Norman, 1970.
- Wisehart, M. K., Sam Houston, American Giant. Washington, 1962.

Periodical Articles

- Barker, Eugene C., "The African Slave Trade in Texas," Texas Historical Association Quarterly, VI (October, 1902), 145-158.
- Gage, Larry Jay, "The Texas Road to Secession and War, John Marshall and the Texas State Gazette," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, LXII (October, 1958), 191-192.
- King, Alma Dexta, "The Political Career of Williamson Simpson Oldham," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XXXII (October, 1929), 112-138.
- Oldham, W. S., "Colonel John Marshall," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XX (October, 1916), 132-138.
- Paschal, George W., "Last Years of Sam Houston," Harper's New Monthly Magazine, XXXII (April, 1866), 630-635.
- Sandbo, Anna Irene, "Beginnings of the Secession Movement in Texas," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1914), 41-73.

Terrell, A. W., "Recollections of General Sam Houston," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, XVI (October, 1912), 119-120.

Wooten, Dudley G., "The President's Address. The Life and Service of Oran Milo Roberts," Texas Historical Association Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1898), 1-20.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

Battles and Leaders of the Civil War, 4 vols. New York, 1888.

Belo, A. H. (ed.), Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide, 1970-1971. Dallas, 1969.

Kielman, Chester (ed.), The University of Texas Archives. Austin, 1967.

Oldham, Williamson S. (ed.), A Digest of the General Laws of Texas. Austin, 1859.

Wallace, Ernest (ed.), Documents of Texas History. Austin, 1962.

Webb, Walter Prescott (ed.), The Handbook of Texas, 2 vols. 1952.

Winkler, Ernest W. (ed.), Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1860. Austin, 1949.

General Histories and Monographs

Angle, Paul M. (ed.), Created Equal? The Complete Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858. Chicago, 1958.

Barker, Eugene C., Texas History. Dallas, 1929.

Barkley, Mary Starr, History of Travis County and Austin, 1839-1899. Waco, 1963.

Benedict, H. Y. and John A. Lomax, The Book of Texas. Garden City, New York, 1916.

Bieseke, R. L., The History of the German Settlements in Texas, 1831-1861. Austin, 1930.

Brown, John Henry, History of Texas, 2 vols. Saint Louis, 1893.

- Eaton, Clement, A History of the Old South. New York, 1966.
- Fornell, Earl Wesley, The Galveston Era. Austin, 1961.
- Garrison, George P., Texas. Boston, 1905.
- Gettys, Warren E. (ed.), Houston. Houston, 1942.
- Lotto, F., Fayette County, Her History and Her People.
Schulenberg, 1902.
- Minor, Henry, Story of the Democratic Party. New York, 1928.
- Newton, Lewis W. and Herbert P. Gambrell, A Social and Political History of Texas. Dallas, 1935.
- Nichols, Roy Franklin, The Democratic Machine, 1852-1854. New York, 1928.
- Overdyke, William Darrell, The Know Nothing Party in the South.
Baton Rouge, 1950.
- Petty, J. W., Jr., (ed), Victor Rose's History of Victoria.
Victoria, 1961.
- Reed, S. G., A History of Texas Railroads. Houston, 1941.
- Simkins, Francis Butler, A History of the South. New York, 1953.
- Tolbert, Frank X., An Informal History of Texas from Cabeza de Vaca to Temple Houston. New York, 1961.
- Tyler, George W., The History of Bell County. San Angelo, 1936.
- Wallace, Ernest, Texas in Turmoil. Austin, 1965.
- _____ and David M. Vigness (eds.), Documents of Texas History. Austin, 1963.
- Wharton, Clarence R., History of Fort Bend County. San Antonio, 1939.
- _____, History of Texas. Dallas, 1935.
- Winkler, Ernest W. (ed.), Platforms of Political Parties in Texas. Austin, 1916.
- Wooten, Dudley G., A Comprehensive History of Texas, 1685 to 1897, 2 vol. Dallas, 1898.

Wortham, Louis J., A History of Texas from Wilderness to Commonwealth, 5 vols. Fort Worth, 1924.

Zornow, William Frank, Kansas: A History of the Jayhawk State. Norman, 1957.