LEST WE FORGET: COMMEMORATIVE MOVEMENTS IN TEXAS, 1893-1936

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO

THE GRADUATE FACULTY OF

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

BY THEODORE BANKS

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

AUGUST, 2015

Approval Sheet

This thesis is submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI

_____

Theodore Banks

Approved June 24, 2015

_____

Dr. Robert Wooster, Committee Chair

_____

Dr. Peter N. Moore, Committee Member

_____

Dr. David Blanke, Committee Member

Approved for the College of Liberal Arts

_____

Dr. Mark Hartlaub, Interim Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by acknowledging a handful of people who were very helpful in tracking down evidence that greatly enhanced this thesis: Veronica Jordan of the Franklin County Genealogical Society; Gary McKee of the Fayette County Historical Commission; Bob Brinkman of the Texas Historical Commission; Bryant Celestine, Historic Preservation Officer of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas. I would also like to thank the Clara Driscoll Chapter of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas for recognizing me with their 2013 scholarship award for Excellence in Texas History which facilitated my research as well.

All of my professors at TAMUCC have been great, but I would like to acknowledge a few in particular: Dr. Patrick Carroll (retired), Dr. Anthony Quiroz, and Dr. Thomas Kreneck (retired). These professors offered praise, encouragement and guidance, I enjoyed all of their courses immensely and learned a great deal from each.

I would like to especially thank the professors who constituted my thesis committee, Dr. Peter Moore and Dr. David Blanke, and my advisor Dr. Robert Wooster. At the risk of sounding redundant, these scholars all provided timely and needed advice and encouragement, and working with them, both in their courses and on this thesis project, has been extremely enlightening and rewarding.

I would like to close by thanking and acknowledging my friend and former colleague, Suzi Gonzalez, who encouraged me to enter the masters program at TAMUCC and helped ease my transition to post-graduate work in History. Finally special thanks goes to my family, especially my father and mother, Ted and Judy Banks, for their continued love, support, and patience.

Introduction

This thesis examines how white elite Texans deployed historical memory in constructing their cultural identity from the last decade of the nineteenth century through the Texas Centennial. As a former member of the Confederacy, Texas in many ways adhered to general patterns observable throughout the south, such as participation in Confederate veteran and auxiliary organizations and the regional celebration of the Lost Cause. Walter Buenger, author of several influential works on Texan identity, notes that World War I was a watershed moment throughout the south in that it served to somewhat mute expressions of Confederate "otherness" within a surging wartime patriotism, and in Texas this disruption helped tip the balance of Texan identity away from their Confederate past. This shift accelerated in the 1920s, Buenger observes, and as the 1936 centennial of Texas' independence from Mexico approached expressions of the state's Confederate history became less prominent while memorialization of the state's frontier period and the Texas Revolution assumed the foreground in the state's commemorative landscape. Following Buenger, Gregg Cantrell finds a compelling example of this conversion in the career of Oscar Branch Colquitt, elected governor of Texas in 1910. Colquitt was instrumental in sponsoring and erecting a handful of monuments that celebrated Texas' frontier and revolutionary eras, a marked break from the scores of Confederate monuments raised in

Texas as across the south, which Cantrell characterizes as a rejection of the Lost Cause in favor of a new, progressive ethos clothed in Texas Revolutionary memory.[1]

However, in moving back the timeline of Buenger's shift from the onset of World War I to 1910, Cantrell inadvertently draws attention to one of the problems this framework presents: that assessing a singular nature of Texan identity based on the number and frequency of a certain strain of cultural products is confounded by the concurrent production and consumption of various traditions. Although he characterizes the years 1902 to 1914 as Texans' "fascination with the Confederacy," Buenger identifies signs of Texan and American identity creeping into the milieu in the first decade of the twentieth century. Further challenging the interpretation of a cultural shift away from the Lost Cause, Kelly McMichael offers as evidence the conspicuous

---

1 Walter L. Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction and the Great Depression* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 104, 123, 127, 129; Walter L. Buenger, "Texas and the South," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 103*,* no. 3 (January 2000): 318, 323; Walter L. Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 134-135; Gregg Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin: History and Memory in Progressive-Era Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 40, 47-48, 54-55, 66.

work of the United Daughters of the Confederacy in continuing to raise Confederate memorials in Texas up to the 1936 centennial and beyond.[2]

This study argues that previous conceptualizations of Texan identity that are based on an either/or model, representing a categorical or essentialist approach to identity--reflected by scholarly language such as "shift," "erased," "rejection," "distancing" and "turning away"--fail to take into account the possibility of a complex, multilayered identity where expressions of Confederate and Texan identities were not mutually exclusive but operating simultaneously and in compliment to one another. This thesis demonstrates that expressions of Confederate and Texan identity were often operating concurrently and harmoniously within individuals and organizations, on both personal and collective levels. It also analyzes the relationship of the two memory repertoires, Confederate and Texas frontier and revolutionary eras, to better understand how and when each might have functioned in relationship to one another, specifically in how

---

2 Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 104, 123, 124; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 318; Kelly McMichael, *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009), 100 n. 38. In his most recent work, Buenger urges fellow scholars to avoid employing any of the interpretative labels he dubs "the terrible triplets"--Texas exceptionalism, Texas as exclusively southern, and Texas as exclusively western--and acknowledges that "more often than not, Texas was American and universal instead of exclusively southern, western, or exceptional." Buenger, "Texas Identity: Alternatives to the Terrible Triplets," in *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013), 3.

each was manifested in the articulation of Texan identity. While this thesis looks essentially at how, when, and by whom expressions of a Confederate and/or Texas Revolutionary past were deployed, a memory study, it reads memory as a window into the identity construction of its producers, the "usable history" of the Confederacy and the Texas frontier and revolutionary eras evidence of the identities white elite Texans imagined for themselves. In this regard, this thesis reads memory as a cultural product by which individuals, organizations, states and nations imagine their pasts in efforts to define themselves. Finally, it recognizes, as Buenger himself has more recently shown, that "a permanent, indelible, and unchangeable imprinting of Texas by place, experience, or event never happened."[3]

Chapter One examines the Confederate monument movement in Texas: the monuments themselves, their unveiling ceremonies and dedications, and the fundraising and organizational efforts of one particularly instrumental group, the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC). It demonstrates how the Texas Daughters, by planning for monuments and their unveiling ceremonies, helped to form and participated in a regional network dedicated to crafting and promoting a usable Confederate past. This network, which was predicated on what

---

3 Margaret R. Somers, "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach," *Theory and Society 23,* no. 5 (October 1994): 621, 632; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 323; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 40; Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 258-259; Peter Fritzsche, "The Archive and the Case of the German Nation," in *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History,* edited by Antoinette Burton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005): 184-185; Buenger, "Texas Identity: Alternatives to the Terrible Triplets," 14.

historian Karen Cox terms "Confederate culture," was comprised of the social, business and political elite of the south. Rather than reading the UDC's relative difficulty in raising funds for their monuments to the Lost Cause as evidence of the average Texan's indifference to Confederate memorialization, as some historians have suggested, Chapter One of this thesis reads the Confederate monument movement in Texas as evidence of the UDC's resounding success in their multi-faceted campaign to vindicate the Confederate generation and promote their version of the "War between the States" and their vision of modern southern society.[4]

Chapter Two surveys the five monuments to Texas' frontier and revolutionary eras, raised between 1910 and 1915 and spearheaded by Governor Colquitt, to determine if this campaign indeed represented a rejection of the Lost Cause. It examines Texans' pre-1910 and post-1915 efforts commemorating the state's frontier and revolutionary eras to ascertain in what ways the 1910-1915 monuments represented an innovation to that repertoire and to what extent that movement was sustainable. Lastly this chapter establishes and describes the "dual allegiance" that white elite Texans exercised in their simultaneous production and consumption of both memory traditions, Confederate and Texas' frontier and revolutionary periods, sometimes even

---

4 Karen L.Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 1-2; Somers, "The Narrative Constitution of Identity," 621; Kelly McMichael, " 'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances': The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Power of Civil War Memory," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 107; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 64.

employing both in a single product. That Texans celebrated both traditions concurrently for several decades suggests that a new interpretative framework for understanding their relationship and interplay is needed.[5]

Chapter Three assesses the state's commemorative landscape surrounding the 1936 Texas Centennial celebrations. It considers the origins and evolution of the centennial, its conceptual and legislative development, the bidding process for the central exposition and the discourse regarding the event once the bid was awarded. It inspects the symbolic profile of the central exposition by considering the inaugural parade, opening ceremonies, and the built environment--the architectural, sculptural, artistic and commemorative representations--of the event. Finally this chapter considers the thirty major monuments of the Texas Centennial Commission, a statewide counterpart to the central exposition's commemorative visage, as well as a handful of monuments raised by groups independent of the state or federal centennial funding, to appraise the state's memorial geography at the close of its momentous anniversary. While the centennial planners consciously presented Texas in an explicitly western guise for the central exposition, this innovation dovetailed nicely with the state's existing memory repertoires within the

---

5 Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 40, 47-48, 54-55; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 145.

"Cavalcade of Texas," or Six Flags motif, a narrative enthusiastically consumed by Texans and Americans alike.[6]

6 Light Townsend Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western for the 1936 Centennial," in *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013), 39-41; Buenger, "Texas Identity: Alternatives to the Terrible Triplets," 3.

Chapter One: Texas and the Lost Cause

On April 21, 1897, streams of people began flowing early into the four streets that formed the public square in Sherman, Texas, around the Grayson County Courthouse. The crowd, that would eventually swell to some twenty thousand, had come for a day of ceremony: the square was decorated for a patriotic holiday, later in the afternoon speeches would be made. Marching bands, veterans groups, students from a number of colleges, hundreds of school children, and a fife and drum corps paraded before the crush of spectators. Local businessmen had sponsored the festivities, and the town's hotels, restaurants, shops and merchants did a brisk trade that day, with perhaps five thousand out-of-town visitors co-mingling with the local citizenry. Indeed, the area business community saw this event not only as a chance to capitalize on the day's receipts but as an opportunity to showcase their up-and-coming city.[1]

The ceremonies were held in conjunction with the unveiling of a Civil War monument honoring Confederate soldiers. Funded by the Mildred Lee Camp of the United Confederate Veterans and the Dixie Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, the memorial stood over forty feet tall and featured a larger than life-size bronze figure of a Confederate infantryman atop a ten foot rectangular shaft of blue-gray granite, a single star motif adorning each of its four sides. The monument, which organizers claimed to be the first Confederate memorial dedicated in Texas, bore this inscription:

---

1 "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; Kelly McMichael, *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009), 7, 42-43; Carol Morris Little, *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 412-413.

> Sacred to the memory of our Confederate dead: true patriots. They fought for home and country. For the holy principles of self-government--the only true liberty. Their sublime self sacrifices and unsurpassed valor will teach future generations the lesson of high born patriotism, of devotion to duty, of exalted courage, of Southern Chivalry. History has enshrined them immortal.

At the moment of the monument's unveiling a volley of shots went up, punctuated by a rowdy chorus of Rebel yells.[2]

A few days later and a few counties away, Dallas Chapter 6 of the UDC unveiled a larger and even more elaborate statue commemorating the soldiers and sailors of the Confederacy. The dedication ceremonies this time unfolded over the course of a weekend and included a banquet honoring Confederate veterans, a formal-dress ball, and a parade, which the *Dallas Morning News* reported as being "the largest and most imposing ever witnessed" in the city. Also larger than that of the Sherman dedication would be the crowd; the Dallas daily reported that over 40,000 people were in attendance for the monument's unveiling in City Park. Among those present were Texas Governor Charles A. Culberson; the last-surviving Confederate

---

2 "History of the Monument," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; *Confederate Monument,* Warren Reed, 1897, Sherman, Texas; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 42-43; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 412-413. As Carol Morris Little notes, an underlying irony of the Sherman ceremony was that Grayson County had overwhelmingly voted against secession. A Confederate monument in Waco had been dedicated in 1893. The correct grammatical quotation of monument inscriptions can be problematic, as many of them appear all in capital letters. The author has endeavored to maintain punctuation as it appears in the original form, and to present inscriptions according to standard conventions, making some accommodation for the stylistic convention of capitalizing the names of important actors or personified concepts, although in some cases he has chosen to use conventions more appropriate for titles than prose.

cabinet member, John H. Reagan; the daughter of Jefferson Davis, Margaret Davis Hayes; the widow of General Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, Anna Morrison Jackson; and representatives from many of the states of the former Confederacy. The Texas state legislature had recessed so that its members could attend the ceremony.[3]

The Dallas monument, almost twenty feet taller than the one at Sherman, also consisted of the figure of a Confederate soldier atop a rectangular shaft. This four-sided column sat on a mammoth base and pedestal, which bore symbols and inscriptions on each of its faces. On the front face, over the inscription, the intertwined "CSA" seal of the Confederacy and a lone star bas relief, which repeated on each side, framed a circular cameo of General William Lewis Cabell, "Old Tige," decorated Confederate veteran, four-term Dallas mayor and progenitor of a prominent Dallas family**.** Flanking the monument at its corners stood four free-standing, larger than life-size statues of Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, and Stonewall Jackson on granite pedestals, each gazing outward, their pedestals creating an interior space from which the main statue rose. The monument, a fitting climax to the weekend's fanfare, faced due south, its main facade with "Old Tige" and the solemn young Confederate soldier above gazing longingly into the fields of Southern memory.[4]

---

3 "Veil Has Been Drawn," *Dallas Morning News,* April 30, 1897; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 46; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 165.

4 "Veil Has Been Drawn," *Dallas Morning News,* April 30. 1897; *Confederate Memorial,* Frank Teich, 1897, Dallas, Texas; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 46; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 165. The Dallas Confederate monument (1897) has since been moved from City Park to the grounds of the Dallas Convention Center.

Thus began in Texas a period of memorialization that would result in eighty monuments to the Civil War, almost all of which would be erected to honor the Confederacy. Although few would rival the Dallas monument in size or its dedication in spectacle, many communities would build structures of admirable size at considerable expense. The majority of these would be built between 1900 and 1915, a period when, according to Walter Buenger, Texans' "fascination" with their Confederate past reached its zenith. However, Kelly McMichael has suggested that beyond a core group of Confederate veterans and their like-minded sons and daughters, this celebration of the Confederacy had little lasting impact on the majority of Texas society. By examining the state's monuments to the Confederacy, the groups who sponsored them (especially the United Daughters of the Confederacy), and the elaborate ceremonies staged for their unveilings and dedications, this chapter assesses and analyzes the production and popular consumption of the Lost Cause in Texas from 1896 through the first third of the twentieth century. Far from being an extreme philosophy held by only a small segment of the citizenry, the Lost Cause was a widely accepted narrative in which the vast majority of white Texans of this period were well versed.[5]

---

5 McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 2, 4, 17, 22, 93-94; Frank Wilson Kiel, "*Treue der Union:* Myths, Misrepresentations, and Misinterpretations," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 115*,* no. 3 (January 2012): 285-287; Walter L. Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction and the Great Depression* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 104. According to Kiel, there are at least ten monuments to the Union in the south, four of them in Texas, at Comfort (1866), Dallas (1900), Dennison (1906), and New Braunfels (1935). The New Braunfels monument, resembling Confederate monuments of the period, honored "fallen soldiers," both union and Confederate; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas,* 342.

The Lost Cause mythology, which appeared soon after the war had ended, provided a narrative of the conflict that glossed over or rhetorically altered the reasons why the South had gone to war, provided soothing rationalizations for the defeat, and romanticized the values the South had fought for. The narrative can be said to have a number of distinct branches, or appeals, which emerged at different moments of Civil War memory. The earliest, whose first issue was delivered in Robert E. Lee's farewell remarks to his army at Appomattox, attributed the South's defeat to the North's "overwhelming numbers and resources." This thrust stressed the inevitability of the Confederacy's loss, and yet at the same time declared the vigor of the southern effort through statistical or strategic comparisons of Union-Confederate disparities. The next trend was spurred on by veterans of the conflict who, in the spirit of reconciliation of the last two decades of the nineteenth century, focused on the "exaltation of military experience." While the language and symbolism of the Lost Cause often eschews any reconciliatory sentiment, the veteran generation's influence can nonetheless be observed in the mythology as an almost religious reverence for military service and its attendant qualities of duty, honor, and bravery. Finally, as memories of Reconstruction became fused with memories of the conflict, the mythology took on a litany of romantic ideals that the Old South supposedly embodied and which the brave soldiers had fought to preserve, all-the-while conspicuously omitting references to slavery. Although the most active monument-building years of the movement coincided with this last turn of the Lost Cause mythology, it did not displace or replace completely the previous

---

See note 16 on most recent assessment of number of Confederate monuments in Texas. See note 36 of this chapter for further elaboration of McMichael's argument regarding the Confederate monument movement's limited impact in Texas.

versions. In fact, each subsequent update of the Lost Cause only added to the canon, and examples of each type are observable on Texas monuments to the Confederacy.[6]

Confederate memorialization in the South had begun years earlier by veterans groups and a loose network of southern women's organizations known as Ladies' Memorial Associations. By around 1890, however, many of these southern women, sensing the need to move beyond memorial work, began organizing in groups they called "Daughters of the Confederacy," which in turn coalesced into the United Daughters of the Confederacy, founded in 1894. The Texas UDC was chartered in 1896, and by 1900 had 57 chapters with over 2,600 dues-paying members, making the Texas division its organizational leader in both categories. While the task of memorializing the Confederacy "fell to" the children and then grandchildren of the veterans' generation, and especially their daughters, the UDC would not languish but thrive with the newfound responsibility, imagining and creating for themselves new roles and attendant power as caretakers of culture and stewards of memory. Although some of the fundraising, activities, and events that accompanied the monument creation fell squarely within the perceived place of

---

6 Kelly McMichael, " 'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances': The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Power of Civil War Memory," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory in History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 95-118 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 97; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 4; Emory Thomas, "Rebellion and Conventional Warfare: Confederate Strategy and Military Policy," in *Writing the Civil War: The Quest to Understand,* 36-59 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 36; Caroline E. Janney, "War over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation," *Journal of Southern History* 77*,* no. 1 (February 2011): 92-94, 107-108.

women in contemporary southern society, the women of the UDC were not content to simply toe the line of societal expectations in their endeavors. Instead they approached their many undertakings as opportunities to shape society and viewed memorial work as a key part of their mission to preserve and transmit the values of the Old South. The frequent mention of women's efforts in raising the monuments and of the role of southern women in sustaining the Confederacy found on the monuments themselves makes clear that, although they in many ways intentionally embodied the traditional ideal of southern womanhood, the Daughters were ready to author their own histories. An inscription on the base of the Dallas Confederate monument, for example, reads: "This stone shall crumble into dust ere the deathless devotion of Southern women be forgotten." When a regional monument commemorating the sacrifice of women during the war was proposed, women's groups--including the UDC--at first offered alternative suggestions and then protested, contesting both the memory makers (in this case, men) and the memory ("men's memories of women's wartime participation").[7]

---

7 McMichael, *Sacred Memories, 7*-8, 17, 35-36, 46; Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South,* 104; Robert M. Harris and J. Michael Martinez, "Graves, Worms, and Epitaphs: Confederate Monuments in the Southern Landscape," in *Confederate Symbols in the Confederate South,* edited by Ron McNinch-Su, J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson, 130-194 (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000), 139, 147; Margaret Nell Price, "The Development of Leadership by Southern Women through Clubs and Organizations," (master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1945), 52, 68-69; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 99, 104-105, 112-114***;*** Janney, "War over a Shrine of Peace," 101-102; Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture,* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 2, 14-24, 26. Many of the Daughters

UDC members quickly recognized the importance of and the power implicit in their memorial work, and unlike other organizations, they stayed true to this task and became known for their ability to see projects through to completion. This focus and specialization paid off, and inter-chapter communication facilitated both the number of monuments erected, and their relative uniformity. Besides word-of-mouth accounts of those who traveled to other communities to attend the unveiling of monuments, local and state newspapers and the *Confederate Veteran* magazine reported on these events and the monuments themselves, creating a regional communication network that helped to disseminate and perpetuate appropriate aesthetics and protocol. As self-appointed trustees and teachers of "true Southern character," the women of the UDC became well versed in and masters of the language and symbolism of the Lost Cause. Their organization's constitution outlined five objective areas to steer their activities--memorial, historical, benevolent, educational and social--and while the Daughters earned their considerable reputation in each domain, the Lost Cause proved to be the common denominator in all of them. Although in this period there were a number of women's clubs and organizations (UDC members, as many women of their day, often belonged to any number of them concurrently) the UDC quickly became the largest and most influential such organization in the nation, a distinction that held for most the first half of the twentieth century. A Daughter's election to a leadership position in the organization was universally viewed as a sign of prestige, status and respect by white southern society, and UDC president-generals were hosted at the White House by Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, and Woodrow Wilson. In many ways, the Texas division of the UDC exemplified the organization's national profile. Texas, one

---

were in fact authors and wrote histories, Texas Daughter Kattie Daffan of Ennis being perhaps the most prominent example.

of the earliest states to charter, regularly maintained memberships among the highest in the south, leading the 1900 and 1910 counts, and falling off only in the 1940s, following the national trend. Kate Cabell Currie was elected as the President-General, an honor that the *Confederate Veteran* magazine noted was "bestowed in appreciation of her unceasing labors for the advancement of the organization not only in the Dallas chapter and the Lone Star state, but throughout the Southland." When she died in 1927, her name had appeared in the society and community events pages of the *Dallas Morning News* for over thirty years, and the organization she had brought to Texas was well established as a pillar of service and charity.[8]

---

8 McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 96; Harris and Martinez, "Graves, Worms, and Epitaphs," 147-154; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 3, 19, 29, 32, 34-36. Nor would the Daughters, once empowered, be cowed by high-ranking political offices. Caroline Janney points out the UDC "saw no reason not to confront the federal government and defend their jurisdiction over the Confederate past." She also finds that contrary to the pattern of reconciliation established by male reunion participants, both northern and southern women proved to be less inclined than men to "partake in reconciliation;" Janney, "War over a Shrine of Peace," 108, 109-110. "Our Sacred Cause at Dallas, Texas--Dedication of the Grand Monument," *Confederate Veteran,* 6 (no. 7, 1898): 299; Kate Cabell Currie remarried and became known as Mrs. J. C. Muse in 1908; "Will Observe Lee's Birthday," *Dallas Morning News,* January 10, 1910; "Dallas Social Affairs," *Dallas Morning News,* June 20, 1909; "Mrs. J. C. Muse Passes Away," *Dallas Morning News,* July 19, 1927; "Mrs. J.C. Muse is Laid to Rest," *Dallas Morning News,* July 21, 1927. Texas UDC membership fell in the 1920s, from over 5,300 in 1910 to 3,536, before rebounding to 4,321 in 1930; according to Margaret Nell Price's table, the UDC had chapters in thirty-nine states, the District of Columbia, and "Indian Territory," Price, "The Development of Leadership

In the historiography of the Lost Cause, men traditionally enjoyed the lion's share of consideration as makers of the myth. In her 2003 study of the UDC for example, Karen Cox notes that "numerous historians have examined the Lost Cause . . . (and) most have focused almost exclusively on the activities of male participants," and that while many have recognized that the organization was "important to the Confederate tradition, they have neglected to fully describe or analyze the role of women in shaping the Lost Cause." She argues convincingly that due to the organization's remarkable success, their dedication to the promotion of a "Confederate culture," and the sheer number of artifacts produced by its members make the UDC easily the most dynamic of all Confederate heritage groups and the most useful lens through which to examine the Lost Cause. Kelly McMichael acknowledges some logic in the traditional skew of gender representation in the literature, as men were positioned as "influential political and financial leaders," and that as the holders of "real societal power...historians have assumed men have dominated the memory production for communities." However, McMichael suggests that the role women played in the creation of the Lost Cause myth has been somewhat re-calibrated of late, with historians belatedly recognizing the ways in which women acted and positioned themselves as custodians of memory and tradition. Caroline Janney sees the UDC's opposition to the Appomattox Peace Monument as an illuminating context from which to consider the timeline of sectional reconciliation. While scholars "have found ample evidence of

---

by Southern Women through Clubs and Organizations," 68-69, and the UDC prided itself on being a "national organization," Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 29. A number of Texas Daughters served as President-General of the UDC. Like McMichael, Buenger observes that monument building in Texas reached its zenith between 1902 and 1914, a period which marked Texas' "fascination with the Confederacy."

reconciliation...focusing primarily on the years between 1880 and 1915," Janney's study demonstrates that the terms of this reconciliation--"exaltation of the military experience and the insistence that causes of the war, as well as . . . Reconstruction, be ignored"--were always tenuous, and routinely ignored by the UDC. Janney observes that "a vocal group of women began to employ the memory of the Civil War, or more precisely, the memory of Reconstruction, to maintain control of the war's interpretation."[9]

Vindication of the Confederate generation was the UDC's "overarching objective," and, married to the desire of white elites to reproduce the racial and class hierarchies of the antebellum period in the emerging New South, the Lost Cause proved to be an effective means of advancing both platforms of the Daughters' agenda. The women of the UDC were active on many fronts in their crusade to honor their Confederate heritage and preserve the cultural and social values of the Old South, but their efforts to raise Confederate monuments marked the most energetic and conspicuous facet of their campaign. These public, permanent expressions were understood by the Daughters to be powerful tools in reclaiming the memory of the Civil War and its aftermath, especially in the acculturation of the region's white youth. To be such instruments, Texas monuments to the Confederacy drew from the extensive canon of Lost Cause language and symbolism, and followed the narrative tropes of that tradition. Texas Confederate monuments, like the Lost Cause tradition from which they issued, rationalized the South's defeat

---

9 Grow, "The Shadow of the Civil War," 82-83; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 3, 29, 32, 35-36; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 96-99, 104, 114; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 3, 7-8; Caroline E. Janney, "War over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation," *Journal of Southern History* 77, no. 1 (February 2011): 92-94.

in the Civil War, exalted the Confederate soldier and Southern military experience to mythic heights, and glorified the Confederate cause while idealizing the Old South.[10]

Texas monuments to the Confederacy paralleled those of other southern states stylistically in their use of Confederate symbolism and expressions of the Lost Cause, and chronologically, as the period of the Texas monument-building movement (generally described as peaking between 1900 to 1915) adhered to the general southern pattern. For communities that could raise the funds, the most common monument type was that of a Confederate soldier on top of some sort of shaft, pedestal, or column. These were almost universally of a young, anonymous soldier, although some were reputedly modeled after known persons, and the vast majority of these figures were in a relaxed, passive pose, often described as "at parade rest." A number of the monuments were dedicated to "Our Confederate Soldiers," "Our Confederate Dead," or "Our Heroes." Many featured general tributes to cavalry, artillery, and infantry units with symbols of crossed swords, cannon, and crossed rifles, as well as anchors for the Confederate Navy, while many recognized specific units from their communities, their outfit designations carved on the monuments' smooth granite faces. Many of them, including monuments at Paris, Georgetown, Denton, and all the Dallas monuments were positioned to "look away," facing due south (as do a number of the county courthouses), while the Mount Pleasant monument faces due north and the Sherman monument faces northeast, perhaps

---

10 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters, 2,* 3, 4, 50-51, 66-67; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 96, 99, 105, 114; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 3. While the Lost Cause is characterized in various ways by scholars and has been described as a "tradition" (McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 4), the use of "tradition" here is intended to signify a literary tradition, a canon of textual and visual language.

examples of the "Watchful Eye" symbolism, like that employed by many of the battlefield memorials erected at Shiloh.[11]

The first utility of the Lost Cause, to rationalize the South's defeat in the Civil War, is the least frequently occurring facet of the canon to be found on Texas monuments, but there are examples. While there are relatively few monuments with inscriptions in the vein of the

---

11 "Private Soldier Monument at Paris, Texas," *CV*, 12 (no. 3, 1904): 120; "Unveiling Ceremonies at Gainesville, Texas," *CV,* 16 (no. 8, 1908): 377; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 165; *Confederate Monument,* Pompeo Coppini, 1903, Paris Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue*, McNeel Marble Company, 1916, Georgetown, Texas; *Our Confederate Soldiers,* Unknown Artist, 1918, Denton, Texas; *Confederate Memorial*, Dallas, Texas (City Park); *Confederate Soldier Statue,* Unknown Artist, 1901, Dallas, Texas (Greenwood Cemetery); *Robert E. Lee on Traveller,* Alexander Proctor, 1935-1936, Dallas, Texas (Lee Park); *Confederate Soldier Statue,* Unknown Artist, 1911, Mount Pleasant, Texas; *Confederate Monument*, Sherman, Texas; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 17, 35-36, 46; Harris and Martinez, "Graves, Worms, and Epitaphs," 158, 164-165; Clement Eaton, *A History of the Southern Confederacy* (New York: Free Press, 1954), 54; John M. Coski, "The Confederate Battle Flag in Historical Perspective," in *Confederate Symbols in the Confederate South,* edited by Ron McNinch-Su, J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson, 89-129 (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000), 89-101; Timothy B. Smith, *The Great Battlefield of Shiloh: History, Memory, and the Establishment of a Civil War National Military Park* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004), 89. "Almost all of the monuments in the state are (one) of two types: either a smooth obelisk or a Confederate soldier atop a column." McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 17.

"overwhelming numbers and resources" version of the Lost Cause, the Bonham monument features such an example on one of its four faces. In a straightforward manner, the panel lists five statistics: "Battles Fought, 2242; Total Enlistment Confederate Army, 600,000; Total Enlistment U. S. Army, 2,778,304; Federal Prisoners Captured by Confederates, 278,000; Confederate Prisoners Captured by Federals, 228,000." Without further commentary or florid prose, the choice of statistical categories implies both the "overwhelming" numerical advantage of the Union's enlistment (more than four times that of the Confederate force by these figures), and the disproportionate level of success the Confederate side achieved, against the odds, in their losing effort. This example is reminiscent of the Confederate monument at the Capitol grounds in Austin, dedicated four years earlier, which features a more extensive report of enlistments, engagements and casualties, on one of its four main facades.[12]

---

12 *Confederate Soldier Statue,* E. Anderson, 1905, Bonham, Texas; *Austin Confederate Monument,* Pompeo Coppini, 1901, Austin, Texas. The Austin monument lists each individual engagement of the war chronologically on its three remaining main facades, as well as the states of the Confederacy, ordered by year and date of their secession, on the four upper facades that form the pedestal upon which stands the bronze of Jefferson Davis, the monument's central figure; "overwhelming numbers and resources" is a direct quote from the Austin monument's inscription. Not all of these numbers, due to weathering (and sometimes light and/or shadow) on the inscriptions, are clear, and since no source is given for them it seemed counterproductive to check them by cross-reference. The author did his best to divine the original numbers, and he is confident of at least the first few digits of each. Neither the Austin nor Bonham monuments' Lost Cause appeals are limited to the "overwhelming numbers and resources" variety; both

The human figures atop the South's Confederate memorialization efforts tended to be of two types; one, what could be termed a Confederate "pantheon," glorified the political leadership and high-ranking military officers, with Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Jefferson Davis serving as "a loose trinity." The second type was the common soldier motif, which favored the anonymous infantryman over the Confederacy's famous personages. This type of memorial was chosen by monument planners with much greater frequency, although a few Texas monuments combined the two genres. Creators of the Texas version of the pantheon genre were happy to introduce General Albert Sidney Johnston to round out the foursome, thus elevating one of their own and facilitating a more symmetric monument design. Planners of the Dallas monument at City Park placed the figure of a common soldier atop their monument's towering shaft with the historic personalities of the "pantheon" atop free-standing pedestals of their own, flanking it on four sides. Organizers chose a similar scheme for the Paris monument, commissioning Pompeo Coppini to cast a larger than life-size bronze of a common soldier to stand upon a stout granite pedestal. For the monument's four faces, Coppini supplied bronze busts of Lee, Davis, Jackson, and Johnston. Conversely, the Austin monument featured a nine-foot bronze of President Davis as the central figure, guarded at the corners by four representations of soldiers, one from each of the service branches, the five figures all creations of Pompeo Coppini as well. Aside from these examples, relatively few Texas monuments overtly memorialized the Confederacy's political and military leadership.[13]

---

memorials combined these with inscriptions that draw from other sub-genres of the Lost Cause, which are discussed below.

13 *Austin Confederate Monument,* Austin, Texas; "Building Confederate Monuments," *CV,* 2 (no. 7, 1894): 216; *Confederate Memorial* (Dallas, Texas); "A Group of Immortals,"

Examples of the second type, which honor the sacrifice of military service in the Confederate effort, were far more common, and offered much more artistic license for the monument creators. These tributes often sought to elevate the military experience beyond the mundane, even human realm, with their rhetoric and style. The creators of the Sherman monument, for instance, credited the Confederate soldiers with "sublime self sacrifice and

---

Dallas Morning News, April 29, 1897; *Confederate Monument*, Paris, Texas; "Private Soldier Monument at Paris, Texas," *CV*, 12 (no. 3, 1904): 120-121; John A. Simpson, "Cult of the Lost Cause," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 34 (Winter 1975): 354-361; Harris and Martinez, "Graves, Worms, and Epitaphs," 144; Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South,* 124; William Alan Blair, *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 108, 127, 134; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 60, 352. John A. Simpson identified "two monument crusades" that "one could hardly distinguish as being separate;" William Alan Blair has stressed that "the shift from celebrating top commanders and political leaders to commemorating the common soldier" arose, in part, from a post-Reconstruction political climate that saw "independent party movements that included biracial coalitions" presenting challenges to the Democratic Party. The Reagan monument in Palestine, the Granbury monument to Gen. Hiram Granbury, the *Robert E. Lee on Traveller* sculpture in Dallas and the individual figures that form part of the *Littlefield Memorial Fountain* complex on the UT campus tend towards the pantheon genre, glorifying Confederate leaders and officers, more than the common soldier motif. Kate Cabell Currie, in describing the common soldier motif, referred to "the tattered and brave private, the 'noble nobody' of the war," in her "letter to the children," which appeared in "Building Confederate Monuments" in the *Confederate Veteran,* cited above.

unsurpassed valor," spoke of their "exalted courage," and proclaimed that it is not the monument, but "History (who) has enshrined them immortal." The Dallas monument, adorned with memorials to the artillery, infantry, navy, and cavalry on each of its four sides, offered quasi-poetic tributes to each, which placed the actions of the respective branches on an epic plane. The inscription honoring the artillery, for example, read "The Brazen Lips of Southern Cannon Thundered an Unanswered Anthem to the Gods of Battle," and to the cavalry, "The Confederate Sabreur Kissed His Blade Homeward Riding Straight on into the Mouth of Hell." On one of its faces, the Bonham monument characterized the conflict as "The Great War, Unrivaled in History for Bravery, Gallantry, Daring and Dash," and on another, locates the fallen "On Fame's Eternal Camping Ground." The Mount Pleasant monument inscription read "As long as Honor or Courage is cherished, the deeds of these Heroes will live." The authors of this sub-genre of the Lost Cause intentionally placed their "Heroes" above any and all in the American military experience. The monument at Beaumont proclaimed that the Confederate soldier was "rendered Immortal by his deeds of valor, sacrifices, and achievements, which are without parallel in the history of the world." A couplet inscribed on the Georgetown memorial declared "No braver Patriots ever fought, no braver deeds were ever wrought," and the Tyler cenotaph attested that "The Confederacy gave to the world its best type of soldier."[14]

---

14 *Confederate Monument*, Sherman, Texas; *Confederate Memorial*, Dallas, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue,* Bonham, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue*, Mount Pleasant, Texas; *Our Confederate Soldiers,* McNeel Marble Company, 1912, Beaumont, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue*, McNeel Marble Company, 1916, Georgetown, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue,* Unknown Artist, 1909, Tyler, Texas. See author's note 12 regarding unclear inscriptions.

If the Confederate soldier was "unrivaled in history," the Confederate cause needed some reworking. Authors of this narrative had the three-fold task of elevating the profile of the Confederate enterprise, obscuring the historical fact of slavery, and painting the antebellum South's racial hierarchy as a paradise lost. The natural connection of the cause to the men who fought for it no doubt facilitated this process. The Sherman monument, after establishing the unassailable character of the Confederate soldier, went on to proclaim their motive as "the holy principles of self government--the only true liberty." The creators of the Denton monument invoked Confederate soldiers as well, stating that they "gave their Manhood and their lives to the South in her hour of need." The juxtaposition of the masculine soldiers defending a personified, feminized South "in her hour of need" lent itself to a number of interpretations, but succeeded in establishing the image of a chaste, victimized Confederacy. The portrait of a just, besieged South was repeated in an epitaph on the monument at the Cooke County Courthouse grounds in Gainesville, Texas, which read, "Oh, home of tears, but let her bear this blazoned to the end of time; no Nation rose so white and fair, none fell so pure of crime." The monument at Corsicana drew a direct connection between the Confederate cause and the American Revolution, declaring that "The soldiers of the Southern Confederacy fought valiantly for the liberty of state bequeathed them by their forefathers of 1776, who glorified their righteous cause and they who made the sacrifice supreme in that they died to keep their country free." In a similar vein, the inscription at the base of the crypt of Albert Sidney Johnston in the Texas State Cemetery was originally to declare " . . . Texas bids her sons come and read. The body may to the sword fall victim, but the principles of constitutional liberty will never die." While most of the space on the squat, rectangular pillar that was the Wharton monument was devoted to names of veterans, the

main face bore the oft-used mantra of the Lost Cause, "Lest we forget," and the Southern Cross of Honor, with its Latin motto, *"Deo Vindice."*[15]

As Cox points out, "beginning in the mid-1880s and continuing through World War I, the meaning and purpose of Confederate memorialization changed." Whereas in the years immediately following the war Decoration Day rituals had mourned the Confederate dead, with Reconstruction over and "the restoration of home rule" the monument movement took on a celebratory tone, glorifying the Confederacy and the men who had defended it. In Texas, the first Confederate monument was erected in a Waco cemetery in 1893, and the UDC and UCV in Texas continued to raise monuments in cemeteries, almost always in connection to Confederate veteran or UDC grave plots, with regularity through 1939, when the Fort Worth monument was dedicated. Of the 76 Confederate monuments in Texas, sixteen were located in cemeteries, comprising twenty-one percent of the total. Beyond their placement in cemeteries and their connection to Confederate burial plots, the Texas monuments found in cemeteries closely

---

15 *Confederate Monument*, Sherman, Texas; *Our Confederate Soldiers,* Denton, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue*, McNeel Marble Company, 1911, Gainesville, Texas (Cooke County Courthouse Grounds); *Call to Arms,* Louis Amateis, 1907, Corsicana, Texas; *Albert Sidney Johnston,* Elisabet Ney, 1903, Austin, Texas; "United Daughters in Texas," *CV,* 14 (no. 1, 1906): 9; *Confederate Monument*, Unknown Artist, Year Unknown, Wharton, Texas. The Austin monument at the capitol draws a similar connection to the American revolution, proclaiming "the people of the South, animated by the spirit of 1776. . . "; "*Deo Vindice"* is variously translated, most commonly as "With God as our Champion." The original text planned for the Albert Sidney Johnston memorial inscription was well over 100 words. For whatever reason, the inscription was cut down to around 65 words, and these lines were omitted.

resembled the larger sample of Texas monuments, in that they generally were either an obelisk or a figure of a Confederate soldier atop a pedestal. While many featured the same Lost Cause rhetoric and symbolism as their counterparts found in other public spaces, their placement in cemeteries limited their overall effect for a number of reasons: one, the nature of cemeteries, where each grave marker and headstone is a monument (many rivaling or exceeding the Confederate monuments in size and adornment) lessened their overall impression; two, their proximity to graves of Confederate veterans made these memorials to Confederate dead much more literal, and so lent them to the type of memorialization Cox identified as characteristic of the period before the mid-1880s, no matter to what extent their language and symbolism glorify the Confederate cause; and three, located in cemeteries, they were rather "hidden away," as Cox puts it. As the occasions and purpose for visiting these "cities of the dead" were by their nature limited, a monument placed in a cemetery was observed by far fewer citizens, on far fewer occasions.[16]

---

16 *Waco Confederate Monument*, Unknown Artist, 1893, Waco, Texas**;** *Confederate Soldier Statue*, Fannie Nunnally, 1939, Fort Worth, Texas**;** Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 66-67**;** McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 106. Kelly McMichael (Stott) refers to 63 Confederate monuments in her 2001 dissertation and counts 68 in her 2009 publication; more recent assessments count 76 monuments to the Confederacy in Texas. The Fort Worth monument was erected in 1935 and dedicated four years later. There is a higher percentage of the obelisk-type monument found in cemeteries than in public parks or on courthouse grounds (69%), but at least five of the monuments found in Texas cemeteries feature figures of Confederate soldiers. Texas Confederate monuments are located in cemeteries in Waco (1893), Bryan (1900), Dallas (1901), Comanche (1903), Austin (1905), Ennis (1906),

Even as new Confederate memorials continued to be raised in cemeteries, other tributes were being built in more public places. The twenty-four Texas monuments to the Confederacy found in public parks, city plazas, or on public university campuses constitute thirty-two percent of the total number. The third (and one of the largest) Texas Confederate monument was dedicated in Dallas' City Park in 1897 by the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and monuments to the Confederacy would be erected in city parks and town squares well past the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition. Consisting of either an obelisk or the figure of a Confederate soldier atop a pedestal, the majority of monuments in this group followed the general pattern. However, a handful of monuments, coincidentally all of which are located in public parks or on university campuses, differed stylistically from the movement's norms sufficiently to garner mention, both to describe the outlier monuments and by comparison to help delineate the boundaries of the genre.[17]

Marshall (1908), Tyler (1909), Orange (c.1910), Temple (1910), Scottsville (1915), El Paso (1919), Alvin (1924), Cleburne (1937), Fort Worth (1939), and Galveston (year unknown). The monument in El Paso is perhaps the most unique among this group in that it memorializes the Confederacy along with the fallen from each U.S. military conflict that followed, through Grenada in 1983; monuments of this type, as Walter Buenger has noted, became more common after World War I, but the El Paso monolith remains unique among products of the Confederate monument movement, if nothing else for the amount of conflicts listed. Texas Confederate monuments that also memorialize World War I are in Austin (*Littlefield Memorial Fountain)* and Memphis. Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 129.

17 *Confederate Memorial*, Dallas, Texas; Besides the Dallas monument at Lee Park and the monuments on the University of Texas and Texas A&M campuses, all of the monuments in

Spirit of the Confederacy, a work by Louis Amateis that the UDC erected in Houston's Sam Houston Park (ironically, General Houston had strongly opposed secession) consisted of a large bronze figure on top of a tall, broad granite pedestal. The winged figure, a male "archangel" with stoic gaze and arms folded defiantly across its chest, was designed to

---

this group were erected by the UDC, the UCV, or the two in conjunction. Texas Confederate monuments located in public spaces that are not courthouse grounds include Dallas (City Park, 1897), San Antonio (Travis Park, 1900), Houston (Sam Houston Park, 1908), Gainesville (City Park, 1908), Gonzales (Jail Square, 1909), Galveston (Central Park, 1911), Palestine (Reagan Park, 1911), Longview (Bodie Park, 1911) Victoria (De Leon Plaza, 1912), Beaumont (Weiss Park, 1913), Corpus Christi (Broadway Bluff, 1915), Mount Vernon (City Plaza, year unknown, c.1915) Farmersville (City Park, 1917), Texarkana (Stateline Blvd., 1917), Texas A&M University (1919), Clarksville (City Square, c.1920), Brownsville (International Blvd., 1926), Greenville (Greenville High School, 1926), Amarillo (Ellwood Park, 1931), University of Texas (1933), Wichita Falls (Memorial Auditorium, 1934), Dallas (Lee Park, 1936), Gonzales (Jail Square, 1937), Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Reservation (Outside Tribal Cemetery, 1937). It should be noted that the Brownsville monument was erected by a national chapter of the UDC, not a Texas group, McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 76. Greenville's monument has been moved at least twice, and now is located on the grounds of the Audie Murphy Museum; http://www.familyoldphotos.com/tx/2s/senior_high_school_and_confedera.htm (accessed 7/8/13). Beaumont's monument was originally located at Keith Park; http://tyrrellhistoricallibrary.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p16058coll7/id/131/rec/15 (accessed 7/10/13). The Longview monument has since been moved to the Gregg County Courthouse grounds.

symbolically represent "the Southern cause." One observer described "his majestic pose seemingly proclaiming: 'I have done the behest of God'." The monument at Palestine, a work by Pompeo Coppini featuring a bronze figure of John H. Reagan standing on the main pedestal above a seated bronze youth figure personifying the "Lost Cause," was perhaps the most thematically ambitious of all Texas Confederate monuments. The Dallas monument at Lee Park was an enormous double-equestrian bronze sculpture portraying General Robert E. Lee on his horse Traveller a few strides ahead of a young soldier, also on horseback, intended to represent the youth of the South. Erected in 1936 by the Dallas Southern Memorial Association in cooperation with the Dallas Park Board, it was among the largest Confederate monuments in Texas. The monument in Corpus Christi, Coppini's *Queen of the Sea*, a bas-relief sculpture consisting of three neo-classical figures and no overt Lost Cause symbolism or rhetoric, was, aside from its inscription, virtually unrecognizable as a Confederate monument.[18]

---

18 *Spirit of the Confederacy,* Louis Amateis, 1908, Houston, Texas (Sam Houston Park); *John H. Reagan Memorial,* Pompeo Coppini, 1911, Palestine, Texas; *Queen of the Sea*, Pompeo Coppini, 1914, Corpus Christi, Texas; *Robert E. Lee on Traveller,* Alexander Proctor, 1935-1936, Dallas, Texas; *The Last Stand,* Pompeo Coppini, 1912, Victoria, Texas; *Littlefield Memorial Fountain,* Pompeo Coppini, 1933, Austin, Texas; "Contribution to Houston (Tex.) Monument," *CV,* 15 (no. 4, 1907): 172; " 'The Last Stand'--Monument at Victoria," *CV,* 20 (no. 1, 1912): 13; "Monument at Victoria, Tex.," *CV,* 20 (no. 9, 1912): 411-412; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 62-63, 122, 161, 163, 350, 247. Victoria's *The Last Stand* was stylistically different in its realistic portrayal of the Confederate soldier and rough granite pedestal, but was a variation on the common soldier motif; the *Littlefield Memorial Fountain* consisted of a large, multi-figure bronze sculpture in a fountain at the head of the university's South Mall, plus six

With their move out of cemeteries and into more prominent public spaces, the monuments assumed a higher profile in the daily life of Texans. Unlike the removed, quiet, contemplative atmosphere of a cemetery, city squares and public parks constituted the space of civic life. And, through their implied connection to the municipality, these monuments became semi-official symbols of its citizenry and extensions of its public works. Furthermore, they were quite often prominently displayed in these locations, many times serving as the intended centerpiece of the space, accentuated by malls, esplanades, landscaped gardens and other improvements that drew attention to the memorial and integrated it with the surroundings. Galveston's monument *Dignified Resignation* in the city's Central Park serves as an illustrative example: the monument's stout, rectangular pedestal rose from a circular, landscaped island surrounded by a broad, paved walkway. This pedestrian traffic area encircled the monument and opened to a tree-shaded corner of the park lined with benches, effectively making it the focal point and most prominent feature of the park. Such placements reflected a willingness by community leaders to accommodate the wishes of the monuments' sponsors, if not, and probably more often the case, a close partnership between local officials and Confederate heritage groups, while completely ignoring the fact that local black populations had no stake in celebrating the Confederacy. The presence of Confederate monuments in city- and county-regulated public

---

individual bronze sculptures of Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, James Stephen Hogg, Albert Sidney Johnston, Woodrow Wilson, and John H. Reagan located at various locations around the perimeter of the mall. Stylistically, the fountain sculpture was rather unique among Confederate monuments, but the accompanying six were quite traditional, bronze figures on granite pedestals, and would be examples of the Confederate "pantheon" genre.

spaces signified a sanctioned endorsement of the Confederate cause and the values the UDC correlated with it.[19]

If Confederate monuments in public parks and city plazas implied a municipally-sanctioned endorsement of the Lost Cause, their placement on the grounds of county courthouses and the state Capitol signaled a significant connection between the values of the Old South and the loci of political power in Texas. The Mildred Lee Camp of the UCV laid the cornerstone of their memorial to the Confederate dead on the northeast lawn of the Grayson County Courthouse on April 3, 1896, becoming the first group in the state to place their monument on the grounds of the seat of local government. Thirty-six such monuments (comprising forty-seven percent of the total) would follow, with UCV camps and UDC chapters continuing to raise monuments at county courthouses with regularity through the mid-1920s. With their placement on the grounds, the scores of monuments whose carved and cast figures stood sentinel outside the state's

---

19 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 66-67, 49; Jay Winter, *"Sites of Memory,"* in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 312-324 (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 315-316*; Dignified Resignation,* Louis Amateis, 1911, Galveston, Texas; http://digitalcollections.smu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/tex/id/1678; http://digitalcollections.smu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/tex/id/1677 ; http://www.texasescapes.com/TexasGulfCoastTowns/GalvestonTexas/Galveston-County-Courthouse-Texas.htm#2006 (accessed 7/4/13). Galveston's Central Park was adjacent to the site of the 1898 Courthouse; Galveston's Confederate monument was later moved to the 1966 Courthouse grounds;

administrative centers ensured that Texas citizens were well reminded of the values their political leaders held dear.[20]

Although all monuments on the Capitol and courthouse grounds occupied spaces that made them conspicuous physical extensions of these centers of government, some of these Texas

---

20 *Confederate Monument*, Sherman, Texas; "First Confederate Monument--Texas," *CV,* 4 (no. 12, 1896): 439; *Austin Confederate Monument,* Austin Texas; *Terry's Texas Rangers Memorial*, Pompeo Coppini, 1907, Austin, Texas; *Hood's Texas Brigade Monument*, Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Austin, Texas; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 49, 66-67. Texas Confederate monuments erected on the sites of county courthouses or the grounds of the State Capitol include Sherman (1897), Livingston (1900), Austin (1902), Linden (1903), Paris (1904), Bonham (1905), Houston (City Hall, 1905), Marshall (1906), Austin (1907), Jefferson (1907), Rusk (1907), Corsicana (1908), Granbury (1908), Austin (1910), Bastrop (1910), Gainesville (1911) Kaufman (1911), Mount Pleasant (c.1911), Waxahachie (1912), Bay City (1913), Hallettsville (1914), Goldthwaite (1915), Weatherford (1915), Belton (1916), Georgetown (1916), Llano (1916), Vernon (1916), Cleburne (1917), Denton (1918), Lockhart (1923) Memphis (1924), Wharton (1924), Hillsboro (1925), Marlin (1925), Huntsville (1956), and Madisonville (year unknown). The Houston monument was later moved to Hermann Park. The Dixie Chapter, No. 35, of the Texas UDC assisted with the Sherman monument. Apparently UCV and UDC members in both Dallas and Sherman were unaware that a monument in Waco had been dedicated by the Pat Cleburne Camp of the UCV in 1893. Whereas more than half of Texas monuments to the Confederacy located in cemeteries are of the obelisk type rather those with a soldier atop a pedestal, the percentages are reversed for monuments on courthouse grounds (72% with statue), and public parks and plazas (75% with statue).

monuments were placed so as to further emphasize their revered standing. The first Austin Confederate monument and the *Terry's Texas Rangers Memorial* at the State Capitol, along with the tributes to the defenders of the Alamo and Texas Firemen, lined the South Mall, the main approach to the Capitol Building with Congress Avenue stretching south in an architectural sight line through the city's center to Town Lake. They were prominently placed, and along with the *Hood's Texas Brigade Monument* which flanked the Capitol to the east, infused the Capitol grounds with a distinct Confederate presence. Texas Confederate monuments were also to be found placed in various positions relative to the courthouses they compliment, many of them on the front lawns off to one side of the buildings' main footpaths. A handful of monuments were located directly in front of their courthouses, taking on an added importance in the architectural scheme of the site. The Georgetown monument in front of the Williamson County courthouse was centered within the wide paved walkway leading to the building's steps, and the monument's rectangular shaft and Confederate soldier accentuate the four ionic columns of the structure's facade behind it, a virtual gate-keeper to this seat of local administrative and political power. The Denton monument's unique design featured the standard private soldier statuary atop an arched stone facing that was supported on either side by two rectangular columns. The columns and arch, which mimic the facade behind them, straddle the paved main approach to the courthouse and formed a portal through which all visitors to the county offices might have passed.[21]

---

21 *Austin Confederate Monument,* Austin, Texas; *Terry's Texas Rangers Memorial*, Austin, Texas; *Hood's Texas Brigade Monument*, Austin, Texas; *Battle of the Alamo*, James Senille Clark, 1891, Austin, Texas; *Fireman, Save My Child,* Frank Teich, 1896, Austin, Texas; *Confederate Soldier Statue*, Georgetown, Texas; *Our Confederate Soldiers,* Denton, Texas;

Monuments on courthouse grounds and at the State Capitol signify a willingness by political and administrative officials to champion the state's Confederate history. Moreover, their prominent placement at these sites, paired with their textual and symbolic odes to the Lost Cause, suggested that such affirmations went beyond memorials to a region or community's war dead, but instead were significant and important statements on the nature of political power in the New South. As Jay Winter explains, "placement signified meaning," and in Texas as it did

---

Confederate Soldier Statue, McNeel Marble Company, 1913, Bay City, Texas; *Confederate Soldier* Statue*,* Unknown Artist, 1911, Kaufman, Texas**;** Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 66-67. Monuments on the front lawns of Courthouses or placed prominently in front of Courthouses include Livingston (1900), Linden (1903), Paris (1904)**,** Houston (1905), Marshall (1906), Jefferson (1907), Corsicana (1908), Bastrop (1910), Mount Pleasant (c. 1911), Gainesville (1911), Weatherford (1915), Belton (1916), Vernon (1916), Llano (1916), Cleburne (1917), Wharton (1924), Hillsboro (1925), and Huntsville (1956). Monuments placed directly in front of their respective courthouses are at Bay City (1913), Denton (1918), Georgetown (1916), and Kaufman (1911), all four courthouses and their monuments are south facing. The courthouses in Bay City and Kaufman have been built since the monuments' dedications at their sites, both monuments were moved. It appears that in Kaufman the monument was replaced to its previous location after the new courthouse was completed; http://www.kaufmancounty.net/countyseat1.html (accessed 7/3/13). It is not clear where the Bay City monument originally was placed in relation to the old courthouse.

throughout the south, the commemoration of a Confederate past carried significant political implications.[22]

The unveiling and dedication ceremonies for these monuments were important community events, and the women of the UDC were invariably spearheaded their planning, organization and orchestration. While both the UDC and the UCV raised monuments, sometimes independently and sometimes in cooperation, the UCV was comfortable deferring these organizational duties to the Daughters, and the Daughters accepted this charge with aplomb. When the John B. Hood Camp of the UCV unveiled their monument on the South Mall of the State Capitol, the Albert Sidney Johnston Chapter of the UDC was responsible for the day's program. Many aspects of these ceremonies involved children, both selected offspring of the monuments' sponsors and large groups of students from the white public schools. Parades were a common feature of these special days, and they routinely drew hundreds and sometimes thousands of participants into celebrations of the Confederate cause. These days took on holiday status, with schools, businesses, and government offices often times closed for the occasion. The culture of Confederate monument dedications, in Texas and throughout the South, reflected not simply citizens turning out in droves to watch with interest the pomp and ceremony of the Daughters unveiling their latest project; instead, it revealed impressive mobilizations of

22 Jay Winter, "Sites of Memory," in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 312-324, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 321.

the white citizenry of hosting communities, with the women of the UDC as the organizational head of the effort, and broad cooperation from political, business, and educational leadership.[23]

The women of the UDC had strong motivations to include children in their monument unveiling ceremonies, as one of the objectives of their organization was to ensure that society, especially white southern youth, understood the "true" history of the Confederacy, and would someday take up their places as "defenders" of the Confederacy's "sacred principles." A common feature of these ceremonies was having young girls pull the cords which unveiled the monuments. At the Austin monument unveiling, "four beautiful maids attired in pure white pulled the canvas which covered the figures of the heroes," and at the Paris celebration each of the four busts of Jefferson Davis, Stonewall Jackson, Robert E. Lee and Albert Sidney Johnston were revealed by young ladies. The names of these fortunate young people were included in the write-ups of both events, which, along with the fact that they were selected to perform these important duties, suggest that they were probably related to prominent members of the UDC or UCV, or both. At the Bastrop unveiling " . . . eight elderly ladies, each accompanied by a wee young maiden carrying red and white flowers, took positions near the monument; as they stood, representatives of the past and future, Mrs. Robert Gill drew the veil, revealing the beautiful memorial, at the foot of which little girls placed offerings of flowers." Similarly, a common motif at these occasions was to employ thirteen young females, dressed in white, to represent the

23 "Austin's Beautiful Monument," *CV,* 11 (no. 5, 1903): 200-201; "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 61-66; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 3; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 109, 114.

states of the Confederacy. The unveiling ceremonies at Dallas, Jefferson, Corsicana, Beaumont, and Temple all featured like contingents of young luminaries.[24]

Dedicated as they were to the business of educating the youth of the South, the women of the UDC left no stone unturned. The Bastrop service, for instance, showcased "the public school children . . . singing 'America'," and at the Rusk commemoration "the children of the public school (assisted)" with "an interesting programme." In the parade organized for the Beaumont unveiling marched "more than a thousand school children carrying Confederate flags." A similar contingent took their place in the parade mustered for the Sherman, when "1,000 public school

---

24 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 61-66, 122-123, 133-135, (quotation) 120; "Austin's Beautiful Monument," *CV,* 11 (no. 5, 1903): 200-201; "Private Soldier Monument at Paris, Texas," *CV*, 12 (no. 3, 1904): 120-121; "Monument at Bastrop, Tex.," *CV,* 19 (no. 1, 1911): 15-16; "Confederate Monument at Jefferson, Tex.," *CV,* 15 (no. 9, 1907): 396; "Monument at Corsicana, Tex.," *CV,* 16 (no. 5, 1908): 210-211; "Confederate Monument at Beaumont," *CV,* 21 (no. 3, 1913): 126; "A Noble Southern Woman," *CV,* 23 (no. 2, 1915): 74; "Veil Has Been Drawn," *Dallas Morning News,* April 30, 1897. The Dallas contingent consisted of 15 maids, representing "the seceding states and territories." While they included New Mexico, Arizona and "Indian Territory" in their number, there is no listing of Kentucky. It is assumed this was an accidental omission on the part of the reporter; the Corsicana unveiling featured 14 girls, the extra representing the Confederacy, and each of the girls' names and the state they represented were included in the event's write-up in the *Confederate Veteran.* According to Karen Cox, a child or group of children pulled the cord to reveal the monument "at every unveiling . . . because the Daughters envisioned each monument as a gift that connected past generations with future generations." Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 63.

children, accompanied by superintendent Lemmon and the corps of teachers" transversed the route; "each child carried a wreath of flowers."[25]

In fact, the parades organized in conjunction with the unveiling ceremonies offered the UDC an opportunity to involve large cross sections of the white community in their celebrations of the Confederacy. While Confederate veterans were the main attraction and usually were positioned at the front of the column, seemingly any and all groups in a community found a place in their city's parade. An observer of the parade preceding Beaumont's unveiling reported a float carrying the thirteen Confederate maids trailed behind the veterans and "a sprinkling of Grand Army men;" then came ". . . the county and State officials, headed by a squad of mounted police and followed by a band. Next to the veterans came the Daughters of the Confederacy . . . followed by the Sons, the Boy Scouts, and more than a thousand school children . . . Lastly came the Fire Brigade, in charge of Chief Eastham." The Sherman parade, whose route took participants through the city before arriving back at the courthouse square, was thus described by a witness:

> Kohler's band, Stanley rangers, Austin College Cadets, North Texas Female Cadets, Mary Nash Female College, Mahan's Commercial College, [the public school children, teachers and superintendent], Odd Fellows, Woodsman of the World, Hemming guards, Jos. E. Johnston Camp, United Confederate Veterans of Gainesville, Drum Corps, Mildred Lee Camp, United Confederate Veterans; Denison Camp, United Confederate Veterans . . . The Red Men were in line in full attire. The two floats containing the young ladies selected...representing the states . . . vehicles containing disabled veterans . . . A number of Daughters of the Confederacy . . . The fire department with gaily decorated apparatus brought up the rear. All civic organizations were in full regalia . . . The line of march extended

25 "Monument at Bastrop, Tex.," *CV,* 19 (no. 1, 1911): 15-16; "Confederate Monument at Rusk, Tex.," *CV,* 16 (no. 3, 1908): 103; "Confederate Monument at Beaumont," *CV,* 21 (no. 3, 1913): 126; "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897.

over a mile and contained nearly 2000 people.

Likewise, without going into such detail, an observer of the Houston parade noted that "the procession extended for miles," adding that "business was suspended in Houston on that day." The children of Texas public schools were regularly excused from classes to attend and participate in these events, and no lesser body than the Texas State Legislature recessed to enable its members to attend the Dallas festivities.[26]

There remains a considerable debate over what to make of the public's participation in and attendance at these ceremonies and the significance, or lack thereof, of these monuments in the lives and minds of Texans without a vested interest in the perpetuation of Confederate culture. Kelly McMichael, contrasting the difficulties UDC chapters encountered in their fundraising efforts with the large turnouts at the monuments' dedication ceremonies, concludes that "Texans' attendance at a monument's unveiling did not imply that they supported the values of the Lost Cause." Conversely, William Alan Blair suggests that although these public holidays were organized and administered by elites, it was necessary that they "tap the sentiments of the public to have validity," and, borrowing a term from Eric Hobsbawn, states that "these commemorations had to maintain 'genuine popular resonance' or they (would fail) to attract supporters." The cultural relevance of these events was certainly not lost on contemporary politicians. City mayors and local judges, members of the Texas legislature, United States

---

26 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 61; "Confederate Monument at Beaumont," *CV,* 21 (no. 3, 1913): 126; "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; "To the Heroes of Sabine Pass," *CV,* 13 (no. 11, 1905): 497; "Veil Has Been Drawn," *Dallas Morning News,* April 30, 1897; "Our Sacred Cause at Dallas, Tex.--Dedication of the Grand Monument," *CV,* 6 (no. 7, 1898): 299-302.

congressmen and senators, sitting and former Governors of Texas, elected officials of all ranks and statures routinely appeared and orated at these ceremonies, reaching large segments of their constituencies while exalting the Confederate cause and its heroes. Finally, these monuments and their dedication ceremonies were indicators of a less-obvious yet more important reality of Texas society of the period; that being the considerable sphere of influence that the UDC enjoyed. While the Daughters might have been "a small minority . . . of self-appointed memory-makers" in the narrowest sense, by the end of World War I they had redefined the role of women in the public sphere while becoming one of the most powerful organizations in the country, both of which had far-reaching implications in the lives of millions of Texans.[27]

Kelly McMichael suggests that historians, when attempting to correlate attendance at monument unveilings with the public's investment in the values of the Lost Cause, have been deceived by the "sheer numbers involved," stating that "numbers alone are misleading." But while the figures themselves do present problems of interpretation, it is unwise to dismiss them out of hand. William Alan Blair counters that although "these ceremonies offer the most accurate descriptions of the values of (their) organizers, they do provide windows, however imperfect into the . . . beliefs of the public they served." Confederate groups like the UCV and UDC could raise monuments, and with the cooperation of local governments, business and

---

27 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 1-2; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 107 (last quotation); McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 108 (first quotation); Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* 2, 7-8. Cox uses "Confederate culture" to describe the cultural products, "ideas and symbols . . . images and beliefs," produced and perpetuated by "Lost Cause devotees," with the UDC at the vanguard of the movement. On the influence of the UDC, see Cox's *Dixie Daughters,* 3, 29, 32, 35-36, 50-51.

political leaders organize elaborate public ceremonies to unveil them, but without considerable interest on the part of the general citizenry, this aspect of the monument movement would not have been sustainable. And it was. Smaller Texas communities regularly attracted many hundreds of spectators to their events, and larger cities hosted crowds numbering in the thousands. For the unveiling of the first Confederate monument at the State Capitol, Austin's "Congress Avenue . . . partook the appearance of a carnival town ablaze with merriment," and "in addition to the enthusiastic recognition of the auspicious event by the citizens of Austin, it is estimated that 5,000 out-of-town people attended the ceremonies." The monument unveiling in San Antonio occurred before "a crowd variously estimated at from 6,000 to 10,000 people," believed to be "the largest outdoor assemblage ever witnessed in the history of the city." In Sherman, the "surging mass of humanity" that turned out for the unveiling ceremonies was reported to be "twenty-thousand people" strong; and in Dallas, "not less than 30,000 people were present . . . and thousands were kept away by the extraordinary crush. Thousands came from adjoining towns, nearly every north and central Texas city sending a large delegation."[28]

---

28 McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 108; Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* 8**;** "Austin's Beautiful Monument," *CV,* 11 (no. 5, 1903): 200-201; "Shaft is Unveiled. Elaborate Ceremonies over Confederate Monument," *The Daily Express* (San Antonio), April 29, 1900; "Confederate Monument at San Antonio," *CV,* 8 (no. 6, 1900): 261; "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; "Notes on the Day," *Dallas Morning News,* April 30, 1897. While most of the larger cities had hosted their monument unveiling ceremonies by 1910, large ceremonies continued to be held in cities like Victoria (1912), Beaumont (1912), Llano (1916), Texarkana (1918), and Amarillo (1931), to name a few; "Monument at Victoria, Tex.," *CV,* 20 (no.9, 1912): 411-412; "Confederate Monument at Beaumont," *CV,* 21 (no. 3,

Although all actions of UDC members were purportedly devoid of political affiliation according to the organization's constitution, the unveiling ceremonies the Daughters staged almost without exception featured politicians as their distinguished guests and chief orators. William Alan Blair points out that "participating in Confederate Memorial Day was a must for anyone harboring political aspirations in the New South," and the number of prominent Texas politicians who spoke at Confederate monument unveilings and dedications suggests that these events were also prized venues through which elected officials could reach large audiences of their constituents. From a sample of roughly two dozen politicians who regularly appeared at these unveiling ceremonies, there were mayors, county and federal judges, members of the Texas legislature, the United States Congress and Senate, and at least eight sitting or former Governors of Texas. Perhaps more striking is that every one of that number prominent enough to garner a biographical sketch in the Texas State Historical Association's "Handbook of Texas" was a Democrat; none were Republican. The theme of their speeches, with remarkable consistency, was the unassailable character of the Confederate soldier. Ex-Governor Joseph Sayers, speaking at the Bastrop commemoration, "extolled the honesty and integrity of men of the Old South and spoke feelingly of the sacrifices and hardships endured by the Confederate soldier." Addressing the audience assembled at the Victoria ceremony, Judge Sterling F. Grimes spoke of "men who gave their lives, their fortunes, their every hope in defense of their homes, their firesides, and for a cause that was dearer than all else on earth to them." On the program at the Beaumont dedication no fewer than five speakers lauded the Confederate soldier as the main thrust of their

---

1913): 126; "Governor Delivers Address at Llano," *Dallas Morning News,* February 23, 1916; "The Memorial at Texarkana," *CV,* 26 (no. 6, 1918): 278; "Confederate Monument at Amarillo, Tex.," *CV,* 39 (no.7, 1931): 263.

address. Democratic leaders found the emotional utility of the Confederate dead effective in helping to forge party solidarity, and their willingness to deliver this message time and time again apparently paid dividends.[29]

If the scores of bronze and granite tributes to the Confederacy stood as the most visible reminders of the UDC's prominence in Texas and southern society, the Daughters' work in other

---

29 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 23; Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* 130 (quotation), 108, 127, 134; "Monument at Bastrop, Tex.," *CV,* 19 (no. 1, 1911): 15-16; "Monument at Victoria, Tex.," *CV,* 20 (no.9, 1912): 411-412; "Confederate Monument at Beaumont," *CV,* 21 (no. 3, 1913): 126. Although the theme of the Martin Dies's speech at the Beaumont dedication, described as "the oration of the day," was not given, it is quite possible that he, too, offered accolades to the soldiers of the Confederacy. Perhaps the utility of and reliance on the Confederate soldier as symbol explains in part why monument sponsors overwhelmingly chose designs which included statuary on their memorials raised in public spaces such as city parks, plazas and on the grounds of administrative centers. Democratic politicians and party operatives who appeared on the programs at Texas Confederate monument unveilings include A.P. Wozencraft, Carlos Bee, Columbus Upson, Norman Kitrell, Martin Dies, Marvin Jones, Morris Sheppard, Clarence Ousley, Cone Johnson, John H. Reagan, Gov. Joseph Sayers, Gov. Charles Allen Culberson (later as U.S. Senator), Gov. Samuel W. T. Lanham, Gov. Francis Lubbock, Gov. James Ferguson, Gov. Richard Hubbard, and Gov. James Hogg. While the Democratic Party's hold on public office in Texas after Reconstruction is well documented, this connection to the Confederate monument movement is perhaps an under-appreciated point. All politicians named were culled from write-ups in the *Confederate Veteran* or newspapers previously cited; biographical sketches referenced at http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook (accessed 7/15/13).

areas would prove to be more far-reaching. The UDC was often successful in their attempts before the Texas Legislature; sometimes in securing state funding for memorialization projects, but more frequently in gathering support for and ensuring passage of their pet legislative concerns. From official recognition of Confederate Memorial Day to the state assuming custodianship of the UDC-founded Confederate women's home and providing pensions for Confederate veterans and widows, the UDC routinely exercised its political might, shaping the state's political discourse and agenda. The organization's influence, which aside from the group's political clout was undoubtedly amplified by the social and familial connections of its members, reached from the primary grades of the public schools though the state's flagship university, boasting a cast of willing collaborators which included local teachers and superintendents; textbook publishing companies and authors; the state textbook board; university presidents, department chairs and boards of regents; state legislators and governors. So positioned, the UDC placed Confederate flags and pictures of illustrious men of the Confederacy in public school classrooms, monitored instruction and educational materials, and removed from school libraries, classrooms and university syllabi "partisan (and) sectarian" literature, even as they "established themselves as the arbiters of 'partisan' and 'sectarian'."[30]

---

30 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 2, 38, 160; Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas," 462-468, 462 (quotation). Cox, in surveying the organization's president-generals from 1894 through 1919, finds "an organization that was led by social elites who were related by blood or marriage to men of power and influence in the region." Gregg Cantrell points out that from around 1905 until 1920 the UDC maintained a museum and meeting space in a "prominent ground-floor room" in the State Capitol Building, even surviving one governor's attempts to evict them. This physical presence in the halls of Texas state government speaks to an

When the Texas UDC petitioned the state legislature for a $10,000 appropriation for a marble sarcophagus to be placed over the grave of Albert Sidney Johnston in the state cemetery, the petition was initially denied. The project enjoyed a second life, however, as Mrs. Eliza Johnson, former president of the Texas Division and wife of Democratic party stalwart Cone Johnson, saw to it that " . . . the matter was brought before a special session of the Legislature, and the bill passed both Houses and was approved by the Governor." The lawmakers went even further in their support of the Daughters, writing into the bill that their division president sit on a four-person committee which oversaw the monument's completion alongside the governor, comptroller, and superintendent of public buildings and grounds. The same legislature passed a bill appropriating another $10,000 towards the construction of a home for Confederate widows at the request of the UDC, and Texas lawmakers obliged the Daughters in their appeals to make June 3, the birthday of Jefferson Davis, a state holiday. Cornelia Branch Stone, an influential Texas Daughter who served terms as both president of the Texas division and president-general of the national organization, successfully spearheaded an effort to better enforce the state poll tax. In 1913 the Texas House honored UDC member Katie Daffan "by unanimous consent . . . in behalf of the people of the state of Texas and the Confederate Veterans in particular . . . " for her fine example in representing Confederate causes. If Texas politicians orating at the UDC's monument unveilings was a largely symbolic, if highly public endorsement of the Daughters'

---

unprecedented (both real and symbolic) closeness to and influence in Texas civic life which the Daughters enjoyed. Gregg Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin: History and Memory in Progressive-Era Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory in History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 39-74 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 63-64; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/lbt06 (accessed 2-24-14).

agenda, elected officials also actively supported the organization's efforts in any number of ways through their offices and positions.[31]

The UDC's influence on education, in Texas and throughout the south, stands, along with "their promotion of pro-Confederate history," as the Daughters' most significant legacy. Time and time again, UDC leadership was proud to report on their Text-Book Committee's "efforts to

---

31 "United Daughters in Texas," *CV,* 14 (no. 1, 1906): 8-10; "Splendid Work of Texas Division, UDC," *CV,* 18 (no. 3, 1910): 100; "Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone," *CV,* 19 (no. 5, 1911): 210-211; "Texas Legislature Honors Miss Daffan," *CV,* 21 (no. 4, 1913): 149; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fjoap (Accessed 7/18/12); http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ync06 (Accessed 7/18/12). While Eliza Johnson's husband's standing in Democratic party politics probably helped her efforts for the Albert Sidney Johnston monument, her own energies and political acuity should not be underestimated. Mrs. Johnson led a long and distinguished career in public life and became the first Democratic national committeewoman from Texas, among numerous other titles and positions. The appropriation bill for the Confederate widows' home was vetoed by the Governor on the grounds of unconstitutionality. The Daughters stated their intention to push for an amendment to the constitution. The home was opened on June 3rd, 1908. By 1910, the UDC was campaigning for legislation that would shift the stewardship of the Confederate widows' home to the state. The home was passed to the state in 1911. Most scholars of the UDC focus to some extent on perceived tensions between UDC members and male politicians and businessmen, often citing the Daughters' public criticism of said leaders as evidence. But, aside from these well-documented instances, there also seems to have been an extraordinary level of cooperation between the UDC, politicians, local educators and the business community.

place proper histories in the hands of public school children of this state and to endeavor to secure recognition for Southern authors," and of the work of their Library Committee " . . . to place (in libraries) such histories and literature as are true and impartial to the part taken by the people of the South in their effort to maintain constitutional government and to request that books by Southern authors of merit have place in them." In 1910 readers of the *Confederate Veteran* were informed that "Pictures of Southern heroes had been placed on many school walls by various chapters, and a close attention has been given to the textbooks studied in all public and private schools." Nor was this oversight, accomplished by the UDC's "constant presence in the South's white public schools," viewed as an imposition by Texas educators or as an intrusion by Texas communities. When the Texarkana UDC presented their city's schools with pictures of Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee to be displayed in classrooms, school officials received them in a public ceremony and the Bowie county attorney delivered "a beautiful speech" to the crowd assembled. The superintendent of Houston's public schools "heartily (commended) the efforts of the UDC to preserve Southern literature and history." And, if the Daughters' educational agenda needed bolstering, they often found sympathetic patrons in opportune quarters. Governor Thomas Campbell appointed UDC stalwart Katie Daffan to the State Textbook board, and when the Chairman of the Department of History at the University of Texas, Eugene C. Barker, attempted to defend the use of textbooks that the UDC had targeted as "slanderous" in their treatment of the South, George W. Littlefield, a prominent Austin businessman, philanthropist, and member of the University of Texas Board of Regents, saw to the removal of the offensive texts.[32]

---

32 Cox, *Dixie's Daughter,* 127-128 (fourth quotation), 160 (first quotation); "Achievements of Texas Daughters," *CV,* 16 (no. 4, 1908): 176-178 (second quotation); "United

When the United States entered into World War I, the women of the UDC eagerly answered the call, immediately at the ready to marshal their considerable "strength, energy, and resources . . . to (meet) the nation's needs, should the occasion demand them." They quickly formed a War Relief Committee, urged individual members, chapters and divisions to communicate and cooperate with other women's clubs and service organizations in relief efforts to "conserve resources and economize the food supplies" and "form Red Cross units," and earnestly began endowing beds in an American Military hospital in Neuilly, France, quickly financing an entire ward. So swiftly and completely did the UDC turn their attention to the war effort that their President-General advised members to finalize all monetary obligations towards monument-building campaigns "immediately," effectively signaling the beginning of the end of the movement with a stroke of her pen. The Daughters spent no time in mourning the closing of this chapter of their history, however, as World War I presented them a new and worthy crusade in which they could prove themselves to be of "the same courage, enterprise, resolution, and spirit of self-sacrifice as displayed by our women of the sixties." The UDC had established itself as a national service organization, and the Daughters had achieved remarkable success in each of the five areas defined by their constitution: memorial, historical, benevolent, educational, and

---

Daughters in Texas," *CV,* 14 (no. 1, 1906): 8-10; "Splendid Work of Texas Division, UDC," *CV,* 18 (no. 3, 1910): 100-101 (third and fifth quotation); Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas," 462-468, 463 (sixth quotation). The participation of school children, teachers and school administration in Confederate monument unveiling ceremonies, detailed previously in this study, also speaks to the close association many UDC chapters enjoyed with the schools in their communities; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fda02 (Accessed 7/18/13).

social. Vindication of the region, which had been the organization's primary objective and their prerequisite for sectional reconciliation, "had been achieved . . . on the Daughter's terms," and in counties across Texas and at the State Capitol, the stoic bronze and stone faces of young Confederate soldiers on high announced that the Old South was gone, but not forgotten.[33]

Texas Confederate monuments provided the UDC and like-minded purveyors of Confederate culture a permanent, public platform from which to deliver their message, which in turn would be viewed by the full spectrum of society. The UDC especially favored the idea of the monuments serving to instill in their children a sense of their Southern heritage, which they felt was best communicated through the language and symbolism of the Lost Cause. By rationalizing the South's defeat, exalting the Confederate soldier, glorifying the Confederate cause and idealizing the Old South, Texas monuments to the Confederacy proved to be powerful instruments of the Lost Cause and useful tools in the UDC's campaign to vindicate their parents and grandparents "of the sixties" and to solidify racial and class hierarchies reminiscent of the antebellum period.[34]

The monuments themselves and their elaborate unveiling ceremonies represented the considerable power of the UDC in Texas and throughout the South. The monuments' placement

---

33 "From the President General," *CV,* 25 (no. 4, 1917): 178-179; "From the President General," *CV,* 25 (no.5, 1918): 230-231. Individual UDC members, Divisions and Chapters were urged to coordinate with other groups because "as a society (the UDC) was unable to federate with any other organization;" (previous citation); "From the President General," *CV,* 26, (no. 4, 1918): 174; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 157-158, 158 (fifth quotation), 19, 49, 66-67; Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas," 462-468.

34 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 68.

in public parks and plazas and on the grounds of county courthouses signified an official, if implicit, endorsement of the political, social and cultural values they expressed. Although the movement started in cemeteries, seventy-nine percent of the state's seventy-six monuments to the Confederacy were eventually raised in their communities' most prominent public spaces and on the grounds of administrative centers, suggesting strong support for the movement in local, county and state governments, and making the monuments virtual extensions of the municipalities. The unveiling ceremonies staged for the monuments became important civic holidays featuring parades that involved hundreds and sometimes thousands of participants drawn from large cross sections of the white citizenry of the host and neighboring communities, while the women of the UDC served as quasi-public officials in planning, organizing and then orchestrating all aspects of the dedication services. Often, the children of the white public schools would march in the parades and perform on the days' programs *en masse*, the schools and businesses routinely closed for the festivities, signifying broad cooperation of educational, business and political leaders. The monuments, their prominent placement in prized public spaces, and their unveiling ceremonies that served as civic holidays for their host communities across Texas and throughout the South, all spoke to the UDC's formidable power, and served to infuse a distinct Confederate character into public life which would support white elite Texans' efforts to "define citizenship."[35]

---

35 Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* x (quotation); Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 51. Cox states that "the success of the Daughters at the local level was evidence of their standing in the community, as UDC members drew on their power and influence as elite women to raise money and monuments." The evidence suggests that the UDC's success, far from being in direct correlation to the collective status of a group of women, was instead due to the women of the UDC being

While McMichael has questioned the impact that Texas' Confederate monuments had on their respective communities and has expressed uncertainty on how historians might read the popular attendance at their elaborate unveiling ceremonies, the public was clearly receptive to the Daughters' message. Large numbers of Texans attended these events, the monument dedications often being easily the largest public gatherings their host cities had ever witnessed. Unveiling ceremonies continued to be a vital part of the monument movement long beyond World War I, suggesting that they continued to find some level of "genuine popular resonance." The featured orators at these events were almost universally politicians, the "apolitical" UDC forging a happy partnership with the Democratic Party, as all level of elected officials took the dais before their constituencies and preached the virtues and sacrifices of the Confederate soldier. Hypotheses regarding the utility of this message in thwarting biracial populist coalitions aside, the frequency of its delivery by Texas politicians attests to their belief that their audiences

---

able to parlay a number of factors, including social status, boundless energies, astute organizational and communication skills, common purpose, and visionary leadership, into a model that was more than the sum of its parts, and then reproduce that model on the local, state, and the national levels over an extended period of time. It quickly assumes a "chicken-or-egg" quality: were the Daughters powerful because of their message, or was their message well-received because they were powerful? While the answer probably lies somewhere in the middle, two things are evident. One, that the women of the UDC were unquestionably clear about their message; no Texan in the first decades of the twentieth century could have been confused over what the UDC brand stood for. And two, the Daughters were extremely successful, and that success was not measured by the number of counties that had or didn't have Confederate monuments, but by the impact they had on Texas and southern society.

found it compelling. The Daughters were extremely successful in shaping the state's political discourse and agenda, often going before the state legislature to push for their pet projects. Through their close contact with and appointments to the State Text Book Board and remarkable access to public schools where they monitored personnel, instruction and materials while enjoying the endorsement of school boards and superintendents alike, the UDC left a lasting impact on education in Texas. And, when their efforts, either in the state legislature or higher education, hit stumbling blocks, the Daughters could always call on friends in high places to do their bidding. The monuments the UDC left marking the cemeteries, public parks, city plazas and county courthouses across the state are physical reminders of the heyday of Confederate culture, like the scar of a flood, but the hold of the Lost Cause would long be felt by the people of Texas.[36]

---

36 Kelly McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966," (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001), 104-133; McMichael, "Memories Are Short," 106-107; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 64-65; Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* 7; Hobsbawn, "Mass Producing Tradition," 263-264, quoted in Blair, *Cities of the Dead,* 2. Citing the difficulties that the UDC encountered in raising funds for monuments, McMichael argues that communities, outside of UDC members, were uninterested in Confederate memorialization, and from this deduces that citizens attended unveiling ceremonies and Confederate reunions and fair days for their entertainment value. Gregg Cantrell agrees with McMichael, suggesting that by around 1910, "the values that the UDC was seeking to inculcate were antithetical to the progressive ethos" of the Texas public. By contrast, the present work argues that the UDC was at once both part of a larger movement dedicated to the preservation of "Confederate culture," which included the

UCV and SCV (Sons of Confederate Veterans) as well as an untold number of "unaffiliated" sympathetic citizens, and the movement's most dynamic, leading-edge segment. The concept of "Confederate culture" is from Cox's *Dixie's Daughters,* 1-2 (Also, see note 27 of this chapter).

Chapter Two: Texans Pledge a Dual Allegiance

On January 14, 1915, out-going Texas Governor Oscar Branch Colquitt submitted his farewell message to the Legislature. At 30,000 words, it was, as reported by the *Dallas Morning News,* "the longest message ever written by a Texas Executive." In it, Colquitt set out to conscientiously fulfill his duty, as outlined by the state constitution, "to inform the Legislature on the condition of the State and to recommend such measures as he may deem expedient," touching upon, among other things, his view on "the border question," and again encouraging for the establishment of a Central Reserve Bank by the state. In addition to these various reports and recommendations, Colquitt was eager to catalog many of the highlights of his administration. He touted numerous strides made in public education and the state's acquisition of a handful of historic sites, including the Goliad battleground, the La Bahia mission and the Gonzales State Park. In addition to these, the state had raised various monuments commemorating Texas' frontier and revolutionary eras under his watch, and the wonkish, detail-oriented Colquitt did not forget these in his address. One correspondent noted a particular "dispute" to which "no reference (was) made," but in his closing remarks, Colquitt perhaps hinted at the issue in question when, after offering his "sincerest thanks and appreciation to the people of Texas for having honored me with the highest office within their gift" and acknowledging the loyalty of his friends, he declared, "I am thankful that those who have not been my friends and not in accord with my views and policies have not been able to destroy me; I love my friends and forgive my

enemies, and thank the Lord that he has blessed me with the strength, good health and courage to do my duty as I saw it."[1]

Colquitt's claim to have overseen the acquisition of certain historic sites and the erection of a number of monuments, inconspicuous among the myriad accomplishments and suggestions he catalogued in his ambitious farewell remarks, referenced a significant phase of commemoration which focused on the state's frontier and revolutionary eras that he and a cohort of like-minded politicians had seen to fruition. Between 1910 and 1915, five monuments celebrating the Texas' frontier and revolutionary eras were raised, doubling the total of such monuments in the state and reflecting an exponential increase in state monies dedicated to such purposes. Some scholars have interpreted this "wave of interest" in Texas' frontier and revolutionary pasts, viewed against the backdrop of the longer, regional Confederate monument movement, as signaling a cultural shift, as the state's citizens began to think of themselves less as Southerners and more as Texans, and by extension, Americans. Noting a long, general trend spanning from about 1910 to 1920, Walter Buenger states that "mention of the Confederacy even in . . . Northeast Texas dwindled and celebration of being Texan increased." Focusing on the commemorative activity of the years 1910 to 1915, Gregg Cantrell builds upon this framework,

---

1 "House Seems Willing to Wait for Ferguson," *Dallas Morning News,* January 15, 1915; "Colquitt's Farewell Message Submitted," *Dallas Morning News,* January 15, 1915; George Portal Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt: A Political Biography," PhD diss., (University of Texas, 1946), 269-273, 420. This study will, for the sake of simplicity and to avoid repetition, collapse "frontier and revolutionary" into "frontier" whenever possible, noting when the particular product specifically refers to the Texas Revolution.

stating that his research "confirms and expands upon the work of Walter L. Buenger, who has suggested that beginning around 1910 there was an upsurge in interest in the period of Anglo American colonization and the Texas Revolution, as Texans began distancing themselves from memories of the Civil War era." By examining the monuments to the state's frontier and revolutionary eras, the people who were responsible for their creation, and the ceremonies staged for their dedications, this chapter assesses and analyzes the production and popular consumption of the Texas-based narratives of these earlier periods. Moreover, it examines the interplay of these traditions and their producers with the state's proponents of Confederate culture and their public expressions of the Lost Cause. It argues that the concurrent production and consumption of both traditions, the two many times celebrated in tandem, by in-common spheres of participants, belies the notion that the two memories were in anyway adversarial, that the expression of one somehow meant a rejection of the other. In doing so, it will call into question the utility of any framework that posits a shift from a southern to Texan identity without

accounting for or considering a cultural milieu that would accommodate Texans freely alternating between and frequently melding the two.[2]

Oscar Branch Colquitt was neither the first nor the only Texas politician responsible for erecting monuments which commemorated the state's frontier past, and the monuments raised between 1910 and 1915 could not have been realized without the shared vision and cooperation of a number of like-minded elected officials and private citizens. The first two major events of the period, the dedication of the monument at Gonzales and the reinterment of the remains of Stephen F. Austin in the Texas State Cemetery, occurred while Colquitt's predecessor, Thomas Campbell, occupied the governor's mansion. Colquitt, the son of a Confederate veteran who emigrated to Texas from Georgia in the 1870s, entered into Democratic party politics before he turned twenty and would own a series of small Texas newspapers. He helped form the First National Bank of Terrell in 1888 and served on its board for the next fifteen years. Ambitious

---

2 Walter L. Buenger, "Texas and the South," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 103*,* no. 3 (January 2000): 320-321; Gregg Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin: History and Memory in Progressive-Era Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory in History and Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 40, "wave of interest" quotation from Beauregard Bryan, relative of Stephen F. Austin, 45. This chapter will use "narrative," "repertoire" and "tradition" as somewhat interchangeable in relation to "memory," the first three meant to include the entire catalogue of stories, symbols, songs, monuments, flags, etc. that might be used to celebrate an historical memory, whether it be Texas (Frontier or Revolution) or the Confederate (Lost Cause). For the relationship of narrative, tradition, and memory with "identity," see note 5.

and confident, Colquitt trusted his gut and didn't shy away from a fight. He was elected to the state senate in 1894, then made a name for himself serving in the capacity of tax agent and then "Expert Member" of the state's Tax Commission for Governors Charles A. Culberson and Joseph D. Sayers after being appointed such in 1899. In 1903, Colquitt began a distinguished term as Railroad Commissioner. Elected for the first of two terms as governor in 1910, he took an active role and interest in the commemorative activities on behalf of the state, and came to be closely associated with this period of memorialization.[3]

Walter Buenger sees in the first decades of the twentieth century Texas able to distinguish itself economically from the rest of the south, and reads an attendant intellectual and cultural change; he describes a long, creeping shift in how Texans thought of themselves, from Confederate to Texan, southern to American, from the 1880s to the 1936 Texas Centennial, counting cultural products, Confederate monuments and ceremonies, San Jacinto Day celebrations and newspaper mentions, patriotic hymns, and marking the relative interest of the state's citizenry in the Alamo all along the way. The comparative dearth of expressions of "Texas distinctiveness" before 1900, he states, "meant nineteenth-century politicians saw little to be gained among their constituents in beating the drum of Texas history," and that "Texans acted as southerners and gave short shrift to proponents of Texas nationalism and Texas exceptionalism." He cites the aging and passing of the Confederate generation, World War I, and

---

3 "Will Move Austin's Remains to Capital," *Dallas Morning News*, September 6, 1910; "Austin Memorial Service," *Dallas Morning News*, October 16, 1910; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 49-50; Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt," viii, 4, 7-9, 11-12, 18, 21, 44-49, 106, 122, 475.

the approaching Centennial as explanations for the ebbing of the state's southern cultural expressions, thus allowing for Texans of "a new generation," which, he says, "bowed to progress, struck a blow to the Lost Cause, and reached out to the rest of the United States." While Texans initially "acted as southerners," Buenger suggests that Texans then "abandoned the limited possibilities and racist ideology implicit in the Lost Cause and adopted the mantle of progress of the Texas Revolution."[4]

---

4 Walter L. Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction and the Great Depression* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 127-129, 258-259, 260; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 315, 324. Although Cantrell cites Buenger's timeline for the shift as "beginning around 1910," and Buenger does use that date in this context, Buenger's timeline is actually somewhat fluid, as he alternately identifies markers of Confederate and Texas memories and variously cites a number of dates between 1910 and 1920**.** One obvious instance of such overlap comes when he identifies Texans' "fascination with the Confederacy" occurring between the years 1902 and 1914. Adding to the list of reasons that expressions of Confederate culture slowed after 1914, Karen Cox cites the UDC shifting their focus from monument building to war relief as America entered World War I and the success of the UDC's monument campaign having left little more to be done. "National reconciliation had been achieved effectively on the South's terms, and certainly on the Daughter's terms," she concludes. "The North had accepted the Lost Cause narrative as fact." Karen L. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 155-158.

Gregg Cantrell seizes upon this framework, that of a cultural shift afoot in Texas, from a citizenry that self-identified as chiefly southern--the "Confederate culture" described by Karen Cox--to one that valued memories of their state's frontier and revolutionary pasts more than the Lost Cause narratives they had previously celebrated. Focusing on the commemorative activity between 1910 and 1915, he identifies a number of subtle dynamics at work, stating that his study seeks "to identify when, how, and why the memory of the Texas Revolution began to inform public life in Texas," specifically intending "to examine who was responsible for the new awareness of the state's frontier and revolutionary past." Cantrell especially emphasizes changes in the hierarchy of producers of these cultural artifacts, "as male politicians, professionals, and other proponents of progressivism sought to take the roles of guardians and promoters of historical memory away from the nostalgia-focused women's groups." He concludes: "The result was a new public view of Texas history that emphasized Texas as both a western and

quintessentially American state . . . ; It was a viewpoint that emphasized progress and modernity and marked a turning-away from Texas' retrograde southern heritage."[5]

Buenger intuits, likely correctly, something of a changing of the guard with regards to Texas and Confederate memories in Texas society. He sees a glut of Confederate evidence, before about 1914, compared to a dearth of Texas frontier memory, with the two traditions reversing trends later. "From the Civil War to about 1910," argues Buenger, "southern memories remained far more important than any sense of Texas exceptionalism." He goes on to compare concurrent campaigns in 1904 to "save the Alamo" and one to build "a monument to Stonewall Jackson," judging the former somewhat less successful than the latter. Though a careful analyst of Texas history, he seems not to consider factors which would make Confederate memories more readily available, or entertain the notion that scattered instances of Texas frontier memory

---

5 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 1-2; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 40-41. Cox employs the phrase "Confederate culture" to describe the cultural products, "ideas and symbols . . . images and beliefs," produced and perpetuated by "Lost Cause devotees," with the UDC at the vanguard of the movement. When Walter Buenger says that "Texans acted as southerners" and speaks of "a new persona for the state," for instance, or some group chooses a particular historical event to commemorate, they are expressing certain values, prizing certain narratives, that these groups hold dear which go some way in defining how they think of themselves, or "identity." For more on the connection between narrative and identity, see Margaret R. Somers, "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach," *Theory and Society 23,* no. 5 (October 1994): 617-621; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 323.

might have escaped his purview. And, drawing much of his evidence from the First Congressional District of Texas in the northeast corner of the state, some problems arise in extrapolating his findings into statewide phenomena. For instance, he allows that the Lone Star motif found on the Paris Confederate monument, dedicated in 1904, signified that "even in the midst of this celebration of the south, subtle signs of Texas influence crept in." While language like "crept in" fortifies his Confederate/Texas "shift" framework, the use of the Lone Star on Texas Confederate monuments dates to 1897, when two of the earliest and most prominent of the state's monuments to the Confederacy, those in Sherman and Dallas, were dedicated. He goes on to explain, "The use of the lone star reflected a mixing of Texas and southern symbols." He offers, however, little or no guidance as to how one should read evidence of such "mixing," or what such instances might suggest about the interplay of the two traditions.[6]

Cantrell identifies a distinct phase, previously un-recognized, of memorialization in Texas that requires attention, and does admirable work. However, his enthusiasm for Buenger's proposed cultural shift, from Confederate to Texas, leads him to accept that framework whole cloth without considering some of its timeline complexities and their implications. Whereas Buenger attempts to describe this trajectory through a kind of chiaroscuro pointillism, alternating between Confederate and Texas data, resetting the timeline, and otherwise manipulating the model to accommodate "that Texas culture evolved over time in an intricate, often contradictory

---

6 Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, xi, 104, 123-126; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 318-319. Buenger also offers no guidance on how to read evidence of Texas memory before 1914, or evidence of Confederate memory after; see note 11 regarding Buenger's findings on San Jacinto Day for another example of problems with his scope/timeline.

pattern," Cantrell paints the backdrop by citing Kelly McMichael's assertion that "Texans were basically disinterested in erecting Confederate monuments." Cantrell offers the caveat, that "of course, it would be a mistake to read all of the evidence . . . and conclude that in 1910 all Texans suddenly abandon their maudlin devotion to the Lost Cause and instead embraced a progressive, entrepreneurial, usable version of the Texas Revolutionary past." However, both he and Buenger repeatedly make just such claims. Buenger, for instance, states that this shift was ". . . the conscious and unconscious distancing of a people from the South of defeat, poor expectations, and racial brutality," that "the shift from southern to Texan erased that sense of not sharing the prosperous destiny of the rest of the country," that "Texans . . . bowed to progress (and) struck a blow to the Lost Cause," that "Texans abandoned the limited possibilities and racist ideology implicit in the Lost Cause," and that "Texans escaped from the defeated, isolated, impoverished, (and) brutally bigoted South." In a similar vein, Cantrell reports that ". . . Texans began distancing themselves from the memories of the Civil War era," that "the values that the UDC was seeking to inculcate were antithetical to the progressive ethos (of Texans)," and that "Texas . . . needed to shed the burden of southern history." The underlying assumption of such characterizations is that the developing Texas tradition and the established Confederate culture

were somehow adversarial or oppositional, and therefore could not peacefully coexist in the hearts and minds of the state's citizenry.[7]

Requiring such an assumption may exhaust the utility of Buenger's shift framework, as the quotidian, concurrent production and consumption of cultural artifacts of both the Confederate and Texas frontier traditions, the two at times being evoked in tandem, belies the idea that Texas society graduated from one memory to another. To argue which one was stronger than the other at any one time may well be to assume a false dichotomy. The present study, by

---

7 Buenger, "Texas and the South," 310, 323-324; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 40, 64-66; Kelly McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966," (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001), 121, quoted in Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 64; Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South,* 124, 258-260. The scholarly language of Buenger and Cantrell suggests an adversarial relationship between the two memory traditions, and in "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," Buenger states "from 1910 to 1936 Texans lived in a world with competing memories and competing identities . . . Boldly put, on the one hand stood the Confederacy and separation from the rest of the United States and on the other stood the Texas Revolution and Republic, inclusion in the westerning experience, and American symbols such as Abraham Lincoln." Walter L. Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 135. Chapter one of the present study details how Texans, alleged disinterest aside, succeeded in erecting 76 monuments to the Confederacy from 1893 to 1956.

contrast, argues that conceptualizations of a Texas identity that are based on an either/or model, a "categorical or essentialist approach to identity"--reflected by scholarly language such as "shift," "erased," "rejection," "distancing," "antithetical," "shed" and "turning-away"--fail to take into account the possibility of a complex, multilayered identity where expressions of Confederate and Texan memories were not mutually exclusive but operating simultaneously and in compliment to one another. The first section of this chapter will further examine the phenomenon Walter Buenger identifies as "mixing" to establish how the two narratives could be successfully integrated. Observing how the two traditions operated in the lives of elite Texans may provide new ways of approaching Buenger's proposed cultural shift and reveal something of the complex nature of Texan identity. The second section will assess the state's commemoration of its frontier and revolutionary histories prior to 1910, and then the monuments and memorialization activities of the years 1910-1915. The third section will look at Texas commemorative efforts after 1915, and examine the relative health of the state's Confederate culture at the close of the twentieth century's first quarter.[8]

---

8 The "categorical or essentialist approach to identity" comes from Somers, "The Narrative Constitution of Identity," 621; the either/or characterization is the author of the present chapter's own. The significance of "concurrent production and consumption of cultural artifacts of both the Confederate and Texas frontier traditions" is that it refers to a cultural milieu in which Texans freely alternated between Confederate and Texas memory repertoires, producing and consuming artifacts of both in a "side-by-side" manner, sometimes together, thus limiting the utility of charting such expressions on a timeline.

Many examples of Texas/Confederate "mixing" appear to have been so organic, or naturally occurring, that it is difficult to imagine that their producers perceived there to be any delineation between the two traditions. The use of the Lone Star symbol on Confederate monuments seems a natural design choice for memorials to fallen Texans. Some form of the Lone Star motif appeared on fourteen of the state's seventy-six monuments to the Confederacy, or almost one of every five. Sometimes subtle, other times more conspicuous, the Lone Star was featured on some of the earliest and most prominent of the state's memorials. But again, this seems like a natural design choice, and one would expect to find similar state symbols on Confederate monuments throughout the south. However, other examples of Texas/Confederate "mixing" reflect a willingness on the part of their producers to deliberately integrate Texas and southern narratives, memories, and traditions.[9]

---

9 The Lone Star motif appears on 18% of Texas monuments to the Confederacy; Texas Confederate monuments with the Lone Star motif can be found in Sherman (1897), Dallas (1897), Livingston (1900), San Antonio (1900), Paris (1904), Austin (1907), Jefferson (1907), Austin (with image of the Texas flag along with flags of the Confederacy, 1910), Bastrop (1910), Longview (1911), Palestine (1911), Waxahachie (1912), Hallettsville (1914), and Farmersville (1917). Walter Buenger counts Texans' inclusion of Albert Sidney Johnston, a veteran of the Texas Revolution, alongside Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson in the Confederate "pantheon" as evidence of Texas/Confederate "mixing." Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 124. John H. Reagan and Sul Ross were further examples of Texans celebrated in the "pantheon" genre of Confederate memorialization.

A Texas correspondent to *Confederate Veteran*, for example, contributed to the magazine's second volume, published in 1894, a biographical sketch of Sul Ross that first appeared in the *Bryan Eagle*. The article detailed the Louisiana-born Ross' family moving to Texas, when "Waco was a mere Indian village . . ." and that "his sister, . . . Kate . . . , was the first white child born in McLennan (sic) County." It told of the "hardships and dangers" of his early years, how Ross earned the moniker "boy captain" in conflicts with Comanches, his appointment by Governor Sam Houston (a staunch opponent of secession) to a command post on the Texas frontier, and his legendary, if ill-fated, rescue of Cynthia Ann Parker. Of the four paragraphs of the original article, only one, the briefest, gave account of his Confederate experience. The piece was bookended by notes provided by a *Confederate Veteran* editor, who in them stated "Gov. Sul Ross has written a thrilling sketch of early life in the Lone Star Republic," and noted that similar "reminiscences of early times in Texas" were enthusiastically received at the preceding Confederate reunion in Waco. The producer of the original article, a Texan writing for a Texas audience, thus gave greater weight to the "early Texas" aspects of Ross' narrative than his considerable Confederate exploits. Furthermore, the sketch's reprinting

in the *Confederate Veteran* shows that Texas frontier memory was eagerly consumed by regional, non-Texan, southern audiences.[10]

A more conspicuous example of "mixing" presented itself at the unveiling of the Confederate monument in San Antonio's Travis Park in 1900. Before a crowd estimated to be 10,000, Columbus Upson, the event's featured speaker, cited inspiration of the park's namesake and the fact that the monument sat "overshadowed by the Temple of Texas liberty, the hallowed Alamo, baptized in martyr's blood," to enter into "the sad and liberty-inspiring story of 'The Fall of the Alamo,' . . . [which] should be a lesson learned and impressed upon the heart of every child in the home of every freedom-loving people throughout the broad and extending limits of civilization." Here, Upson, a long-time San Antonio resident, prominent citizen and former Confederate officer, chose a register appropriate for the ceremony, but a subject indeed rare at such dedications. The standard repertoire on these programs was to extol the virtues and valor of the Confederate soldier and cause. In a comparable example of mixing traditions, the patrons of the Sherman Confederate monument chose April 21, 1897, San Jacinto Day, for their unveiling ceremonies. A visiting contingent from McKinney reported to the *Dallas Morning News* that they would be celebrating the momentous day in Texas history by attending the festivities, and

---

10 "General and Governor Sul Ross, of Texas," *CV,* 2 (no. 6, 1894): 169. The *Confederate Veteran* editor also promised to feature Ross' "thrilling sketch of early life in the Lone Star Republic" in later editions of the magazine. For another example of non-Texan southerners' enthusiasm for Texas revolutionary memory, see Jefferson Davis quote on the Hood's Texas Brigade Confederate monument on the Texas State Capitol grounds, referenced in note 13 below.

while it is impossible to know how many of the twenty thousand persons present made the same connection, it is safe to assume that most at least realized the day's historical significance. Without entering into any debates on how frequent or common such examples were, it is safe to say that they did occur, and the evidence at hand demonstrates that Confederate and Texas frontier and revolutionary memories could be successfully invoked in conjunction to one another.[11]

---

11 "Shaft is Unveiled. Elaborate Ceremonies over Confederate Monument," *The Daily Express* (San Antonio), April 29, 1900; "Monument Unveiling," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897; "Elaborate Ceremonies at Waco," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897. The Texarkana monument was also dedicated on April 21, 1918; McMichael, *Sacred Memories,* 33. While the placement of the San Antonio Confederate monument in Travis Park probably doesn't qualify as "mixing," the naming of the park for a hero of the Texas Revolution is an example of celebrating Texas memory before 1914. In gauging expressions of Texas versus Confederate memories before World War I, Walter Buenger notes that "from the 1880s to 1914 Texas Independence Day and San Jacinto went unmentioned" in at least 10 different Texas periodicals, while "in contrast, hardly an issue of a Northeast Texas newspaper passed without mention of Confederate veterans, the Daughters of the Confederacy, or southern honor and pride." As counterpoint to Buenger's findings, on April 22, 1897, the *Dallas Morning News* reported on San Jacinto Day celebrations and observances from twelve Texas communities, the "Elaborate Ceremonies at Waco" garnering the headline. Buenger, "Texas and the South," 321 n.33; "Elaborate Ceremonies at Waco," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1897.

The women of the United Daughters of the Confederacy were, in Texas as throughout the south, the frontline in the production and de facto promulgation of the Lost Cause in southern society and culture. Yet, scholars have curiously noted that the women of the UDC often employed the seemingly countervailing traditions of Confederate culture alongside the trappings of American patriotic celebrations in their observances. At many of these ceremonies, flags of both the Confederacy and the United States were flown, "America" was sung on the same program as "Dixie," and orators traced a lineage from the American Revolution and the United States Constitution to the Confederate cause. A correspondent to the *Confederate Veteran* noted, for instance, that in preparation for the unveiling of the monument there, "Dallas gave them a royal welcome. Flags of the Confederacy and flags of the Union fluttered from every store." On celebrating apparently incompatible memories and traditions simultaneously, Kelly McMichael notes that "Texans appear not to have noticed the ideological contradiction in honoring both the Confederacy (the conquered) and the United States (the conqueror)." More to the point, Karen Cox observes that southerners, particularly the women of the UDC, "genuinely believed that southern patriotism was synonymous with American patriotism," and "assumed that a dual allegiance--to the south and to the United States--was possible."[12]

In Texas, UDC members exhibited a similar "dual allegiance," to the Confederacy and Texas. Texas Daughters routinely found ways to elevate their state's profile amidst their Confederate commemoration. At the time of their creation, for instance, Texas UDC founders

---

12 "Our Sacred Cause at Dallas, Texas--Dedication of the Grand Monument," *Confederate Veteran,* 6 (no. 7, 1898): 300; McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 102; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 65, 145.

opted for an organizational structure with five vice-presidents, which they envisioned as being "emblematic of the five points of the Texas star." Monument planners boasted that as their creations would "stand on Texas soil, [they] must be built by Texas workmen and of Texas stone." Texas Confederate heroes such as Albert Sidney Johnston, John H. Reagan, and Sul Ross were honored alongside Robert E. Lee, "Stonewall" Jackson and Jefferson Davis, and of the many Confederate flags in their repertoire, a favorite was the seven-star version of the "stars and bars" banner, symbolic of Texas' order in the Confederate states secession. To this point, Mrs. J.M. Wright, speaking at the 1908 unveiling ceremonies at Gainesville, proclaimed that the men of Cooke County had helped to distinguish their state, "Texas, whose valiant sons had made her star one of the brightest in the galaxy of stars on the bonny blue flag!" Like their male counterparts who thrilled to stories of the Texas frontier at Confederate reunions and who adorned the John B. Hood and Terry's Texas Rangers monuments at the State Capitol with

inscribed testimonials to the superiority of Texas' fighting men, the women of the Texas UDC conspicuously promoted their state within their celebration of the Confederacy.[13]

---

13 McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 29, 30 n.16; "Our Sacred Cause at Dallas, Tex.--Dedication of the Grand Monument," *CV,* 6 (no. 7, 1898): 299; "Private Soldier Monument at Paris, Texas," *CV*, 12 (no. 3, 1904): 120; "Unveiling Ceremonies at Gainesville, Texas," *CV,* 16 (no. 8, 1908): 377. According to McMichael, the Texas UDC amended the number of vice-presidents in their organization from five to four a year later at their first annual convention; The Terry's Texas Rangers and the John B. Hood monuments at the State Capitol are adorned with various testimonials to those units' fighting prowess from the likes of Generals Braxton Bragg, William J. Hardee, Albert Sidney Johnston, Robert E. Lee and President Jefferson Davis, among others. One such homage on the John B. Hood monument, whose facades and pedestal are covered with more than a few hundred words of such inscribed accolades in addition to a record of the unit's engagements, reads "The troops of other states have their reputations to gain/the sons of the Alamo have theirs to maintain. President Jefferson Davis, C.S.A." *Hood's Texas Brigade Monument*, Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Austin, Texas; *Terry's Texas Rangers Memorial*, Pompeo Coppini, 1907, Austin, Texas. The official flag of the Confederacy, nicknamed the "stars and bars," featured white stars representing the states of the Confederacy within a blue field, and red and white horizontal stripes. The Confederate battle flag, composed of a blue St. Andrews cross with white stars against a red field, is probably more recognized. Coski, "The Confederate Battle Flag in Historical Perspective," in *Confederate Symbols in the Confederate South,* 89-101.

The UDC was a formidable organization, in Texas, throughout the south, and nationally: UDC president-generals were hosted at the White House by three presidents in the first decades of the twentieth century; their membership rolls dwarfed other national organizations; and UDC offices were the most prestigious positions among clubwomen society on the local, state and national levels. The UDC's power, and the nature of women's club culture, enabled high-profile Daughters, many of whom enjoyed celebrity-like status and recognition, to hold leadership positions in multiple organizations over the course of a career. When Katie Cabell Currie died in 1927, it made the front page of the *Dallas Morning News*. After telling of her family, "from Virginia, . . . settled in Fort Cobb, then in Indian Territory, where (she) was born," the piece devoted ample time to her role in founding the UDC's first chapters in the state as well as its Texas Division before calling her "a pioneer of cultural club work" and naming a handful of other clubs she had a hand in founding or for which she had served terms as president. Eliza Johnson, wife of politician Cone Johnson, at various times served as president of the UDC, the Woman's Home Missionary Society, the Texas Federation of Women Clubs, and held leadership positions in the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Daughters of the War of 1812, and the League of Women's Voters. If the Daughters could be imperious, they were hardly insular. In attendance at the Texas UDC's annual convention in 1915 were the presidents of the National Federation of Women's Clubs, the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Texas Press Women's Association, the Colonial Dames, and the Daughters of 1812. When Mrs. Alice Colquitt, wife of the governor and an officer in the Austin Chapter of the UDC, was made an honorary chairman of the National Made in U. S. A. League, she was in a

position to name nearly fifty "prominent women of Texas to serve on the national committee." Included in her appointments, drawn from nineteen cities from across the state, were distinguished clubwomen from both within and without the UDC, not to mention the wives of a host of Democratic Party luminaries: fund-raisers, allies and appointees of her husband, state senators and legislators, mayors and the governor-elect. In an era when women's public life was largely limited to and defined by club participation, the ladies of the UDC leveraged their high-standing in club and southern society through networking and finding common ground with other clubwomen across a spectrum of causes and issues. While "Texas Clubdom," as it was often called in the society pages, was drawn along lines of race, class, and probably political affiliation, once inside the tent the Daughters knew how to be ladies.[14]

The Texas Daughters shared a close association with another women's heritage society, the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, on a number of levels. First, and most significantly,

---

14 "Preparedness Subject of UDC Convention," *Dallas Morning News,* December 8, 1915; Kate Cabell Currie remarried and became known as Mrs. J. C. Muse in 1907; "Mrs. J. C. Muse Passes Away," *Dallas Morning News,* July 19, 1927; "Mrs. J. C. Muse is Laid to Rest," *Dallas Morning News,* July 21, 1927; "Honor Days Should Be Observed," *Dallas Morning News,* April 8, 1912; "Mrs. Colquitt's Appointees," *Dallas Morning News,* January 15, 1915; Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt," 11-12; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters*, 24, 29-36, 38, 51, 160; Fred Arthur Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas: A Study of Social Control in the New South," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly 97,* no. 3 (January 1994): 458-474; Alice Cooksey, "Johnson, Eliza Sophia Robertson," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fjoap), accessed August 14, 2014.

many UDC members, including some of the state's divisional leaders and most prominent representatives, also belonged to the DRT. Clubwomen of this period regularly belonged to multiple groups, and UDC and DRT members were no exception. But beyond the overlapping membership rolls and similar organizational objectives, much evidence suggests an easy affiliation existed between them. The UDC and DRT shared a multi-use museum space in the State Capitol, and when the old Land Office building became available the two groups jointly, and successfully, appealed the Texas Legislature for its use as headquarters. This partnership, and the fact that they chose to sustain and extend it through their combined efforts, demonstrates that they were able to align themselves harmoniously more often than they found themselves at odds with one another. Some evidence even hints that they were viewed by the general public and perhaps themselves as interchangeable. Karen Cox notes that an analysis of the UDC's presidents-general from 1894 to 1919 reveals "an organization led by social elites who were related by blood or marriage to men of power and influence in the region," and an informal survey of DRT leadership affirms that that society largely selected their officers from the same pool. Texas Daughters of the Confederacy stood in as proxies for the DRT without either constituency or the public-at-large crying foul. Although the clubwomen of Texas probably didn't perceive themselves to be exercising a "dual allegiance," the idea that they would be somehow restricted from participating in one memorialization movement by reason of their involvement in another would have been equally foreign to them. The same was true of their men: in the space of one week in October, 1910, prominent citizens A. J. Eilers and E. P. Wilmot, Austin Mayor A. P. Wooldridge, University of Texas President S. E. Meses, State Treasurer Sam Sparks, ex-Governor Joseph Sayers and Governor-elect Colquitt all served as honorary or active

pallbearers for the Stephen F. Austin re-interment as well as on many of the various committees responsible for dedication of the Hood's Texas Brigade monument at the state capitol.[15]

The premise that Confederate memorialization outpaced Texas frontier memorialization before 1910 is certainly supported by the sheer number of monuments raised in the state through the first decade of the twentieth century. Texans had sponsored twenty-six monuments to the Confederacy by the end of 1909, while only providing for a handful of similar memorials to their state's frontier or revolutionary eras. The Texas tributes include the *Dawson Monument*, erected in 1884 on the grounds of the Fayette County Courthouse in LaGrange; the *Fannin Memorial*,

---

15 "Stephen F. Austin's Remains Reburied," *Dallas Morning News,* October 21, 1910; "Ceremonies in Senate Chamber," *Dallas Morning News,* February 27, 1913; "Monument at Acton for Mrs. Crockett," *Dallas Morning News,* May 22, 1913; "Texas Clubdom," *Dallas Morning News*, March 20, 1899; "Austin Memorial Service," *Dallas Morning News*, October 16, 1910; "In Honor of Texas' Illustrious Dead," *Dallas Morning News*, October 19, 1910; "Program for Reunion Hood's Texas Brigade," *Dallas Morning News,* October 15, 1910; "To Dedicate Monument," *Dallas Morning News,* October 23, 1910; "Monument at Austin Unveiled," *Dallas Morning News,* October 28, 1910; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 59-66; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 34*,* 38; Cox limits her analysis of UDC membership to the organization's presidents-general because "information of the rank and file of the UDC has not been preserved." http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/lbt06 (accessed 3/12/14); http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/vnd03 (accessed 3/12/14); The DRT, holding their first annual meeting in April of 1892, predated the UDC both nationally and in Texas. The UDC room in the State Capitol building contained their museum, library, and classroom space.

funded and raised by local citizens on Fannin Square in Goliad in 1885; *Battle of the Alamo,* appropriated by the Texas Legislature and installed on the grounds of the State Capitol in 1891; and the *Texas Heroes Monument*, dedicated in 1900 at the bequest of long-time Galveston benefactor Henry Rosenberg. Furthermore, with the exception of the Galveston memorial's dedication, there appears to have been little ceremony associated with these monuments, particularly in comparison with the Confederate monument culture that had developed around the turn of the century. A May 22, 1884, newspaper item describing the *Dawson Monument*, which was realized through a $1,000 appropriation of the state legislature, made no mention of any dedication ceremony, and, by incorrectly identifying the monument's placement as "over the last resting place of the heroes of Salado," hinted at the legal disputes and related troubles which plagued the Monument Hill memorialization efforts for the better part of a century. An April 22, 1891, *Dallas Morning News* note reported glowingly on the monument to the heroes of the Alamo then receiving its finishing touches on the grounds of the State Capitol. While the story intimated that it had been "hoped the monument would be completed for the anniversary of the battle of San Jacinto," April 21, it failed to make mention of any events planned to commemorate either the historic battle or the monument's dedication. An April 26 item covering goings-on at the state's capital dated from the previous day reported unceremoniously: "The Alamo monument on capitol square was completed today." The Dallas daily, having dutifully followed the monument's progress for five years, then fell silent with regards to the memorial until May

12, 1893, when it was mentioned in reference to a proposed and later realized Firemen's monument at the State Capitol.[16]

But while Texans' early efforts to memorialize their state's frontier and revolutionary eras may have lacked the numbers or public spectacle of the Confederate monument movement, to characterize the latter as "far more important" than the former in the daily life of the state's citizens is to both minimize their diverse and continued endeavors in that respect and to miss an opportunity to contextualize the two movements' concurrent development. As early as 1848, the survivors of the Mier Expedition and a procession of "more than one thousand persons, male and female," gathered on a hillside just south of LaGrange to commemorate their fallen comrades and to thank the "citizens of LaGrange and the county of Fayette" for "the aid rendered and distinguished honors bestowed upon the heroic deceased." Legislators sought and secured funds to purchase and improve the Alamo and San Jacinto battle sites in the 1880s and 1890s, and state money was appropriated for the "purchase and erection of [monuments] over the graves of the

---

16 "Marble Shaft," *Austin Weekly Statesman*, May 22, 1884; "The Alamo Monument," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1891; "Chartered--For the Home--Taxes Paid," *Dallas Morning News,* April 26, 1891; "Firemen's Convention," *Dallas Morning News,* May, 12, 1893; *Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*, 9: 435; Carol Morris Little, *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 59, 230-231, 238; Mark Abolafia-Rozenzweig, "Monument Hill State Historic Site: The Dawson and Mier Expeditions and Their Place in Texas History" (Austin: Texas State Publications, 1986), 24-26. Of the 26 Confederate monuments raised before 1910, 13 were on the grounds of seats of government, 5 were in public parks or city squares, and 8 were in cemeteries.

veterans who fell at Goliad [and] Refugio" and "over the graves of the Dawson heroes." In 1892, among other celebrations of Texas Independence Day, students of the Sam Houston Normal Institute in Huntsville held services at the site of Sam Houston's grave, jointly honoring the March 2 date of Texans declaring their independence from Mexico and the birthday of the former Texas president and hero of the Revolution, with a program that featured patriotic songs, poems and orations, "the grave . . . beautifully decorated with flowers." After detailing Houston's career in epic terms, a correspondent to the *Dallas Morning News* reported in December of that year on the sad state of the General's gravesite, lamenting that "the ingratitude of republics may be well said to exist so long as Texas permits the remains of her greatest benefactor to sleep thus neglected, while monuments to her lesser heroes are provided at the expense of the state." The contributor then called upon good citizens and the press to "urge the legislature to make an appropriation sufficient for the removal and interment of General

Houston's remains at the capitol of the state and for the erection of a monument to his memory commensurate to his services for the freedom and glory of this empire state."[17]

In 1899, the Daughters of the Republic of Texas mounted a statewide campaign to recognize March 6, anniversary of the fall of the Alamo, as "Texas Heroes Day," with "the graves of Texas heroes and pioneers, wherever found, whether in green city cemeteries, on lonely hillside or prairie . . . decorated, with solemn ceremonies." They also called for greater public

---

17 "Meeting," *Victoria Advocate* (Published as *The Texian Advocate*), October 5, 1848; "Austin Democrat; Mier; Dawson; LaGrange; September," *Victoria Advocate* (Published as *The Texian Advocate*), October 5, 1848; "Marble Shaft," *Austin Weekly Statesman*, May 22, 1884; "Texas Independence Day," *Dallas Morning News,* March 4, 1892; "At Sam Houston's Grave," *Dallas Morning News,* March 4, 1892; "Sam Houston's Grave," *Dallas Morning News,* December 26, 1892; *Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1822-1897,* 9: 435; Abolafia-Rozenzweig, "Monument Hill State Historic Site," 24-26. Walter Buenger argues that "From the Civil War to about 1910, southern memories remained far more important that any sense of Texas exceptionalism," and "Before 1900 . . . Texans acted as southerners and gave short shrift to proponents of Texas nationalism and Texas exceptionalism." Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 123; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 315. Efforts to more appropriately memorialize Sam Houston, like the ones suggested by the *Dallas Morning News* contributor described above, surfaced with some regularity, although without success, until the legislature took up the campaign in earnest in 1907; see "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, August 26, 1891; "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, May 27, 1893; "The Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, June 27, 1893.

action, asking that "prominent citizens . . . perform this duty . . . where no chapter of the society of Daughters of the Republic exists." In addition to the commemorative activities of the various DRT chapters, the Daughters secured distinguished volunteers to adorn the monuments at Refugio and La Grange, the graves of Sam Houston at Huntsville and Stephen F. Austin at Peach Point, the monument to Thomas J. Rusk at Rusk, the Fannin monument at Goliad, the monument to Mirabeau B. Lamar and grave of "Deaf" Smith at Richmond, and the graves of veterans in Victoria and Gonzales. While Walter Buenger suggests that the dearth of "significant political use of Texas distinctiveness meant nineteenth-century politicians saw little to be gained among their constituents in beating the drum of Texas history," memorialization efforts of both

politicians and citizens indicate that such practices held considerable cultural currency in Texas society of the period.[18]

The March 6, 1899 "Texas Heroes Day" observances planned by the Daughters of the Republic of Texas were reminiscent of Confederate veteran grave-decorating ceremonies popularized by the UDC and their precursor Ladies Memorialization Associations in the late nineteenth century. The Texas UDC issued a similar "call to arms" in the columns the *Dallas Morning News* regarding their "Decoration Day" activities planned for April 26, 1900. Without knowing the number of Texas clubwomen who participated in both observances, it is safe to assume that participants in each movement were acutely aware of one another, and that many Texans would have been aware of both. Rather than completely discreet movements, evidence

---

18 "Texas Clubdom," *Dallas Morning News*, March 20, 1899; *Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*, 9: 435; Abolafia-Rozenzweig, "Monument Hill State Historic Site," 24-26; Buenger, "Texas and the South," 315. The DRT also succeeded in acquiring marble statues of Stephen F. Austin and Sam Houston, crafted by Elisabet Ney, and had them placed in the State Capitol building. The Daughters then persuaded the legislature to appropriate funds for reproductions of the two statues to be placed in the National Statuary Hall in Washington, D.C. Ney originally had been commissioned to sculpt the pieces for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, but the project ran into difficulty, and the DRT essentially salvaged the works some years later. These efforts were not highlighted in this study because they seemed to reflect the efficacy of the DRT more than any groundswell of commemorative activity among Texans of the era. "Mrs. Dibrell's Report," *Dallas Morning News,* April 21, 1903; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 42-44, 69-70 n.12.

of cross-pollination hints that their concurrent development and in-common spheres of producers and consumers blurred the lines of separation. About a week before Columbus Upson dedicated the San Antonio Confederate monument with a dramatic oration of "The Fall of the Alamo," a mix of that city's residents and visitors believed to number around 40,000 celebrated San Jacinto Day with the close of San Antonio's annual Carnival and a parade that honored Texas veterans. In a practice borrowed from Confederate monument ceremonies, "at the close of the parade 5,000 children in red, white and blue presented the living flag of Texas on Alamo Plaza."[19]

April 21, 1900, was also the day that the tradition of Texas memorialization came into its own in Galveston with the dedication ceremonies for the mammoth *Texas Heroes Monument*. The day's program featured "the greatest civic and floral parade ever seen in the Oleander City," speakers that included the city's Mayor, A. J. Walker, Judge M. E. Kleburg of Galveston, Hon. J. C. Hutchinson of Houston, and Governor Joseph D. Sayers, and was attended by 250 delegates of the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress. In what could have passed for a Confederate monument dedication, "2,500 school children marched past the monument and deposited floral emblems on the pedestal. The children arranged in companies, each company in different uniforms and carried flags and banners. Following the children's parade was a civic and floral

---

19 "Daughters of Confederacy," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1900; "Shaft is Unveiled. Elaborate Ceremonies over Confederate Monument," *The Daily Express* (San Antonio), April 29, 1900; "San Antonio's Carnival Ended," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1900. Karen Cox details the use of children in forming "living flags" at Confederate ceremonies in *Dixie's Daughters*, 64-66, on Ladies Memorial Associations as precursors to the UDC 16-17, 19-20, 26, 30.

parade . . . participated in by the society people who had forty exquisitely decorated vehicles." The city's Fire Department paraded in the column, along with "several allegorical and historical floats." Governor Sayers, in his remarks which honored the patron of the monument, Henry Rosenberg, accepted the monument of behalf of the state and thanked the Sidney Sherman Chapter of the Daughter of the Republic of Texas for his invitation "to participate in the ceremonies of this most interesting occasion." Rosenberg's widow, Mollie Macgill Rosenberg, was not a member of the DRT, but she was a pillar of Galveston society and the local women's club network. She had played an integral part in establishing the UDC in her adopted hometown, and she served as president of the Galveston Veuve Jefferson Davis Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy until her death in 1917. Macgill Rosenberg was instrumental in Galveston's dedicating *Dignified Resignation*, a tribute to "the Soldiers and Sailors of the Confederate States of America," in that city's Central Park, adjacent to the Galveston County Courthouse eleven years after her husband's tribute to Texas heroes was unveiled, underscoring

the fact that the producers and consumers of both the Confederate and Texas monument movements were essentially the same community.[20]

There were no more major projects commemorating Texas revolutionary or frontier memory until 1910, when a string of five monuments were realized in the course of five years. These efforts all closely resembled previous monument dedications in Texas, both of the Confederate monument movement and those of earlier memorials to the Texas frontier and revolutionary eras. Officers of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas figured prominently into all but one of the ceremonies, although their role appears to have been somewhat less integral

---

20 "Rosenberg Monument Unveiled," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1900; "Monument to the Heroes of 1836," *Dallas Morning News,* April 22, 1900; "Big Time in Galveston" *San Antonio Express* (Published as *The Daily Express*), April 22, 1900; *Dignified Resignation*, Louis Amateis, 1911, Galveston, Texas; *Texas Heroes Monument*, Louis Amateis, 1900, Galveston, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 229-231. Governor Sayers misidentified the DRT as "The Daughters of the Texas Revolution," according to the *Dallas Morning News'* account of his remarks; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/froaw accessed 7//2/2014; *Dignified Resignation* was originally situated in Central Park, adjacent to the 1898 courthouse. It was later moved to the grounds of the 1966 courthouse.

The Galveston monument is an illustrative example of the problems with using dedication dates of monuments in constructing a timeline for commemorative movements: the *Texas Heroes Monument* was realized through a $50,000 provision in Henry Rosenberg's will. Henry Rosenberg died in 1893, and his will would have had to have been finalized sometime before that, making the 1900 date of the monument's dedication somewhat misleading.

than that of their UDC counterparts in the concurrent Confederate monument movement. Correspondingly, male politicians and public figures assumed a greater role in these proceedings, having served chiefly as orators at the invitation of the UDC on the programs of Confederate dedications. And, while many of the pre-1910 Texas monuments had been realized through some combination of funds collected by "local citizens" and state appropriations of one or two thousand dollars, the monuments of this period were all funded by state funds, some with allocations of up to $10,000.[21]

In the miscellaneous items of the 31st Texas legislature's budget in spring, 1909 was a $5,000 appropriation "to erect a monument at Gonzales, Texas at some place on the public square . . . in memory of this as the birthplace of Texas independence." The monument board, comprised of the governor, the state comptroller and attorney general, commissioned San Antonio sculptor Pompeo Coppini for the work, *Come and Take It.* His bronze figure mounted upon a pedestal of Texas granite depicted a determined Texas volunteer in mid-stride, readying a

---

21 This study uses the periodization 1910-1915 based on the five monuments to Texas frontier memory the state raised in those years. However, there is some doubt as to when the last piece, the Joanna Troutman memorial, was installed and whether it was ever dedicated. Carol Morris Little cites its date as "circa 1915," and there is some evidence that it might not have occurred until 1916. Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 62. Two of the monuments of this movement, to Stephen F. Austin and Joanna Troutman, were preceded by the reinterments of their honored subjects. The DRT participated in both of these events, while no mention has yet been found of a dedication ceremony for either monument. After participating in the reinterment ceremony for Joanna Troutman, the DRT withdrew their support for the project.

rifle, peering at the south horizon, its realism foreshadowing the similar figure of the artist's *The Last Stand* memorial dedicated at Victoria two years later. The facade of the granite base was adorned with a bronze plate that illustrated the relocating of a cannon, whose contested ownership produced the battle cry that opened the historic hostilities and for which the monument is named. The monument was dedicated on October 21, 1910. Due to inclement weather, the program was moved into the Gonzales opera house, which accommodated "a packed audience." The president of the local DRT chapter, Mrs. J. W. Hilderbrand, spoke at the

ceremony, as did Mrs. J. B. Dibrell and a state senator. Governor Thomas M. Campbell was scheduled to attend, but apparently did not.[22]

At about the same time of the dedication of the *Come and Take It* monument, another commemorative event drew the attention of the state's citizens. In September, House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 provided for the removal and relocation of the remains of Stephen F. Austin

---

22 Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the 1--2 Called Session of the 31st Legislature of Texas*, (Austin, 1909), 423-424; "Gonzales Hero Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, October 20, 1910; "Monument Unveiled at Gonzales," *Dallas Morning News*, October 22, 1910; *Come and Take It,* Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Gonzales, Texas; *The Last Stand,* Pompeo Coppini, 1912, Victoria, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 239; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fhacc (accessed 7/20/14); (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fdi04) (accessed 7/20/14). Besides the $5,000 allocation for the Gonzales monument, other line items included in the 1909 legislative budget were $10,000 to acquire the paintings "The Battle of San Jacinto" and "Dawn of the Alamo" by Henry Arthur McArdle, and $5,000 for a portrait of David Crockett, all "to be purchased by the Governor at his discretion;" http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fmc03 (accessed 7/20/14). Gregg Cantrell points out that Ella Dibrell was a founding member of both the DRT and the UDC; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 43-44. Coppini's *Come and Take It* and *The Last Stand* are examples of the "private soldier" genre of Confederate memorialization, the anonymous Texas militiaman of the Gonzales monument being a slight variation, a frontier equivalent of the enlisted Confederate. Both works exhibited a realism of detail and pose uncharacteristic of memorial sculpture of the time.

from their previous resting spot at Peach Point to the Texas State Cemetery in Austin, and the casket and a five-person legislative committee began the trek in mid-October. Along the route, which took three days, the cargo and its attendants were greeted by large public ceremonies in Brazoria, Angleton and Houston. Once in Austin, the party met a procession that included the active and honorary pallbearers for the occasion, a veritable who's who of Texas political luminaries, a band, a military honor guard, and a detachment of Texas Rangers, which escorted the casket to the state capitol building, where it laid in state in the senate chamber. Memorial services on the evening of October 19 consisted of music and oratory by honored guests. An Austin correspondent to the *Dallas Morning News* praised W. C. Day, State Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, for his oversight of the senate chamber's "splendid decorations," replete with flags, "property of the State," and "great bowers of ferns, flowers and potted plants [which] came from the Capitol greenhouse and gardens."[23]

An honor guard held post in the senate chamber all night, and Governor Campbell and Austin Mayor A.P. Wooldridge had declared October 20 a holiday, with government offices, local businesses and schools shutting down at noon to observe the services of that cold, rainy Thursday. Following a prayer by Reverend Dr. R. J. Briggs, the procession left the senate

---

23 Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the 3--4 Called Session of the 31st Legislature of Texas*, (Austin, 1910), 148, 171, [S.I.: 4th Session], 153, 241; "Will Move Austin's Remains to Capital," *Dallas Morning News*, September 6, 1910; "Austin Memorial Service," *Dallas Morning News*, October 16, 1910; "In Honor of Texas' Illustrious Dead," *Dallas Morning News*, October 19, 1910; "Stephen F. Austin's Remains Reburied," *Dallas Morning News*, October 21, 1910; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 44-48.

chamber through the Capitol's south exit and passed through a course lined by school children. Besides the same military honor guard, band, active and honorary pall bearers and funeral bier from the previous day's arrival, the Austin family brought up the rear of the column on route to the Texas State Cemetery. At the grave site, two ministers offered prayer and eulogies, and the fresh earth was adorned with "floral tributes." Rebecca Fisher, president of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, placed a silk Lone Star flag over the grave "with a supplication for peace to the ashes of the noble Texan."[24]

The legislative resolution that provided for the removal and reburial of Austin's remains did not address the matter of a suitable monument, but Senator John Peeler of Austin assured his colleagues that "a substantial appropriation would be urged . . . for this purpose." To that end, the 32nd Legislature, which convened on January 31, 1911, allotted $10,000. Governor Oscar Branch Colquitt took a hands-on approach to the design and execution of the memorial, requesting input from various quarters such as the editorial staffs of the state's newspapers, the State Textbook Board and the Austin family, but firmly manning the reigns through the project's completion. The governor awarded the contract to Pompeo Coppini, and Colquitt would continue to insist on the San Antonio-based sculptor's hand for many of the major state commissions under his administration. The monument presented Austin in a larger-than-life bronze, a stoic, determined look upon his face, his right arm leveled before him to shoulder height, his left hand grasping a scrolled document at his side. The dramatic pose is reminiscent of Coppini's *John H. Reagan Memorial*, dedicated two years earlier in Palestine, which depicted "the Old Roman" with stern visage, his left arm raised as if addressing a body. The Austin

---

24j "Stephen F. Austin's Remains Reburied," *Dallas Morning News*, October 21, 1910.

tribute's stout granite pedestal spread to a wider plinth which covered the grave site. The granite facade was minimally adorned with large block letters reading "Stephen F. Austin," while a rectangular granite slab jutted from the front of the squared base, signaling the outline of the grave and topped with a bronze plate that read, "Stephen Fuller Austin, 'Father of Texas'--Was Born in Wythe County, Virginia, November 3, 1793--Died in Brazoria County, Texas, December 27, 1836--Wise, Gentle, Courageous and Patient--He Was the Founder of a Mighty

Commonwealth." The monument, which had been installed at the site sometime before, and was formally accepted on April 28, 1913 with little ceremony.[25]

Repeated but halting efforts to construct a monument to Sam Houston finally gained traction in 1907 with a $10,000 appropriation by the 30th Legislature, provided for by a resolution introduced by Senator McDonald Meachum of Navasota. Senator Meachum and State

---

25 "Will Move Austin's Remains to Capital," *Dallas Morning News*, September 6, 1910; Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the 1--2 Called Session of the 32nd Legislature of Texas*, (Austin,1911), 7; "Designs for State Monuments," *Dallas Morning News*, December 8, 1911; "Governor Goes to San Antonio," *Dallas Morning News*, February 15, 1912; "Stephen F. Austin Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, August 9, 1912; "Stephen F. Austin Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, August 28, 1912; "To Submit Inscription," *Dallas Morning News*, October 8, 1912; "Planter Praises Gov. Colquitt," *Dallas Morning News*, October 18, 1912; "S. F. Austin Monument Accepted," *Dallas Morning News*, April 29, 1913; "Gonzalez Hero Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, October 20, 1910; *Stephen F. Austin*, Pompeo Coppini, 1912, Austin, Texas; *John H. Reagan Memorial,* Pompeo Coppini, 1911, Palestine, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 64. Both the Austin and Reagan monuments fall into the "pantheon" genre of memorialization. Whereas there are several examples of Confederate monuments of the "private soldier" genre that feature dynamic poses, many with a hand or closed fist raised above the head, these are two of only three examples of such poses within the "pantheon" genre in Texas until the Centennial monuments. The 1925 equestrian *Sam Houston,* discussed later in this chapter, is the third; *Sam Houston,* Enrico Filberto Cerracchio, 1925, Houston, Texas.

Superintendent W. C. Day visited Huntsville in 1908 to view the site and to meet with "prominent citizens" regarding "design, manner of fence and other incidentals." The monument committee, constituted by Governor Campbell, Superintendent Day, and state representative A. T. McKinney of Huntsville, accepted and approved of the inscriptions submitted by Mrs. Nettie Houston Bringhurst, granddaughter of Houston. Pompeo Coppini, who also had worked on *Come and Take It* and the John B. Hood Confederate monument simultaneously, was ready with the Houston memorial by the beginning of November, 1910, but the unveiling was put off until spring of the following year. The piece, a stone triptych, depicted General Sam Houston on horseback in the center panel framed by allegorical female figures personifying Victory and History. In addition to the inscriptions of Mrs. Bringhurst and others which adorned the back of the memorial, the base of the facade beneath the central panel was emblazoned with the words of Andrew Jackson, serving as epitaph: "The world will take care of Houston's fame."[26]

In mid-February, 1911, plans for the ceremony, slated for San Jacinto Day (April 21), were revealed. The featured speaker would be William Jennings Bryan, "the Nation's most gifted orator;" honored guests included Mrs. Bringhurst and two veterans of the battle of San Jacinto, W. P. Zuber and Alonzo Steele. The Daughters of the Republic of Texas accepted an invitation from the president of the Sam Houston Normal Institute and the mayor of Huntsville to

---

26 "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, August 26, 1891; "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, May 27, 1893; "The Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, June 27, 1893; "To Construct Memorial," *Dallas Morning News*, April 10, 1908; "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, July 29, 1910; *General Sam Houston*, Pompeo Coppini, 1911, Huntsville, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 290.

hold their annual convention in that community the day before the event to facilitate their attendance. Nearly 6,000 people were present at the ceremony, and the stands were "draped with . . . the six flags under which Texas was governed--French, Spanish, Mexican, Texas Republic, Confederate and the United States . . . They furnished much evidence of the rich and glorious history of this grand territory." Rebecca Fisher, President of the DRT, placed a silk Lone Star flag over the grave and "recited a short patriotic poem of her own composition." The redoubtable Mrs. Bringhurst then cut the cords, revealing the monument to the loud applause of the crowd while the band played "Hail to the Chief." Representative McKinney, a Confederate veteran, acted as Master of Ceremonies, and State Senator McDonald Meachum's oratory was well received before the remarks of William Jennings Bryan, whose elegant praise for Houston dazzled the crowd with "forensic powers that could not be surpassed . . . He was cheered time and again." A number of young girls from the public schools placed flowers upon Houston's grave, and students of the Sam Houston Normal Institute sang "The Texas Flag Song" and "America" accompanied by the Thayers Band, of Houston. The assemblage, which special excursion trains had helped deliver from across the state, featured many prominent citizens. While "immense," some observed "there had been a greater congregation present at the same spot [when] the body of Gen. Houston was laid to rest forty-seven years [before]."[27]

The 32nd Legislature that appropriated $10,000 for the monument over Austin's grave also budgeted $2,000, in a bill drafted by Senators Pierce Ward and O. S. Lattimore, for a

---

27 "Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, February 15, 1911; Sam Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News*, March 12, 1911; "Sam Houston Monument," "Houston Monument Unveiled Friday," *Dallas Morning News*, April 22, 1911.

monument to be placed over the grave of Elizabeth Crockett, wife of Davy, in a cemetery outside of the small north Texas community of Acton. Governor Colquitt and Dr. A. B. Conley, Day's successor as Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, accepted the monument design of "a pioneer woman resting on a pedestal," submitted by Cleburne's R. P. Robbins. Just over a year later, on December 18, 1912, Conley reported to Colquitt on the erection of the Crockett monument, "under his supervision and in accordance with an act of the Legislature," along with a memorial to be placed over the grave of former Governor George T. Wood, near Point Blank in San Jacinto County. The Crockett monument's squat plinth was of rough-hewn stone, on top of which rested a rectangular base that read "Crockett" at the bottom of the front and rear facades, and "Wife of David Crockett" across the main panel. The side panels were adorned with a large Lone Star, around which were the dates 1788 and 1860, the years of her birth and death, and 1911. A longer, more slender rectangular shaft tapered up to a four-sided, beveled capital, upon which rested the portraiture. The front face of the shaft section featured a single branch of vegetation in bas-relief, organically symmetrical but for two bent stems, perhaps symbolic of trailblazing. The sculpture of the pioneer woman atop the monument faced due west, her left hand at her brow to shade her gaze, her right hand at her side slightly cupped, index finger

separate from the rest of the digits, the wrist a touch rotated almost as if readying to reach out and indicate some point or object on the horizon.[28]

The unveiling ceremony took place on May 30, 1913. Attendance estimates ranged from three to five thousand people, most having arrived by "a great throng of wagons and buggies and at least seventy-five automobiles . . . principally from Cleburne, Fort Worth and Stephenville." Progressive state representative Jess Baker acted as Master of Ceremonies, assisted by J. R. Randle, chair of the event's organizing committee. The program began at 10:00 a.m. with the singing of "America," followed by the invocation led by Reverend J. N. Chandler. The congregated were then treated to speeches by prominent citizens and musical performances before breaking for a basket dinner. Five grandchildren, thirty-two great grandchildren and

---

28 Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the 1--2 Called Session of the 32nd Legislature of Texas* (Austin, 1911), 8; "Monument for Mrs. Crockett," *Dallas Morning News*, January 15, 1911; "Texas Senate Proceedings," *Dallas Morning News*, August 12, 1911; "Designs for State Monuments," *Dallas Morning News*, December 8, 1911; "State Monuments Under Construction," *Dallas Morning News*, December 19, 1912; *Elizabeth Crockett,* Artist Unknown, 1913, Acton, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 44; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fla49 (accessed 7/23/14). The monument to Governor Wood was also realized through a $2,000 appropriation of the 32nd Legislature.

twenty-three great great grandchildren of David and Elizabeth Crockett, many of whom participated in the ceremony, were present at the event.[29]

The observances reconvened at 2:00 p.m. with the presentation address by Pierce Ward of Cleburne, author of the legislation that provided for the memorial. Ward made a point to boast that the Crockett tribute was "the first and only monument at the grave of a woman in the South," and noted that "History discloses the fact that man never plays the hero alone; in all great accomplishments the hand of woman may be discerned." He tied the frontier experience to the fortunes of the state, noting the role of "this marble shaft" in " . . . teaching to the youth of our land the lesson of appreciation for the hardships and privations which were endured by the wives and mothers in frontier days in order that we might enjoy the advantages and the prosperity which surround us in these modern times." He went on to underscore the role of women: "among the pioneers of our country none are more worthy of honor than the brave-hearted women who shared the burdens equally with men; . . . who with sublime faith and unquestioned patriotism sent forth their husbands and sons to carve out the glorious future of the Lone Star State." Then, two descendants of the couple pulled the cords to reveal the monument. The unveiling ceremonies were "conducted by the Daughters of the Confederacy of Granbury Camp,

---

29 "Monument at Acton for Mrs. Crockett," *Dallas Morning News*, May 22, 1913; "Unveil Monument to Mrs. David Crockett," *Dallas Morning News*, May 31, 1913; "Texas Nonors (sic) Memory of Davy Crockett's Wife," *Dallas Morning News*, October 5, 1913; http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fbawa (accessed 7/24/14).

assisted by old soldiers." After a patriotic reading, a musical presentation of "Lone Star State" closed the program.[30]

The campaign to memorialize Joanna Troutman, designer of the Lone Star flag of the Republic of Texas, was a special project of Governor Colquitt. A relative of Ms. Troutman's in Georgia wrote to Governor Colquitt alerting him to the poor condition of her grave, and Colquitt pledged, contingent on the approval of her surviving relatives, to have the remains transferred to Texas and reinterred in the Texas State Cemetery, at his own expense if necessary. He also vowed "to secure funds with which to place a suitable monument over the grave." To these ends he promised "to give the matter to the Texas press and also to call the subject to the attention of some of his friends in the Legislature." By January 21, 1913, Colquitt had secured the consent of Troutman's surviving family and he issued a call to "all patriotic citizens of the State who are

---

30 "Monument at Acton for Mrs. Crockett," *Dallas Morning News*, May 22, 1913; "Unveil Monument to Mrs. David Crockett," *Dallas Morning News*, May 31, 1913; "Texas Nonors (sic) Memory of Davy Crockett's Wife," *Dallas Morning News*, October 5, 1913. It may be assumed that the "old soldiers" participating in the Crockett memorial dedication were Confederate veterans, based on the fact that the UDC regularly featured Confederate veterans in their ceremonies and that it was widely known at the time that Alonzo Steele and W. P. Zuber were among a very small number of the last living veterans of the Texas Revolution. That the Granbury Camp of the UDC officiated the event, Confederate veterans provided the day's festivities with appropriate patriotic reverence, and that Ward chose to highlight the Crockett piece as "the first and only monument at the grave of a woman in the South" in his remarks all constitute further evidence of "mixing" of Texas and Confederate narratives.

willing to share with me the cost of this expense and aid in the erection of a suitable monument to the young lady's memory in the State cemetery." On February 26, services were held in the senate chambers, well attended by members of both houses of the legislature. No less than three lawmakers delivered addresses commemorating Troutman's life and legacy, as did DRT President Fisher. Governor Colquitt, called to the podium, spoke of the fundraising effort underway and the plot which had been selected in the Texas State Cemetery as her resting place, and lamented the slight monument at the site of Ben Milam's grave in San Antonio, suggesting a similar movement to fund "a more imposing memorial to that hero of the revolution." The next day, "in a beautiful lot in the Texas State Cemetery . . . [with] simple but impressive ceremonies," the remains of Joanna Troutman were interred, and "with the casket were buried a silk Texas flag, a badge of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas and a flower that had been worn by Gov. Colquitt." Among those in attendance were the governor and his wife, Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds Conley, DRT stalwart Dibrell, and a contingent of state legislators.[31]

The story of Joanna Troutman and the campaign to honor her memory apparently impressed Texans, as private citizens and organizations responded to Colquitt's appeal, sending him funds that they had collected for the Troutman monument from around the state. An artist from Palestine, Miss Marie Cronin, was inspired to paint a portrait of Troutman fashioning her

---

31 "Colquitt to Remove Girl's Body to Texas," *Dallas Morning News*, January 9, 1913; "Governor Asks People to Contribute Funds," *Dallas Morning News*, January 22, 1913; "Ceremonies in Senate Chamber," *Dallas Morning News*, February 27, 1913; "Designed Texas Flag," *Dallas Morning News*, February 28, 1913.

banner which she presented to Governor Colquitt. Colquitt donated it to the Senate where it was given a special placement on the wall of that chamber just above and to the left of the president's chair.[32]

The project, however, ran afoul of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, who despite the previous participation of some of their organizational leaders now aggressively opposed the planned memorial on the grounds that their research revealed that Troutman had in fact not created the first Lone Star flag. In November, 1914, the Daughters appealed to Austin Mayor Wooldridge for his assistance in preventing the monument, which was near completion in Coppini's studio, from being erected in any of the capital city's public spaces. It is difficult to know how much of the dispute was politically motivated. Colquitt had dueled with the Daughters of the Republic of Texas in court and the press alike over their custodianship of and plans for the Alamo, as he had the United Daughters of the Confederacy in his attempts to evict them and the DRT from their shared library and classroom space in the State Capitol building. Likewise, Colquitt's soft stance on prohibition and opposition to women's suffrage had earned him no allies in Texas clubwomen circles. Nannie Webb Curtis, President of the Texas Women's Christian Temperance Union, addressing that body in May, 1914, called Colquitt out in her keynote, pining for the much prayed-on close of "his administration of gigantic failure." While Wooldridge is said to have privately sided with Colquitt and Coppini in their desire to place the Troutman monument in an Austin city park, the mayor publicly deferred to the Daughters

---

32 "State Brevities," *Dallas Morning News*, June 4, 1913; *Dallas Morning News*, February 28, 1913; "Marie Cronin," *Dallas Morning News*, June 14, 1914; "Inventory of Jarvis Estate is $933,936," *Dallas Morning News*, June 18, 1914.

formidable lobbying, agreeing to halt any plans for the memorial going forward until the group could "be given a hearing." The issue was apparently not sorted quickly, as almost a year after the DRT's protest, in October, 1915, Coppini's bronze of Troutman was being shown in the Fine Arts Exhibit of the State Fair of Texas. The six-foot figure depicted the young Miss Troutman, with needle and thread, in the act of stitching the lone star on the flag she would then give to the Georgia volunteers preparing to depart for Texas, and attracted "considerable attention" while on display at the annual exposition in Dallas. In the meantime, the monument's chief patron was succeeded in office by fellow Democrat James Ferguson. Colquitt vacated the executive

residence in January, 1915, having chosen to go on the stump for Ferguson and make a run for a U. S. Senate seat in the next election cycle.[33]

---

33 "Colquitt Bank Bill Not Yet Considered," *Dallas Morning News*, September 20, 1914; "Colquitt Receives Troutman," *Dallas Morning News*, July 23, 1914; "Say Troutman Did Not Design Flag," *Dallas Morning News*, November 19, 1914; "The State Press," *Dallas Morning News*, November 29, 1914; "Civil Appeals Court Affirms UDC Case," *Dallas Morning News*, July 6, 1913; "Daughters Secure Temporary Stay," *Dallas Morning News*, March 3, 1912; "President Delivers Address to W. C. T. U.," *Dallas Morning News,* May 7, 1914; "Bronze Statue at State Fair," *Dallas Morning News*, September 23, 1915; "Statue Attracts Attention," *Dallas Morning News*, October 26, 1915; "Sparks' Withdrawal Causes Speculation," *Dallas Morning News*, March 31, 1914; "Gov. O. B. Colquitt Will Be Candidate," *Dallas Morning News*, May 13, 1914; "Ferguson Club at Austin," *Dallas Morning News*, May 20, 1914; Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt," 400-401, 442. On prohibition, see Huckaby, 14, 97-98, 236-237, 280-282, 461-462, 471. On Women's suffrage, 35, 433. On A. P. Wooldridge's correspondence with Coppini and Colquitt on the Troutman monument, 375. On the UDC objecting to men's attempts to memorialize women of the south, see McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 129-132; Kelly McMichael, "'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances': The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Power of Civil War Memory," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 95-118 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 111-114. Cantrell explains the technicalities of the DRT's complaints about Troutman's claims to the Lone Star design in "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 73 n.45.

When the monument was finally installed over Troutman's grave in the Texas State Cemetery, Coppini's bronze was mounted upon a square stone base and pedestal with brass plates on each of its four sides. The plate on the east-facing monument's facade told a bit of Troutman's life ("She lived to see Texas free and one of the mightiest states in the American union"), of her creation of the flag and its symbolism, and of its subsequent career throughout the Texas war for independence. The personified banner, the plate proclaimed, "was raised as national flag . . . by Fannin when he heard of the declaration of Texas independence," and "silently witnessed the murder of Fannin and his men at Goliad." Plates on the north, west and south faces carried the heading "Martyrs to Texas Independence at Goliad--Names of Heroes Murdered at Goliad, Sunday, March 27, 1836," followed by the names of the fallen. A small bronze plate on the base beneath the facade announced the memorial was "erected through efforts of O. B. Colquitt--Governor of Texas Jan. 1911 to Jan. 1915." Colquitt's patronage was often cited in the press. An item from November 1921 noted that the former Governor had visited Austin the previous day "on business with the State Board of Control relating to final payment for the monument erected to the memory of Johanna (sic) Troutman." The same note pointed out that the appropriation for the project "was made by the Legislature at special request of Governor Colquitt, who has taken interest in its construction." An observer cataloging many of the markers in the Texas State Cemetery in 1925, commenting on the plates listing the Goliad

victims on the Troutman memorial, noted "Ex-Gov. Oscar Colquitt is said to have paid $500 of his private means to have these three tablets placed upon this monument."[34]

On April 20, 1915, newly-elected Governor James Ferguson addressed something of a joint delegation, that of the DRT's twenty-fourth annual convention, held "in the Daughters of the Confederacy room in the State capitol." Top officers of the Texas Division of the UDC were in attendance as well. The governor did little to distinguish between the two organizations in his remarks, choosing to refer to them collectively as "Daughters" most frequently, and a correspondent to the *Dallas Morning News* observed that "a few plainly spoken words by Governor Ferguson . . . dispelled . . . all possibilities of a resumption of unfriendly relationship between the chief executive of the State and the Daughters of the Republic of Texas and the Texas division of the Daughters of the Confederacy alike." The governor's words seemed to address controversies over the Alamo, the UDC/DRT library in the capitol building, and even the monument to Joanna Troutman: "I say to you come and help me make Texas history and keep Texas history. I want this organization to have all the help, aid and assistance that I can give it . . . I want the Daughters to remain in this room just as long as they care to remain."

---

34 "Bronze Statue at State Fair," *Dallas Morning News*, September 23, 1915; "Statue Attracts Attention," *Dallas Morning News*, October 26, 1915; "Colquitt at Austin," *Dallas Morning News*, November 15, 1921; "Many Heroic Dead Rest Through the Passing Years in State Cemetery," *Dallas Morning News*, May 24, 1925; *Joanna Troutman*, Pompeo Coppini, c. 1915, Austin, Texas. The monument's connection of Troutman's banner to Goliad perhaps reflected an effort by its designers to broaden its appeal. It remains unclear as to when exactly the monument was installed at the Texas State Cemetery, or if there was a dedication ceremony.

Ferguson's comments were received with "an outburst of applause," signaling in the eyes of those assembled "his enunciation of a 'hands-off doctrine' of the affairs of both organizations." Following the governor's address, Clara Driscoll Sevier, first vice-president of the DRT and the organization's point-person in their legal battles with Colquitt over the Alamo, declared to the convention, "We have been forced to fight the devil with fire and brimstone and have won." While Driscoll didn't name Colquitt, the reference was most likely not lost on her audience. Now the "Daughters," and Colquitt's other detractors in Texas clubwoman circles, had outlasted him.[35]

Although Colquitt had depended on the support of many of his "friends in the legislature" in realizing the spate of monuments erected by the state between 1910 and 1915, no Texas politician then stepped up to carry the standard, and by the time he left the governor's office this latest wave of commemoration had run its course. There would be no more major memorialization projects until the 1920s. In 1921, the Mary Isham Keith Chapter of the

---

35 "Governor Addresses DRT Convention," *Dallas Morning News*, April 21, 1915. Before Governor Ferguson's remarks, welcome addresses were made by Austin Mayor A. P. Wooldridge, Mrs. Charles L. Hamil, President of the Texas Division of the UDC, and Mrs. J. S. Brownlee, President of the Albert Sidney Johnston Chapter of the UDC. Mrs. Cornelia Branch Stone, one of the organizational leaders of the Texas Division of the UDC, was elected as second vice-president of the DRT. In her remarks, Driscoll called the legalities over the Alamo stewardship a "bitter fight," stating that "we have been forced to play politics and have plainly demonstrated that the fighting instincts of our ancestors, when right was with us, have not been lost." Gregg Cantrell relates the Colquitt/DRT fight, as well as the Governor's desire to evict the UDC from the capitol building, in some detail in "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 56-64.

Daughters of the American Revolution dedicated the *Camp Worth Plaque* in downtown Fort Worth, on the site of the original military garrison around which the town that took its name had grown. While the piece and its accompanying ceremony undoubtedly owed something to previous commemorative movements in Texas, the plaque, a bronze tablet depicting a frontier scene of the fort mounted on a rough stone marker, was part of a "nationwide service" project of the DAR. A monument outside of Groesbeck, the *Fort Parker Memorial*, was erected in two stages, with appropriations of the 37th ($2,500) and 42nd Legislatures ($1,500) matching funds collected by local citizens in 1922 and 1932. The imposing monument, located in the small, pastoral cemetery where many victims of the 1836 attack on the fort were buried, featured three stone figures of a pioneer family, the Parkers, atop a large four-pillared base. In 1925 the Women's City Club of Houston dedicated the *Sam Houston* monument in that city's Hermann Park before a crowd of "many thousands" with "patriotic music [and] old Southern airs." The massive structure, located at the head of the park's main mall, consisted of an enormous bronze equestrian depicting General Houston dramatically marshaling his Texas forces on horseback mounted on a large stone pedestal whose arched interior formed a portico. The ladies of the Women's City Club collected $50,000, mostly through popular subscription, and received $25,000 from an appropriation of the 38th Legislature. A number of prominent Texans spoke at the ceremony, and Houston's great-granddaughter Margaret Bringhurst unveiled the sculpture. Apart from the second phase of the Fort Parker memorial it would be another decade before

Texans again took up the mantle of commemorating their state's frontier and revolutionary periods in earnest.[36]

---

36 "A Patriotic Project," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram,* January 12, 1921; "D. A. R. Chapter Will Mark Historic Spot," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram,* January 16, 1921; "Marking the Birthplace of Fort Worth," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram,* December 29, 1921; "Perpetuating Our Traditions," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram,* December 29, 1921; "Will Speak in Houston," *Dallas Morning News,* August 15, 1925; "Get State's Share Houston Monument," *Dallas Morning News,* August 15, 1925; "Baby Hands Tear Veil From Sam Houston's Statue While Many Thousands Pay Tribute," *Dallas Morning News,* August 17, 1925; "Lawmakers Reply to Governor Neff," *Dallas Morning News,* July 13, 1921; "Senate Approves Bill to Increase Highway Patrol," *Dallas Morning News,* May 15, 1931; *Camp Worth Plaque*, Joseph Lorkowski, 1921, Fort Worth, Texas; *Fort Parker Memorial*, Roy Weldert and W. H. Dietz, 1922-1932, Groesbeck, Texas; *Sam Houston,* Enrico Filberto Cerracchio, 1925, Houston, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 214, 241-242, 250, 340-341. Little names "J. M. Lore" as artist of the *Camp Worth Plaque,* but a January 16, 1921, *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* article, "D. A. R. Chapter Will Mark Historic Spot," names Joseph Lorkowski as sculptor. Another *Fort Worth Star-Telegram* article (December 29, 1921, "Mayor Advocates City Beautiful at Unveiling of Camp Worth Marker") reported that the mayor was proud that "a Fort Worth boy, Joseph L. Lore, had designed the tablets placed upon the granite monument." http://texasbrazostrail.com/plan-your-adventure/historic-sites-and-cities/sites/fort-parker-memorial-cemetery (accessed 8/2/2014). A Texas chapter of the DAR and citizens of Navasota sponsored a monument to La Salle in that city's downtown in 1930. *La Salle Monument*, Frank Teich, 1930, Navasota, Texas.

In simple numbers, the 1910-1915 Texas monuments could not have represented much of an affront to Confederate culture in Texas. Compared to the five raised to the Texas frontier and revolutionary eras between 1910 and 1915, Texans erected thirty memorials to the Confederacy in the same period. Nor could this movement represent much of an ideological affront to Texas' Confederate culture, given its producers' need to operate effectively within the latter. Colquitt clashed with the State Textbook Board over a text that contained a photo of Abraham Lincoln, and vetoed an appropriation for a Confederate monument when the legislature had failed to fund projects he deemed more pressing, but he was, nevertheless, entrenched in Confederate culture. Two of the patriarchs of Confederate culture in Texas, General William "Old Tige" Cabell of Dallas and Major George T. Littlefield of Austin, had close social, political and financial ties to Colquitt. One of his first major appointments as governor was Cabell's son, Ben, to chair the newly-constituted State Prison Commission, and the younger Cabell became one of his go-to stump speakers in the 1912 governor's race. Littlefield engaged Colquitt as a broker for a major land deal before his term as governor and personally loaned him money after his time in office.

The Colquitts' social circle was predicated on Confederate culture and, Mr. Colquitt's quarrels with the UDC aside, the couple enjoyed the company.[37]

---

37 "State Appointments Being Made Slowly," *Dallas Morning News,* November 14, 1910; "More Appointments by Mr. Colquitt," *Dallas Morning News,* December 4, 1910; "To Inspect State Prisons," *Dallas Morning News,* January 3, 1911; "Committees Are Named for Colquitt Banquet," *Dallas Morning News,* July 28, 1910; "Program for Reunion Hood's Texas Brigade," *Dallas Morning News,* October 15, 1910; "To Attend Reunion," *Dallas Morning News,* May 13, 1911; "Organization Activities," *Dallas Morning News,* October 14, 1923; "Organization Activities," *Dallas Morning News,* February 17, 1924; "Officers Installed by Dallas U.D. C." *Dallas Morning News,* October 18, 1930; Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt," 199, 261, 292, 315-317, 417-418. Gregg Cantrell mentions both the Abe Lincoln controversy and the Confederate monument veto in "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 66. One of the offending history texts was replaced with one that treated the South appropriately in the eyes of the Textbook Board, *Student's History of Our Country,* co-authored by Clarence Ousley, Democratic Party operative and political advisor to O. B. Colquitt; Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas," 467-476; (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fou02) (accessed August 07, 2014). After their time in Austin, the Colquitt's resided in Dallas; Alice Colquitt and Mrs. J.C. Muse, formerly Mrs. Katie Cabell Currie, were both key members of the Dallas Chapter No. 6 of the UDC. If the periodization is extended to 1930 to include the *Camp Worth Plaque,* the *Fort Parker* Memorial, the *Sam Houston* monument and the *La Salle* monument (see note 36), Texans raised nine monuments to the Texas frontier and revolutionary eras compared to thirty-seven monuments to the Confederacy during the same years.

Texas politicians, especially Democratic Party candidates, had to maintain a public profile that their constituencies, many of whom self-identified as southerners, would find palatable. Confederate concerns, such as pensions for aged veterans and care for the widows of Confederate soldiers, punctuated Democratic platforms throughout the first decades of the twentieth century, and no serious candidate could afford to appear unsympathetic to them. R. F. Paige wrote an open letter warning Confederates that they could "expect no consideration from Colquitt," the Democratic nominee, based on his senate record, even as, "in his canvass for the nomination for Governor he is posing as the friend of the Confederate soldier." Despite the claims of his missive, Paige's quarrel with Colquitt stemmed more from the former's position as Chairman of the State Prohibition Committee. In his letter, Paige endorsed "Col. A. J. Houston, the nominee of the Prohibition party," and coupled support for Confederate legislation with "best principles," stating, "Col. Houston not only stands squarely for the prohibition of the liquor traffic in this State, with its kindred evils, but he also stands for the best interest of Confederate veterans and Confederate widows." G. I. Goodwin, "an old Confederate soldier, a Democrat and a prohibitionist for twenty-five years," responded, chastising Mr. Paige for urging Democrats to break "the party pledge," stating that "the Confederates are Democrats . . . I have been a voter in Texas for fifty-five years and often have heard men advise others to stand by their pledge and not violate their honor." While prohibition often divided Democrats, the connection between the

party and Confederate culture in Texas was a point of pride, and no savvy Texas Democratic politician would attempt to get between them.[38]

Writing about the 1935 legislative creation of the Commission of Control for Texas Centennial Celebrations, Carol Morris Little notes the action's dual significance: "a change occurred in the funding and subject matter of commemorative sculpture; for the first time, the founders of the Republic of Texas became the primary focus of attention and government became the primary commissioning agent." While the scope, import and volume of the Commission's work in the state make the oversight understandable, Little ignores the years 1910 through 1915, couched as they were between the ongoing Confederate monument movement and the Texas Centennial Celebrations. Cantrell has rightly identified this important phase of memorialization, with heroes of the Texas frontier and revolutionary periods receiving the laurels, Democratic politicians taking the role of producers from women's heritage groups and casting the movement in a progressive ethos which tied frontier hardships to modern progress. Cantrell does admirable work detailing Colquitt's conflict with the UDC and DRT, and he touches upon the effect these quarrels might have had on the DRT's objection to the Troutman campaign, but he generally characterizes the 1910-1915 monuments as overwhelming public

---

38 "Mr. Paige Warns Confederates," *Dallas Morning News,* October 15, 1910; "From a Confederate Veteran," *Dallas Morning News,* October 21, 1910; "Colquitt Winner; Majority 130, 000" *Dallas Morning News,* November 9, 1910. The Paige letter included within it an appeal written before the Democratic primary by State Legislator W. B. Wall, which detailed Colquitt's opposition to a particular bill Mr. Wall had sponsored; See also Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt," 150-151, 231, 238-239, 241, 242-243, 299, 307, 323-324, 338.

successes, the Troutman piece included. Buenger, for his part, sees a general increase in Texas memory against a static-to-diminishing backdrop of Confederate culture and, seeing the state able to distinguish itself from the rest of the region economically, reads a cultural shift to match the state's rising fortunes. Wanting to move beyond the past and look forward, Buenger says, "Texans committed to a different future (than other southerners)--one that more quickly buried the ghosts of Confederate and Reconstruction era prejudices against an active government and one that made them more American and less southern." By then though, Texans had Confederate credit on the books to spare, and they would never let the membership lapse.[39]

The basic premise of Buenger's framework of a cultural shift, that Southern expressions proved to be more prominent than Texas memories early and that Texas narratives later caught and surpassed the Confederate celebration, somewhat eclipsing (although without ever erasing) that tradition in the state, is sound. The Texas repertoire was a work-in-progress for much of this period, while the Lost Cause enjoyed a period of intense, coordinated regional production in the few decades around the turn of the twentieth century. However, a problem with this

---

39 Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 13-14; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 56-66; Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 128. Cantrell acknowledges that "It is difficult to judge how much political capital Colquitt had to expend in pursuit of the aforementioned projects," claiming that the "broad support" for them, including the Troutman monument, reflected "the newfound value that Progressive-era Texans were placing on their state's revolutionary past." He then goes into some detail regarding the disputes Colquitt endured with the DRT and UDC, touching upon the Troutman monument troubles, but essentially glossing over the project's anti-climatic completion.

interpretation soon arises in that it never accounts for the ample evidence that bucks the trend, how to read Confederate memory late or Texas expressions early other than as aberrations. This oversight is exemplified by the difficulty Buenger and Cantrell encounter in establishing a timeline for when exactly the tide turned in favor of Texas memory. The contradictory examples, besides bedeviling such a timeline, point to the fact that the two traditions happily coexisted for several decades. This extended period of overlap reveals a second problematic assumption of the shift framework as it is presented: that the development of a vibrant catalogue of Texas memory represented a rejection of the Lost Cause. That the two were celebrated concurrently by in-common producers and consumers signifies that they were highly-compatible aspects of the state's cultural landscape. Whatever cultural or societal shift that may have been afoot in the first few decades of the twentieth century meant little with regards to the Lost Cause in Texas. The state's citizens had internalized its lessons, and it remained a memory repertoire they could access and invoke at will whenever the context required it.

Texans had been distinguishing themselves from other southerners in ways subtle and conspicuous for some time by 1910. The state had a nascent culture celebrating their frontier and revolutionary pasts prior to 1910 that was evident and substantial if not equal to the concurrent Confederate movement in product, vigor or volume after that tradition blossomed in the 1890s. Sumner A. Cunningham began publishing *Confederate Veteran* in Nashville in 1893, and a year later the United Daughters of the Confederacy was founded: with those two events like-minded southerners had a national communication media and the most formidable women's organization of its day ready to disseminate what came to be called "southern values." While Texans celebrated the Confederacy along with the rest of the south, Texas frontier and revolutionary

expressions were hardly absent from public spectacle. Columbus Upson's oratory, a Sul Ross sketch in the *Bryan Eagle* reprinted in the *Confederate Veteran*, Jefferson Davis lauding the "Sons of the Alamo," evidence of "mixing" of the Confederate and Texas frontier narratives prove that much, and together with the concurrent production and consumption of both traditions by elite and average Texans alike, they belie the notion that the two were ever in any way adversarial. Furthermore, participation in both by high-profile Texans--politicians, clergy and prominent citizens--many of whom had to consider party platforms and constituencies, congregations, careers and reputations as they negotiated a course through their public lives, demonstrates that these actors understood each repertoire to convey certain messages and values which they endorsed to the profit or peril of their professional lives. The manner in which the two traditions successfully co-existed in Texas society suggests that both franchises had much to offer the state's elite citizenry so-inclined to employ them.[40]

The 1910-1915 monuments and their unveiling ceremonies produced very little new, their producers having drawn much from the Confederate monument movement. Event organizers modified the song catalogue, substituting Texas anthems for the verses of the Confederacy,

---

40 Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 2, 95. There is a subtle distinction to be made between production and consumption on the one hand and participation, especially of public figures, on the other. While public figures, UDC officers and elected officials for instance, may organize and orchestrate a monument ceremony in a "behind-the-scenes" manner, to be an orator or performer on the ceremony program is to be a part of the product. Such participation constitutes an added layer of production and essentially links the participant with the tradition in a highly-public way.

keeping "America" and other national hymns to align their cause with American patriotism, as southerners had done in the Confederate movement. The programs followed a similar pattern, with invocations, musical and vocal performances, readings, and orators before the memorials were unveiled. Youthful descendants of the honored subjects unveiled these tributes, and public school children regularly attended as a body. Pompeo Coppini was at the top of the art and industry, and his part in creating both traditions, like that of Elisabet Ney and others, is but another small instance of mixing, literal "concurrent production," that challenges the framework of a more general "turning away" from one culture to another.[41]

The monuments of 1910-1915, however, did represent a movement: the elected officials responsible produced them in a concerted effort which was sustained across five public works. Included in this wave of memorialization was the acquisition of various battle sites and historic paintings, all achieved by the same cohort using the same means. The dedicatory ceremonies followed a common pattern, and although they drew much from the concurrent Confederate monument movement, their content and their unveilings told a story that connected the state's

---

41 The one monument of the movement not from Coppini's hand, the Crockett monument at Acton, exhibits many unique aesthetic and design features that are intriguing. The artist is unknown. Louis Amateis is another sculptor, along with Ney, Coppini and Frank Teich, who worked in creating both Confederate and Texas monument traditions. Of course, the pre-1910 culture of Texas memorialization drew heavily from the Confederate monument movement as well, as previously referenced in this study: "Rather than completely discreet movements, evidence of cross-pollination hints that their concurrent development and in-common spheres of producers and consumers blurred the lines of separation."

good fortune to the hardships of the frontier and the sacrifices of the revolution. The movement expanded the repertoire of Texas frontier and revolutionary narratives, symbols, heroes and traditions, and refocused Texans on these latent memories with reminders of bronze and stone. The movement served perhaps as a corrective, as Texas politicians marshaled prominent citizens, acquired and constructed artifacts and sites of a Texas memory, and fortified their state ethos with a new lease on a familiar "usable" past, helping it draw closer apace the Confederate culture that Texans still eagerly produced and consumed. As with the women of the UDC and DRT, it made the most sense that the two traditions should work together, and the 1910-1915 monuments reinforced a Texas citizenship that was Anglo, and largely southern. Like Colquitt, all the

subjects of the movement, save perhaps the anonymous irregular of Coppini's *Come and Take It*, had emigrated to Texas from southern states.[42]

The most significant innovation of the 1910-1915 campaign was the subtle, yet significant, shift in the hierarchy of producers. In the Confederate monument movement, elected officials played a part as orators and honored guests. This, the placement of the monuments in public parks and on the grounds of seats of government, and the quasi-public official status granted the United Daughters of the Confederacy in the planning, organizing and then

---

42 Jay Winter, "Sites of Memory," in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 315-316; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 67. For the acquisition of battle sites, see paragraph 1; for the acquisition of historic paintings, note 22. The expanded repertoire of Texas frontier and revolutionary memory came with its own set of social and political implications, functioning as it did in a similar manner to the Lost Cause in its justification of a class of Anglo elites privileged before Texans of Mexican and even German heritage. For an overview of the suppression of Mexican American memory and the correspondent discriminatory practices, both de facto and de jure, in twentieth-century Texas society, see Andrés Tijerina, "Constructing Tejano Memory," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 176-202 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007). The four historical subjects of the 1910-1915 monuments, Stephen F. Austin (Virginia), Sam Houston (Virginia, Tennessee), Elizabeth Crockett (North Carolina, Tennessee), and Joanna Troutman (Georgia) all hailed from southern states before coming to Texas, Troutman posthumously.

orchestrating all aspects of these highly-public and widely-attended event programs, all essentially amounted to official sanction of the monuments, their attendant ceremonies, and the values communicated through them. While Democratic Party politicians found this to be a beneficial partnership, this cohort of elected officials, perhaps sensing the power implicit in these sites of memory and their ceremony, began deploying the resources at hand to promote a narrative of progress that would lend historical gravitas to their legislative agendas. For this purpose, they elicited the DRT to fulfill a role commensurate in appearance to that of the UDC's in Confederate celebrations, and they were able to secure the cooperation and participation of the Daughters until that organization withdrew their support, seemingly abruptly. Whether the movement was a deliberate attempt to wrest commemorative powers away from women's heritage groups, or if this result was an unintended consequence, remains unclear; but it should be noted that one creative aspect of the movement, if not an innovation, was the memorializing of women. The Texas UDC had clashed with the UCV over their men's attempts to erect a monument to southern women, and the issue of commemorating women, especially the parties responsible and their interpretations, had long been a point of contention. That this conflict occurred over the Troutman monument, and that the DRT did object to her as the creators' choice, could represent that this same quarrel had spilled over into the Texas tradition. Whether or not the totality of the Colquitt/clubwomen baggage fueled every interaction between the two

camps, the Daughters likely might have felt this cut, their displacement as guardians and keepers of history, to be the deepest.[43]

Although the post-1915 monuments were not of the same movement, the memorials at Groesbeck and Houston, both of which were achieved through a combination of state funds and popular subscription, demonstrate that the standard had been set, that the state had a vested interest in commemorating its frontier and revolutionary histories when it could successfully partner with citizens, and helped to set the commemorative landscape heading into the Centennial celebrations. More importantly, the expanded repertoire of Texas memory had meshed well with the state's Confederate culture. Sam Houston had been the most prominent Texan to oppose secession, and a generation earlier all efforts to formally honor his memory had run up against lingering hard feelings over this stance. But through the mechanism of dual allegiance, the passage of time and the selection of memory, Houston's opposition to the

---

43 Kelly McMichael, "'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances'," 111-114; McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment," 129-132. When assessing the overall cultural impact of the 1910-1915 monuments, some consideration should be given to their placement. Of the five, only the monument at Gonzales garnered a highly-public site, the four remaining works all being placed in cemeteries. While this site selection probably reflects some of the aforementioned "corrective" aspect of the movement, these "sites of memory" nonetheless would have been much less visible than so many of their Confederate counterparts that found audiences in public parks and on the grounds of seats of government across the state. The DRT/Colquitt dispute over the Troutman monument and its placement reflects some level of understanding of this by both parties.

Confederacy proved less damning, perhaps forgotten by many. In 1908, the Robert E. Lee Chapter 386 of the UDC dedicated their *Spirit of the Confederacy* in Sam Houston Park in the Bayou City. The 1925 dedication of the General's equestrian, also in the city named for him, was reported to have transpired under "patriotic music [and] old Southern airs" before a crowd of "many thousands." Jackson's epitaph for his friend and protégé had come to pass, and the state's Confederate culture had survived intact; those same southern values, well-learned, stood ready to enjoy a long career after in Texas.[44]

44 "Unveil Confederate Monument," *Dallas Morning News,* January 20, 1908; "Baby Hands Tear Veil From Sam Houston's Statue While Many Thousands Pay Tribute," *Dallas Morning News,* August 17, 1925; Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin," 42-44, 69-70 n.12.

Chapter Three: The Spirit of The Centennial

Sixteen United States Army aircraft buzzed across a pale blue sky, tracking against a "merciful canopy of light cirrus clouds," and signaled the beginning of the trek eastward. Eight officers of the Dallas police force riding abreast on motorcycles in a blunt phalanx spanning the city's main thoroughfares led the opening parade of the Texas Centennial Exposition on June 6, 1936, breaking the hot stillness of the morning with the roar of their engines. They were soon followed by the clatter of hoofs, six horsemen uniformed in cowboy attire on their beasts approaching, each of whom carried a banner representing one of the six sovereignties which had flown theirs over the territory, personifying the narrative organizers deemed "the Cavalcade of Texas," providing four centuries of provenance for their centennial event. A reported 350,000 spectators lined the three-mile parade route which took the column nearly an hour to transverse. The fair's Grand Marshall rode in the first car, trailed in succession by twenty-five mounted Texas Rangers, the United States Marine Corps Band and various other companies of the armed forces. A fleet of motorized military units capped the first segment of the procession, which was followed by a group of "Centennial rangers," and a "colorful aggregation" of well over one hundred riders from the exposition's rodeo and their accompanying "cowboy band."[1]

---

1 "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Cavalcade Presents Flags of Texas History," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 18, January 11, 1936. See note 7 on the limited scope of this chapter in relation to commemorative products produced for the Texas Centennial.

At noon the parade arrived at the main vehicular entrance of the grounds for the official opening ceremony, where Governor James V. Allred and U. S. Secretary of Commerce Daniel C. Roper opened the exposition "to all the peoples of the world," the scene captured by a number of newsreel photographers and their words transmitted across the nation and overseas, "(the) international broadcast . . . arranged by the exposition radio staff in co-operation with the Columbia Broadcasting System." From there the procession advanced to the Cotton Bowl for the "Ceremony of Flags," where each banner was raised in turn with musical accompaniment, and dignitaries visiting and remote representing the six celebrated nations delivered addresses extolling their place in state's history and praising the "Empire of Texas."[2]

In the afternoon the governor and other dignitaries toured the grounds and participated in various dedication ceremonies. Traffic through the turnstiles slowed in the heat of the day, but picked up around sundown, and the day's ceremony gave way to spectacle as darkness fell, even veterans of the annual Dallas fete starstruck by the show of the magnificent and electrically illuminated fair grounds at night. The ceremony however would return again and again, for any number of dedications to follow, for the reception of honored visitors during the nearly six-month run of the event, for President Franklin Delano Roosevelt one week following. Texas, as imagined by the planners and patrons of the Central Exposition and the Texas Centennial Commission, presented itself as host to the world for the one hundredth anniversary of its

---

2 "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936.

independence from Mexico. This image of the land and its inhabitants, depicted in the Central Exposition's installations and ceremonies and the Texas Centennial Commission monuments, reflected what some scholars have characterized as a shift in the identity of Texans from one that emphasized the state's southern heritage as one of the former members of the Confederacy to one that highlighted the region's frontier and revolutionary periods, drawing on images and symbols of the American west. The shift, Walter Buenger argues "began around 1910, and . . . accelerated after 1920," and that during the period 1910 to 1936, "Texans lived in a world of competing memories and competing identities, . . . one the one hand stood the Confederacy . . .and on the other stood the Texas Revolution and Republic [and] inclusion in the westerning experience." Light Cummins posits that this shift was at least in part the result of a "rebranding" campaign, and that "during the Great Depression decade of the 1930s especially, there was an explicit effort to remake the popular image of Texas within a western context." By examining the Texas Centennial and the commemorative activities surrounding it, this chapter assesses the popular image of the state and its people produced for the celebration. In doing so, it analyzes the

relationship and interplay between the "competing memories and competing identities" of the Confederate and frontier/western repertoires.[3]

As early as the 1920s, business leaders had anticipated the economic opportunity a grand-scale centennial celebration would present, and a "committee of 100" was formed to begin conceiving of and planning for such an event. In the early 1930s the state legislature, with much input from the project's patrons, passed an amendment to the constitution which allowed for an appropriation to be made to fund the Centennial celebrations. This measure in effect set off a period of increased promotion and lobbying that would last a number of years as the nature and specifics of the celebrations gradually took shape in conference rooms, the halls of the legislature, and in the pages of the state's newspapers. The commemorations would essentially take three forms: the central exposition, which a handful of the state's principal cities competed intensely for the privilege of hosting; an unspecified number of secondary celebrations, which beyond a few prominent, prescribed sites--San Antonio, San Jacinto, Goliad--were open to the applications of any and all communities and limited only by the "initiative and imagination of the citizenship" of these aspirants; and finally, the creation of a number of large monuments and

---

3 Walter L. Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 134-135; Light Townsend Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western for the 1936 Centennial," in *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013), 40-41.

hundreds of smaller markers, memorials to the historic places, persons and events of the state. As applications for the central exposition, the secondary celebrations and the larger monuments (as well as the smaller markers) all vied for the same limited state and federal resources, and the amounts available were in play until fairly late in the process, the level of competitive positioning for these funds raised in rough approximation to the heightened tenor of promotion as the centennial approached. Within this competitive environment, a further level of debate entered into the dialogue over the nature of the celebration, that of which aspect of Texas should be most prominently showcased, the state's history or its industrial progress.[4]

Walter Buenger, in expanding upon his framework of a shift from a Southern- to Texan- (or more western-, or American-) based identity, argues that the shift away from Southern memories "accelerated after 1920," a period "when memories of the past stood roughly balanced between American and Southern images and symbols." Buenger goes on to declare that "from 1910 to 1936 Texans lived in a world with competing memories and competing identities . . . Boldly put, on the one hand stood the Confederacy and separation from the rest of the United States and on the other stood the Texas Revolution and Republic, inclusion in the westerning

---

4 "Secondary Fetes Important During Centennial Year," *Dallas Morning News,* August 26, 1934. As the nature of the celebrations evolved and additional, federal funds became available, the prescribed sites for the "secondary fetes," San Jacinto, Goliad, San Antonio, as well as the Central Exposition site in Dallas, received monies not for the celebrations themselves but for permanent installations such as museums, ceremonial halls, theaters, classrooms and park improvements. "Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935.

experience, and American symbols such as Abraham Lincoln." Light Cummins states that while Buenger and Gregg Cantrell have "called attention to the de-emphasizing of the southern image in Texans' collective remembering . . . , no scholar has yet studied the process whereby the basic underpinnings of public memory actually moved to a western frontier orientation," and notes that this shift was, at least in part, the result of a "grassroots, *sui generis* intellectual movement," as "things 'western' were seen by many people across the country as positive, progressive, and vitalizing forces in a new emerging national life." Texans, according to Cummins, "thus adopted the west and western imagery during the Depression decade in a broad based historical rebranding of the state." Cummins goes on to note that in addition to the "grassroots," organic aspect of this movement, "this rebranding also occurred as a consciously and carefully calculated effort that took place in the world of advertising, popular culture, and business."[5]

However, problems arise with this interpretation, especially in regards to the relative cultural currency of the Lost Cause in Texas society. For instance, reading the shift as a

---

5 Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 40-41, 57 n.44; Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," 134-135. Both Cummins and Buenger "muddy the waters" of examining the interplay of Southern and Western memory traditions by interjecting at intervals the specter of "American." Lost Cause proponents always cast their products celebrating Southern heritage under the umbrella of supreme patriotism and Americanism. To assume that such expressions in non-southern traditions represented an affront to the Lost Cause is to adopt a false dichotomy. See Karen L.Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 65, 145.

"rebranding," a "consciously and carefully calculated effort that took place in the world of advertising, popular culture, and business" with the end goal of promoting the state's commercial interests through a single event is not an "apples to apples" comparison to a memory tradition long used to justify, establish and maintain a race-based social order. Rather, by presenting their state as a lead actor in the drama of the nation's frontier experience, Texans consciously accessed a well-known memory repertoire with the intention of leveraging the "cultural utility of the frontier" to their advantage. Nor does a "de-emphasizing of the southern image in Texans' collective remembering" constitute a critique of that repertoire, especially as products from the tradition continued to be produced alongside artifacts reflecting the newer, western ethos that Americans found so attractive. Buenger notes that "the (Ku Klux) Klan espoused the normal range of ideas and opinions among white Protestants in the 1920s," and that although not all citizens who shared those beliefs were Klan members, the group enjoyed such widespread and overt support that "in Texas the Klan . . . functioned as a fraternal organization and as a faction within the dominant Democratic Party that elected a U. S. senator in 1922 and almost elected a governor in 1924." The Lost Cause had been so successful and had gained such universal acceptance among white Americans from all corners of the nation that there was very little pressure on Texans to "abandon" it, especially when they could freely move between this

tradition and memories of the frontier and Texas Revolution, alternately promoting their state's rigidly-segregated society and robust economic climate to their liking.[6]

The cultural shift that facilitated the state assuming a more western ethos was in part an extension of an expanding repertoire of Texas frontier and Revolutionary memory that Texans had been developing and refining for several decades. Those events and historical actors, conflicts and customs dovetailed nicely with national narratives of "the westerning experience" that by the first decades of the twentieth century increasingly became the lens through which Americans conceived of their history and understood their country's trajectory, and through these, themselves. The state's role in the development of cowboy culture became another entry

---

6 Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 40-41; Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," 131,134-135, 138; Richard White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill." in *The Frontier in American Culture,* ed. James R. Grossman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 9.

See note 5 above on the problems of Buenger's use of Texan, Western, and American as somewhat interchangeable in contrast to Confederate memory. Buenger suggests that as Texans approached the Centennial they "abandoned the limited possibilities and racist ideology implicit in the Lost Cause and adopted the mantle of progress of the Texas Revolution." Walter L. Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction and the Great Depression* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 258. Karen Cox, in describing how national reconciliation was achieved, explains: "The North had accepted the Lost Cause narrative as fact, which was an essential element of reunion. That narrative . . . was, at its core, about preserving white supremacy." Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 158.

point into this national mythology of the American west, and Texans eagerly cast themselves as "western" to accommodate and capitalize on the expectation. The present chapter assesses the public face white elite Texans put on to host their state's centennial celebrations--a world's fair in their central exposition, a full calendar of regional festivals, and hundreds of dedications of monuments and historical markers across the state--to examine their product, the public and popular image of the land, its history and inhabitants in their massive campaign to "Sell Texas to Texans and Others." The first section examines the origins of the centennial, its conceptual and legislative development, the bidding process for the central exposition and the discourse regarding the event once the bid was awarded. The second section inspects the symbolic profile of the central exposition by considering the inaugural parade, opening ceremonies, their participants and the built environment--the architectural, sculptural, artistic and commemorative representations--of the event. The third section considers the thirty major monuments of the Texas Centennial Commission, a statewide counterpart to the central exposition's commemorative visage, as well as a handful of monuments raised by groups independent of the

state or federal centennial funding, to appraise the state's memorial landscape at the close of its momentous anniversary.[7]

By the middle 1920s, Texas business and civic leaders had organized around the idea of a large-scale celebration commemorating the state's 1936 centennial year. Their steering body, the "commission of 100," was formed to begin conceiving of and planning for such an event, the economic benefits of which were frequently touted as providing the opportunity "to advance the State commercially for perhaps fifty years." Such declarations of the projected financial windfall associated with the occasion took on an increased sense of urgency after the market crash of 1929, and the centennial became a sort of panacea, part focal point and part rallying cry, which Texas political and business leaders repeatedly invoked against the effects of the Great Depression. An organization, Progressive Texans, Inc., was formed in the early 1930s with the purpose of promoting industry in the state. The group held close ties to the newly constituted Texas Centennial Commission (TCC)--Cullen F. Thomas of Dallas serving in an executive

---

7 "Texans Urged to Turn Eyes Toward South," *Dallas Morning News,* August 22, 1931; Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," 135. Cummins states that "Popular culture during the 1930s increasingly presented Texas to the nation and the world as a western place." Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 39. The commemorative products of the centennial comprise a catalogue far too great to completely consider here. The three aspects chosen for this chapter are the original concept of a centennial celebration and its evolution, the commemorative face of the central exposition as told through a handful of ceremonies, the commemorative sculpture and architecture of the grounds, and lastly the major TCC monuments and a few substantial non-TCC memorials.

capacity on both--and it outlined a five-year development campaign to coincide with the Centennial celebrations that would employ the state's newspaper media to promote "the State's industrial possibilities and Texas products," the overall theme of which, as declared by Governor Ross S. Sterling in his keynote before a gathering of the industry group's directors, was to "Sell Texas to Texans and others."[8]

The constitutional amendment which permitted the state to fund the Centennial passed in November 1932 without any specification as to the amount or distribution of monies, only authorizing the legislature "to make an appropriation for the support and maintenance of the exposition," and to provide for an unspecified number of "subsidiary celebrations," declaring that the purpose of all centennial activities would be to commemorate "the heroic period of early Texas history." A *Dallas Morning News* correspondent succinctly appraised the situation less than two years before that of the centennial: "The greatest and most urgent of problems to be

---

8 "Forward Steps Planned by Centennial Body, *Dallas Morning News,* January 20, 1925; "Pick Two at Waco for Centennial Committee, *Dallas Morning News,* April 20, 1924; "To Name Two for Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* April 19, 1924; "Heads Managers," *Dallas Morning News,* May 27, 1934; "Contennial (sic) Plea To Be Expressed Via Film Screen," *Dallas Morning News,* August 6, 1934; "Texans Urged to Turn Eyes Toward South," *Dallas Morning News,* August 22, 1931; "Anticotton Truck Measure Is Passed by Large Majority," *Dallas Morning News,* May 3, 1931. While the Centennial was so regularly touted as promising a state-wide economic impact of "fifty years" that it became a promotional mantra, it wasn't beyond the sponsors' rhetoric to suggest that the celebration would "influence progress for another 100 years." "Texas Centennial Measure," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931.

solved is of course that of financing, and after that there will be the question of the magnitude and character of the celebration." Any cities wishing to vie for "the privilege and profit" of hosting the central exposition needed to anticipate and calculate two outside sources of funding, those of the state legislature and the federal government through its Public Works Administration, in addition to the monies that could be secured locally in drafting their bids. That the state and federal funds weren't to be appropriated prior to the September 1, 1934 application deadline seemed to complicate the bidding process, but one provision of the centennial amendment offered clarity, if also controversy. The stipulation provided "for holding the principal celebration in that city or community that offers the largest financial inducement of support," to which one member of the TCC objected, characterizing it as "the selling of the centennial to the highest bidder." Cullen Thomas defended the clause, stating it did not amount to "an auction of patriotism," having earlier characterized the centennial celebrations as "a revival of patriotism in an era of materialism." Grumblings aside, this feature of the legislation at least provided the measure against which aspiring cities would be judged.[9]

Before any city was awarded the central exposition, the publicity machine was in full swing in its campaign "to sell Texans on their state's 100th birthday." In the summer of 1934 the publicity committee of the TCC distributed 4,500 copies of a brochure detailing the history of the Texas Centennial movement, and beginning in November of the following year, 15,000 copies of the weekly *Texas Centennial Review* to the state's newspapers, chambers of commerce, labor and

---

9 "Centennial Plan Delay is Hurtful to State-Wide Aim," *Dallas Morning News,* March 28, 1934; "Centennial Board Lays Foundation for Celebration," *Dallas Morning News,* March 25, 1934; "Texas Centennial Measure Is Passed," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931.

civic organizations, libraries, luncheon clubs and individuals. In addition to print media, sponsors spread the Centennial message via radio and outdoor advertising, posters and window cards, and 250,000 postage stamps. TCC members Lowry Martin and Walter D. Cline, and Pat Neff, ex-Governor and president of Baylor University, gave "screen talks," movie trailers promoting the Centennial that ran in eighty motion picture theaters across the state. Lowry Martin set a high bar in is his address, calling "this patriotic and progressive project," the centennial, "the greatest event in Texas history," and stating that it would "be a challenge to the patriotism, business judgement and common sense of every Texan." Characterizing it as "the opportunity to demonstrate his patriotism and love for his state . . . the time has come for every Texan to do his duty in making this great investment for Texas a success . . . ; the time is here when the acid test as to our greatness will be made. Texans never fail!" The message was explicit, linking the state's heroic past to its prosperous future by way of Texans full participation in the centennial, or as Lowry put it, "It will not only give the opportunity to pay tribute to the heroes of the past but . . . to . . . participate in the glories that are to be."[10]

As the September 1, 1934 deadline for bids for the central exposition approached, Dallas, Houston and San Antonio emerged as the major players. The hopeful municipalities were

---

10 "No Cash Minimum Set on Centennial, Hulen Says," *Dallas Morning News,* August 4, 1934; "Texas Centennial Brochures Relate History of State," *Dallas Morning News,* September 2, 1934; "Contennial [sic] Plea To Be Expressed Via Film Screen," *Dallas Morning News,* August 6, 1934; "Tourist Crop" *Dallas Morning News,* August 8, 1934; "Dallas Ad League Enters Campaign to Get Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* August 8, 1934; "Radio Programs Start in Earnest," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 21, 1935.

provided a detailed schedule of specifications for necessary infrastructure, improvements, utilities and services, along with terms of profit distribution and suggested scope and character of the celebration. Dallas boosters began rallying their constituency for their help in raising between five and eight million dollars, what they understood to be the city's equal share of the total amount the Centennial Commission predicted the state legislature and federal government would partner in. The Dallas plan called for "a $2,500,000 municipal bond issue, plus subscriptions underwritten by business men for $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 more, plus free use of the State Fair of Texas grounds and buildings, now valued at $3,500,000." A few days before the deadline, Houston representative Judge Clarence Wharton requested an extension, stating that while the citizens of Houston backed the venture, without knowing more of the portions to be provided by the legislature and federal agencies, it would be "next to impossible . . . to submit an intelligent bid." This opened the door for Dallas sponsors, who stressed their previous experience and readiness to go forward as partners with the legislature. No extension was granted, however, and all bids were submitted by noon, September 1, 1934. On September 9,

after visiting sites in Dallas, Houston and San Antonio, the Centennial Board unanimously awarded the central exposition to Dallas.[11]

A confluence of factors had contributed to Dallas enjoying the inside track on winning the centennial exposition from the onset: the city's core of business and civic leaders--some of

---

11 "Centennial Board Lays Foundation for Celebration," *Dallas Morning News,* March 25, 1934; "Houston Has Hope of Being Site for Texas Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1934; "Centennial Board Sets $15,000,000 as Its Minimum," *Dallas Morning News,* July 17, 1934; "Call Citizenship to Make Decision About Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* August 1, 1934; "Eight Million Bid Advocated for Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* August 4, 1934; "Centennial Aid to be Asked of Dallas Council," *Dallas Morning News,* August 10, 1934; "Houston Asks Delay on Centennial Bids," *Dallas Morning News,* August 26, 1934; "Dallas Bid Ready to Place Before Centennial Body," *Dallas Morning News,* August 28, 1934; "1936 Centennial Bids are Received But Kept Secret," *Dallas Morning News,* September 2, 1934; "C. of C. Board to Discuss Bid for Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* September 2, 1934; "Centennial Board Coming to Dallas to Look Over Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 3, 1934; "Dallas Unanimously Chosen For Texas Centennial Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 10, 1934. Fort Worth was expected to be a fourth city vying for the central exposition but apparently did not submit a bid, opting instead to host their own centennial celebration, the Texas Frontier Centennial; "Texas Centennial," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/lkt01), accessed May 25, 2015; Wesley E. Sparling, "Texas Frontier Centennial," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/lkt03), accessed May 25, 2015.

whom, such as Cullen Thomas, even serving on the TCC--who had been conceiving of and angling for the event since their days on the "committee of 100" more than a decade earlier, their forty-plus years of experience planning, promoting and putting on the State Fair of Texas, and the existing infrastructure, installations and facilities at Fair Park that substantially bolstered and distinguished their bid chief among them. City leaders were happy to portray the centennial coup as the latest chapter in a narrative of success that featured Dallas as the dynamic protagonist, uniquely representative of the state's rising fortunes. "The spirit that built Dallas from a cleared spot on the banks of the Trinity River to the industrial and commercial leader of today," began one *Dallas Morning News* feature reporting on a coming bond issue in support of the exposition, calling the event "the spark that will set off a modern renaissance for the city that has already risen to success along with the Lone Star State." (The same piece, commenting on the prospect of securing a congressional appropriation for the exposition, noted that ". . . since Texas is 'sitting pretty' with the United States Government in Washington, little trouble is expected.") A few weeks later, R. L. Thorton, who had headed Dallas' bid for the centennial exposition, penned a history of the city for the *Morning News* titled "Dallas, Neither Port City Nor Fort, Built by Hardy Man Power," in which he called Dallas "the center of the Southwest," and the region "a new land of opportunity." The op-ed was accompanied by a large, stylized illustration titled "Dallas, the City of Opportunity," which depicted the city as a modern, industrial metropolis. The news that Dallas had won the centennial came along with the declaration that Dallas was "a community of Texanic Texans," and that although "there was consideration of hallowed grounds and nobility of enterprise, . . . the Centennial Commission

took thought also of . . . the Texas that the fathers--the men whose blood was let at the Alamo, at Goliad and at San Jacinto--had thought to build."[12]

In calculating their projections of the commercial and cultural scope of the centennial, TCC members often looked to the "Century of Progress" exposition that had run through parts of

---

12 "City Is Mobilizing Its Forces for Launching $13,500,000 Centennial in 1936," *Dallas Morning News,* September 11, 1934; "Dallas, Neither Port City Nor Fort, Built by Hardy Man Power," *Dallas Morning News,* October 7, 1934; "Dallas, the City of Opportunity," *Dallas Morning News,* October 7, 1934; "Dallas Unanimously Chosen For Texas Centennial Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 10, 1934. Thorton's editorial and the accompanying illustration reflect the approach described by David Wrobel of land boosters "to present western places as frontiers of opportunity, while at the same time seeking to purge from readers' consciousness the possibility that any of the hardships and dangers . . . existed in those promised lands," and that "social and industrial development of the state" needed to be sufficiently highlighted. While Dallas in the 1930s was developed well beyond "pioneer privations," the promotional language and tone was of the same genre as the one described by Wrobel. David M. Wrobel, *Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), 14, 60. The statement that Texas was "sitting pretty" with the Federal Government could have been a reference to any number of connections: that John Nance Garner, a Texan, was vice president; that Jesse Holman, of Houston, had been appointed by President Franklin Roosevelt chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; that Texas' strong Democratic Party had helped Roosevelt win the state by a wide margin in 1932.

1933 and 1934 in Chicago. Cullen Thomas and other TCC officials visited the site on a number of occasions in the summer and fall of 1934, and its economic impact was frequently cited as a precursor to what could be expected from the Texas festivities. Furthermore, the Chicago fair's theme of "Progress" was an aspect of Texas that Dallas patrons were eager to showcase in their celebration. As early as 1931 Cullen Thomas, in praising the Texas Senate for their efforts in conceiving of the centennial, predicted the pageant "will properly commemorate the heroism of the early pioneers and celebrate 100 years of Texas progress." Another commentator echoed these dual themes of the event, history and progress, even while acknowledging that "the purpose is to commemorate 'the heroic period of early Texas history'; . . . While the design should be primarily to tell the romantic story of Texas' first 100 years in ways which would make it a civic rite, by exciting the pride and patriotism of Texans, . . . also there should be gathered a display of the State's progress in the arts and sciences and industries, together with an exhibition of its wealth and economic opportunity." The second prong of this dual-themed concept of the centennial, that of showcasing the state's progress, wealth and economic opportunity, even extended to the bottom-line rationale for the event, as boosters often pointed out "in addition to commemorating its heroes, Texas, in its 1936 Centennial, has an opportunity . . . to advance the state commercially for perhaps fifty years." By the end of October 1934 the interpretation of the centennial had morphed into two discrete objectives in the view of one reporter covering Dallas' centennial bond issue election: "Celebration of Texas Centennial will be in two parts, the historic and patriotic phases are to be state-wide in scope, and the central exposition which will be located in Dallas to depict largely the economic, scientific and commercial aspects of Texas." And in the first edition of the *Texas Centennial Review,* published in November of 1935, the TCC

announced that "The State of Texas officially opened the Centennial year celebration of independence and progress" in Gonzales earlier that month.[13]

When Dallas was awarded the bid, patrons of the rival cities pledged cooperation, if sometimes grudgingly. The editorial board of the *San Antonio Express,* for example, affirmed their intention to get behind the Dallas fair while lamenting that the TCC had sided with Dallas' concept of "a great industrial exposition" rather than an "observance [that] should be predominantly historical." The San Antonio daily, here drawing a negative connection to the Chicago festival, was still happy to contrast the Dallas approach, "another 'Century of Progress' for Texas" in their view, with their city's vision, "Texas' Century of Independence." The Alamo City did take some consolation in the fact that it was one of a handful of sites of prescribed "Secondary Fetes," and as such would receive sizable allotments of state and federal aid. Indeed, the awarding of the central exposition bid set off a new and intensified period of jockeying for

---

13 "City Obtaining Texas Centennial to be Benefitted," *Dallas Morning News,* August 12, 1934; "Big Value of Fair to Chicago is Told Centennial Chiefs," *Dallas Morning News,* September 1, 1934; "Centennial Board Coming to Dallas to Look Over Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 3, 1934; "Committee Named To Plan Smaller Centennial Fetes," *Dallas Morning News,* October 4, 1934; "Texas Centennial Measure," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931; "Centennial Plan Delay is Hurtful to State-Wide Aim," *Dallas Morning News,* March 28, 1934; "Head Managers," *Dallas Morning News,* May 27, 1934; "Five-to-One Majority Scored As City Favors Centennial Bonds to Assure Huge Fair," *Dallas Morning News,* October 31, 1934; "Other Spots to Portray Spirit," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, November 21, 1935.

the state and federal funds still to be divided between that event and the state-wide celebrations. Speaking before the United States Texas Centennial Commission in Washington, D. C., Jesse H. Jones of Houston, who had been appointed chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1933, denounced the "chamber of commerce spirit" of the Texas Central Exposition Corporation, along with the $2,000,000 request submitted in their application, arguing in favor of that amount going instead to the Alamo, San Jacinto and Goliad historic sites. "To me, it will be little less than sacrilege to spend this money for strictly exposition or commercial purposes," Jones continued, dismayed that the Dallas contingent, having secured both local and state funds, sought still more: "More money spent to have a big time--none of which will have any serious or direct connection with the sacred events we are to memorialize. A few more dollars spent in this manner will be only that much more to make the show a little bigger, but to get which we must rob the very heart and purpose of the Centennial." Rather than simply facile swipes taken at a dynamic rival city who had won an important commission, these critiques most likely represented genuine unease in some sectors regarding the way in which Texas prepared to commemorate its 100 years of independence from Mexico.[14]

---

14 "Dallas Unanimously Chosen For Texas Centennial Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 10, 1934; "What Other Papers Say," *Dallas Morning News,* September 17, 1934; "Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935. San Antonio received $400,000 in federal funds for their centennial celebration. Lionel V. Patenaude, "Jones, Jesse Holman," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fjo53), accessed April 30, 2015.

When the central exposition of the Texas centennial opened on June 6, 1936, organizers were ready to present their state to local, national and international audiences in an image they had carefully crafted for some time. That image had been cultivated for several years leading up to the event in promotional materials such as newsletters, radio and screen talks, print advertising and newspaper editorials, and now was constituted by the ceremonies, exhibitions, architectural scheme and attractions of the event itself. Elements of the composition reflecting the American West and casting Texas as embodying a frontier ethos certainly found their way into the Dallas festivities, but at Fair Park these worked as complementary aspects within the greater theme of "the Cavalcade of Texas," represented by the myriad and ubiquitous iterations of the Six Flags motif, which, like other products of the frontier memory repertoire, "erased part of a larger, more confusing and tangled, cultural story to deliver up a clean, dramatic and compelling narrative." Within this context, the state's frontier and western *bona fides* of the Texas Revolution, the Texas Rangers, and the state's place in the history of cowboy culture became part of a larger, national

trajectory of expansion and progress, a tradition that could be touted equally by Texans and Americans alike and experienced vicariously through memory and celebration.[15]

At the head of the parade which marked the opening of the Central Exposition, just behind a phalanx of motorcycle policemen, rode six horsemen carrying the flags of Spain, France, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the Confederacy and the United States, a Texas-specific version of a familiar "progress of civilization" narrative of American development. Grand Marshall John Hulen of Fort Worth and his Chief of Staff rode in the lead car, followed by twenty-five mounted Texas Rangers. The United States Marine Corps Band trailed, treating the assembled spectators with musical numbers they would later perform at the Ceremony of Flags

---

15 "Cavalcade Presents Flags of Texas History," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 18, January 11, 1936; White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill," 9. Buenger has suggested that an overemphasis on the "terrible triplets" of Texas identity, which he identifies as southern, western, and exceptional, has "often obscured more than (it) uncovered." He offers an alternative view, in which historians begin to "conceive of Texas as a border region with ties and influences stretching . . . across multiple regions and national boundaries, as a place whose cultural identity has been constructed and reconstructed repeatedly through the conflict and cooperation of disparate groups originally from across these borders, and as a region that as a consequence of those borders and that constructed identity explained and influenced other parts of North America and beyond." Walter L. Buenger, "Texas Identity: Alternatives to the Terrible Triplets," in *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013), 3, 13.

such as "The Eyes of Texas" and "Dixie." Governor James Allred, Sheriff Smoot Schmidt, and Allred's "small son, Jim Boy, in cowboy costume" then led a large succession of local, state and federal officials in open cars, succeeded by a number of military units, the "Centennial Rangers" and a "colorful aggregation of 150 riders and horses from the exposition rodeo and (their) cowboy band."[16]

The Centennial rangers were a contingent of the event's large police force and security detail, their number ranging between twenty and around one hundred and twenty depending on the occasion, and whether mounted or on foot the unit went uniformed in "the traditional frontier attire of the old rangers." Although they were under the direction of Captain Leonard Pack, commander of the "special police force" of the exposition, their main function was ceremonial and theatrical, as they rode and marched in parades and performed in commemorations and exhibitions. An important component of this ceremonial aspect of their mission was their use as special escort to esteemed guests of and visitors to the fair, many of whom were made honorary Centennial rangers, presented with ten-gallon hats and commissions signed by Governor Allred. One observer explained the connection of the Texas Ranger to the "Anglo-Texan legend" thusly: "The Texan [believes he] has no equal anywhere, but within Texas itself there developed a

---

16 "Cavalcade Presents Flags of Texas History," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 18, January 11, 1936; "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; Louis S. Warren, *Buffalo Bill's America: William Cody and the Wild West Show* (New York: Random House, 2005), xiii.

special breed of men, the Texas Rangers, in whom the Texan's qualities reached their culmination." With their ubiquity and ceremonial significance at the central exposition they functioned both as ambassadors of the centennial and "in-the-flesh" symbols of the state's frontier and western heritage. Their appearance in the inaugural parade positioned between the actual Rangers and the exposition's rodeo riders reminded spectators of this connection, and their

frequent deployment on horseback in "traditional frontier attire" imbued the desired "wild west" atmosphere to the exposition grounds at Fair Park.[17]

At around noon the column of automobiles paused at the main vehicular entrance to the fair grounds to allow the dignitaries to formally open the festivities. Miss Frances Nalle, Bluebonnet Girl of the exposition, presented a "$50,000 jeweled key" to Mrs. Fred

---

17 "Centennial Police Force to be Larger Than of Many Cities," *Dallas Morning News,* May 3, 1936; "Friendliness and Courtesy Texans Show in Town and at Centennial Impress Visitors," *Dallas Morning News,* June 10, 1936; "Fall Fashions, Fine Horses to Parade at Fair," *Dallas Morning News,* September 23, 1936; "Bob Taylor Takes In Centennial Just Like Any Ordinary Tourist," *Dallas Morning News,* July 4, 1936; "Harvard Club Officials Made Centennial Rangers," *Dallas Morning News,* October 8, 1936; "Wisconsin Senator Receives Hat and Centennial Scroll," *Dallas Morning News,* November 18, 1936; "With Sadness Over Centennial Ending, Dallas Looks Forward to 1937 Fair," *Dallas Morning News,* November 30, 1936; Américo Paredes, *"With His Pistol in His Hand:" A Border Ballad and Its Hero* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958), 15-16, 24. Along with "122 Centennial Rangers on foot and mounted," the exposition employed as many as "134 uniformed guides in traditional cowboy costume," "ninety-one guards," over a hundred "uniformed men . . . [who] will wear the conventional navy blue of the Dallas police force" as well as "plainclothes officers" to round out a force that organizers boasted was larger than any Texas cities but Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston and San Antonio. The Texas Rangers as a symbol of the frontier served double duty, operating as short-hand for both the "Indian fighting" aspects of the state's frontier history and for their role of protection and enforcement along the Mexican border.

Schenkenberg, president of a local chapter of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, who then entrusted it to Governor Allred, who used the ceremonial key to unlock a barrier. Then, U. S. Secretary of Commerce Daniel C. Roper, speaking into a microphone which would broadcast his words to an international audience, declared "the State of Texas sends greetings to all the peoples of the world on the occasion of her 100th birthday, and invites you to join us here at the exposition in 1936." With these words, the ribbon cutting commenced, after a fashion. In a nod to both the international scope of the exposition and the event's underlying theme of progress, organizers had devised a contraption that harnessed Roper's address to open the fair both figuratively and, it would seem, literally, as described by a *Dallas Morning News* correspondent: "Instantly the Secretary's message began its trip around the world, reaching the entrance gateway again two minutes and five seconds later to give the electrical impulse which operated the ribbon cutting scissors." The procession then advanced to the Cotton Bowl, filing in and taking their positions for the flag raising ceremony.[18]

The pageant began with a United States infantry band playing a centuries-old Spanish war hymn as "a squadron of riders dashed across the Cotton Bowl arena carrying the royal banner of old Castile and Aragon." The address of Agusto Barcia, the Foreign Minister of Spain,

---

18 "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936. The use of Miss Frances Nalle, Bluebonnet Girl, in the opening of the exposition was a variation on the Confederate tradition of using children to unveil monuments as a symbolic opening of a gift from the project's patrons to future generations. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 61-68, 70.

was then broadcast from Madrid, in which he noted that "Spanish heroes are vitally connected with your great region," and that the explorers Coronado and Cabeza de Vaca are "honored in your country as in our own." Following his brief address the band played the Spanish national anthem and the Spanish standard was raised on the first of six "towering" flagpoles as the assembled crowd stood at attention. A similar ritual then transpired honoring France, the address provided by Andre Maurois, "one of France's greatest living men of letters." As Barcia did before him, Maurois stated "In our country we recall with pride the notable figures of French blood who had a part in your great drama of history," particularly mentioning "the famous explorer La Salle," among others. As he finished his remarks a band played the Marseillaise and the historic French banner was raised. The tri-colors of Mexico was then unfurled to a live rendition of the Mexican national anthem. Frank Chapa, a prominent San Antonio resident, then addressed the crowd via radio broadcast from the Alamo, stating "I speak for thousands of Mexican settlers in Texas who refused to bow to the tyranny of the Dictator Santa Anna and joined forces with Austin and other colonists to achieve the independence and freedom of Texas." It is unclear from this vantage why Texas' time beneath the banner of Mexico was reduced to Santa Anna's dictatorship when this period could have been depicted in honoring the Republic of Texas, for the sake of the program's parallel structure if nothing else, but as one

observer noted, ". . . all dignitaries, including officers of the United States and Texas, (saluted), as the Mexican emblem was given its place of honor."[19]

Col. Andrew Jackson Houston, last living son of Sam Houston, spoke next on behalf of the Republic of Texas, broadcast from Washington-on-the-Brazos, "where the [Texas]

---

19 "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936. The Premier of France, Leon Blum, had been scheduled to address the Cotton Bowl festivities from abroad, but "Riots in Paris and other matters made it impossible for the official to talk." On the surface, the choice to have a United States citizen represent Mexico, and the rather undignified characterization of that period, especially in comparison to the reverent representations of Spanish and French Texas, would seem a slight to that country and perhaps signal some sort of lesser diplomatic status or tension between the United States/ Texas and their southern neighbor. However, it could also be read at least in part as a concession to both San Antonio, which vied for the central exposition, and politically powerful Mexican Americans, a small but significant group of which Frank Chapa belonged. In his remarks that day, Chapa also declared "People of my race and those of Texas have been one for a hundred years and we are honored to have this part in the program and to bring greetings to those at Dallas." Cynthia E. Orozco, "Chapa, Frank L.," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fchar), accessed April 06, 2015; Teresa Palomo Acosta, "Chapa, Francisco A.," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fch50), accessed April 06, 2015.

Declaration of Independence was signed." Houston told the story "that when the flag of the Independent Republic was lowered at Austin by the last president, Anson Jones, men and women wept, . . . and that when they raised the Stars and Stripes, they cheered royally." Houston then noted that although "Texas at present is enjoying a profound peace . . . ever have her sons known war. Our sons have fought in five wars. Hundreds of thousands of men and women of Mexican ancestry live among us today, among the finest citizens we have," and that "Old enmities are forgotten and forgiven." He concluded his address with the following wish: "My fervent prayer, in bringing this greeting to the great Centennial exposition at Dallas, is that all Christendom shall know war no longer. Adieu, my friends, goodbye, adios." As the flag of the Republic of Texas was raised, military bands played "The Eyes of Texas" and "Come to the Bower." Dr. Bolling Lee, descendent of General Robert E. Lee, then spoke "on behalf of Texas' membership in the Confederacy." In his address Lee made explicit not only Texas' participation in the Confederate cause but also the role southerners had played in Texas' war for independence:

> I bring you greetings from the State of Virginia and all the States which were associated with you in the Confederate Government. Twice have our States and Texas shown their loyalty to each other--once when we poured men and aid to you in your struggle for independence and then some years later when Texas, with less than 500,000 inhabitants, furnished more than 50,000 soldiers to the Government of Jefferson Davis. They were among the best and bravest of Lee's troops.

Then, in a statement that demonstrated both the universal acceptance and plasticity of the Lost Cause, Dr. Lee, speaking of the Civil War, declared that "Although that struggle tore the Nation in twain, the event served in the end to weld us all closer together and today the United States knows no boundaries, no divisions." A seven-starred Confederate flag, signifying Texas' place in

the secessional order, was then raised to the accompaniment of "Dixie" and "other airs of the Old South."[20]

Commerce Secretary Daniel Roper, present at the event, then delivered greetings on behalf of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He noted the "impressive pageant" of the flag ceremony, "which . . . characterizes 400 years of steady growth. Under these six banners a courageous and forward looking people have lived and made history worth commemorating." The secretary's address nicely wedded the event's dual themes, declaring that the state's "deep and patriotic tradition . . . has furnished the empetus (sic) for an almost unbelievable commercial, agricultural and economic development," and that with the exposition it would now "commemorate the heroes who at the Alamo, at Goliad and at San Jacinto won her a great heritage." He stated that it was "an inspiration" for him "to view the broad sweep and concept with which Texans have captured the glorious past and combined it with the progress of the present day." The band transitioned from "The Stars and Stripes Forever" to "The Star-Spangled Banner" as "Old Glory rose slowly in the air while the five other symbols of sovereignty descended slowly in deference to the ruling flag. Then followed a pageant of Texas history including the floats and principals who took part in the morning parade." The visiting dignitaries

---

20 "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936. Dr. Bolling Lee was not present at the Cotton Bowl for his address, which he presumably delivered from Virginia. The *Dallas Morning News* report of the event notes that Commerce Secretary Daniel Roper was the "last speaker and only one on the ground at Dallas."

and exposition officials paused for luncheon before resuming their afternoon schedule of ceremonies and dedications. At 3:00 pm Miss Christine Lamb of Nashville representing Tennessee Governor Hill McAlister presented her state's Hall of Heroes in the Varied Industrial Arts Building, which was formally accepted by Governor Allred. Around 5:00 pm, "the $50,000 Negro Building, first of its kind at an international exposition, was dedicated impressively." At 5:30 pm Governor Allred, Secretary Roper and members of the state and federal Texas

Centennial Commissions dedicated the $1,125,000 Federal Exhibits Building. The exposition's price tag, previously projected at $15,000,000, was now widely cited as being $25,000,000.[21]

---

21 "350,000 View 3-Mile Parade To Exposition," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "France, Spain Send Greeting In Radio Talks," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; "Centennial Exposition Scenes as Texas' $25,000,000 Fair Throws Wide Its Gates to the World," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1936; *"*Negroes to Raise Funds At Centennial Barbeque," *Dallas Morning News,* June 25, 1935; *"*Centennial Fete Set for Negroes," *Dallas Morning News,* July 15, 1935; *"*Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935; "Inspiration to Future Ages Seen in Showy Texas Shrine, Focal Point of Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* September 26, 1936; "Eight Million Bid Advocated for Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* August 4, 1936; "Centennial Board Coming to Dallas to Look Over Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 3, 1934. It is unclear if the "Empire of Texas" verbiage was used in Secretary Roper's oratory as the phrase was not included in the quoted text of his address, although it does appear in a correspondent's paraphrasing of his remarks. The same phrase is used in the paper a week later, both as sub-headline and quoted text attributed to President Franklin D. Roosevelt. "Roosevelt at Centennial, Salutes Empire of Texas," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936. The TCC organized barbeques to raise funds ($50,000, by the sale of Centennial bonds) for the "Negro Building" at the exposition in June and July of 1935. When the United States Centennial Commission committed itself to a $1,200,000 appropriation that August, those funds came with a stipulation "that from this amount a suitable sum may be devoted to a distinctive recognition of the progress and development of the Negro in America."

Dallas Architect George Dahl had guided the project from the earliest planning stages, and the entire site was stamped with his architectural vision and aesthetic. As with the parade and the flag-raising ceremony of the exposition's inaugural day, the built environment of Fair Park reflected the "Cavalcade of Texas" motif, which highlighted frontier and western imagery beneath a larger thematic umbrella. At the main entrance of the fairgrounds, Dahl's plan had added a towering, four-sided pylon, with a large star at the top. A two-paneled frieze titled *Buffalo Hunt*, repeated once around the structure's perimeter, depicted a scene of cowboys on horseback racing alongside buffalo (and what appear to be longhorn cattle) in one frame alternating with a scene of pioneers on foot and horseback alongside a wagon train in the following. While the pace of the action expressed slowed from one scene to the next, from a stampede in one to a plodding progression, they both portrayed movement, and at various times each probably mimicked the foot traffic and activity at the gates through which passed the streams of visitors to the exposition, helping to tie participation in the event through attendance to the histories it intended to commemorate, as had been suggested by much of the event's promotional material. Patrons who passed through these gates, if not propelled on by excitement, who took a hard, immediate left would see, framed by the tall, arched portico of the Maintenance Building and anticipated by a long, narrow reflection pool, the *Spirit of the Centennial* monument. In an overt reference to Botticelli's *The Birth of Venus,* the comely nude

female figure of the *Spirit* monument arose from--and was supported by the arms of--a saguaro cactus instead of the scalloped shell of the original.[22]

Just past the entrance lay a mall that opened to the "Esplanade of Texas." The Esplanade featured a rectangular reflecting pool, several hundred feet in length, down its center, a large fountain on each end, with landscaping and walkways down either side. Bordering the Esplanade were a series of six sculptures, two three-part works, one series on each side, which comprised one of the most prominent expressions of the Six Flags motif of the exposition. On the left, as one approached from the entrance, fronting the Centennial Building and with

---

22 "Eight Million Bid Advocated for Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* August 4, 1936; "Centennial Board Coming to Dallas to Look Over Site," *Dallas Morning News,* September 3, 1934; *Buffalo Hunt*, George Dahl, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Spirit of the Centennial*, Raoul Josset, 1936, Dallas, Texas; Christopher Long, "Dahl, George Leighton," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fda86), accessed April 07, 2015; Sarah Hunter, "Fair Park," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/ggf03), accessed April 07, 2015; Carol Morris Little, *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 142-143, 152. While attributing *Buffalo Hunt* to Dahl, Morris notes that the structure's frieze work was designed by James Buchanan "Buck" Winn, Jr. In her entry on Fair Park, cited above, Sarah Hunter notes that the term Art Deco was not in use at the time of the centennial. This chapter will contrast many works of this movement with monuments that adhere to an aesthetic or realism of an earlier period. Although clearly a reference to the American West, the Saguaro cactus depicted in the *Spirit of the Centennial* is not native to Texas.

accompanying murals on the interior walls of each of its entrance porticos, was *Spain, the Confederacy, and Texas*. On the right visitors encountered *France, Mexico, and the United States* as they ventured up the esplanade. The figures, fashioned in the stylized line and form of the period, each twenty feet high atop a twelve foot base--Dahl characterized the style and scale of the exposition as "Texanic"--were each a female, muse-like personification of their respective sovereignty, replete with appropriate national talismans in hand or upon the breasts of their gowns. The crown of *the Confederacy* had seven stars, again alluding to Texas' place in the order of secession, for example, while *the United States* boasted an emblem of a shield on her gown, a sprig of laurel in her hand. The accompanying murals, directly behind the sculptures on the interior walls of the large porticos of the exhibition buildings, portrayed each sovereignty with similar symbolism, provided dates for their respective periods and offered relevant notes on their significance. Mexico's mural told visitors, for instance: "This Republic fostered the entry of the first American colonists, a people destined to mould a Great Empire." Whereas the two pieces are roughly chronological in their own right--allowing that Texas might grant themselves the last word over the Confederacy at their centennial--they had been somehow "balanced" rather than simply divided chronologically. Their composition and relative placement allowed for visitors to transverse the space seeming to experience them in some semblance of

chronological order while arriving at a *Texas* and *United States* at the end of the Esplanade, ready then to enter, at the head of the column, in direct line from the main entrance, the Hall of State.[23]

The Six Flags motif was repeated on the Texas Centennial Seal, which appeared on bronze plates that commemorated the event. It was repeated by seals of the six sovereignties and a bas-relief figure representative of each on two fluted bronze standards that flanked the main

---

23 *Spain, the Confederacy, and Texas,* Laurence Tenney Stevens, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *France, Mexico, and the United States*, Raoul Josset, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *France, Mexico, and United States* (Murals), Pierre Bourdelle, 1936, Dallas, Texas; "Cavalcade Presents Flags of Texas History," *Texas Centennial Review*, Vol. 1, No. 18, January 11, 1936; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 150-151, 163; Hunter, "Fair Park," *Handbook of Texas Online*; in her entry on Fair Park, cited above, Sarah Hunter notes that the term Art Deco was not in use at the time of the Centennial, as does Light Cummins in "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western," 51. It should be noted that the physical order of *France, Mexico, and the United States*, from left to right, are the sculptures depicting the United States, Mexico, and France, the reverse order of the work's title. The change allowed the two pieces to mirror one another across the water feature and as visitors progressed down the Esplanade while maintaining the rough chronology of the design. In another case of curious unequal treatment of subjects, the imagery in the Mexican "seal" of that country's mural is pre-Columbian, inspired by and drawn from the mesoamerican cultures that populated the region prior to their defeat by the Spanish in 1521. While not of the correct period (Mexico's periodization in the Six Flags motif and presented with the mural is 1821-1836, Mexico's national period), it is possible that it was chosen to contrast with the "Christian" heritage of the United States.

entrance to the plaza that announced the Hall of State. The plaza could be accessed by this front, main entrance, or by one of two others, these positioned opposite one another, one on the far left (north) side and one on the far right (south) side of the Hall's facade. The words "Romance" and "Honor" were carved in the stone capitals that marked the north entrance; "Adventure" and "Fortune" in those that marked the south. Forming a banner across the frieze of the Hall of State appeared the names of sixty illustrious Texans, radiating out from Stephen F. Austin to the left of the building's entrance, Sam Houston to its right. Henderson, Roberts, Zavala, Bowie, Reagan, in time Navarro, Coronado, Piñeda, Leon, Cabeza de Vaca, the names continued around the frieze of the building's south wing, abated on the rear, east wing, and picked up again on the back side of the north wing, running the length of two of that structure's three wings to end back at the entrance with "Austin." Houston oil executive Louis W. Kemp as chairman of the Board of Historians for the TCC had selected the names with board members J. Frank Dobie and Paul Foik. Above the main entrance, housed in a towering portico, was an eleven foot bronze, gold-leafed stylized figure of a Native American, arching to raise his bow to the heavens. *Tejas Warrior* "was placed in this frontal position it has been explained," a newspaper correspondent noted, "because it was from the Tejas tribe that the State took its name and in which early settlers found their first friends." There appeared two more images of Native Americans on the exterior of the Hall of State: the east wing, which formed the rear of the building and unlike the north and south wings was without names across its frieze, featured two square cameos of Native American males in profile, facing each other across the eastern-most facade. Carved in a realistic hand that eschewed the popular conventions of the period, they were the only human forms that appeared

in the exterior adornments; the rest depicted various exemplars the state's flora and fauna in the same, more traditional cast.[24]

If the exterior of the Hall of State's east wing, its facade devoid of illustrious names but framed by those of Spanish explorers on the building's south and north wings and punctuated by the two profiled cameos of Native Americans, hinted at the state's "unknown" history, the

---

24 "Historian Visits Hall of State," *Dallas Morning News,* October 13, 1938; *Tejas Warrior*, Allie Victoria Tennant, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Hall of State,* George Dahl, 1936, Dallas, Texas; "Inspiration to Future Ages Seen in Showy Texas Shrine," *Dallas Morning News,* September 26, 1936; Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western," 49-50. Louis S. Warren notes that in Buffalo Bill's "wild west" productions, Native Americans were "routinely divided between noble savages . . . and savage savages, . . . a classic depiction that allowed Europeans and Americans to utilize Indians as symbols without understanding them as complex people." Warren, *Buffalo Bill's America*, 195.

Inside Austin and Houston's name on the facade, but opposite each other above the building's entrance and so not as visible from the front of the Hall are Bonham on the left and Crockett on the right. The first five names after Sam Houston are listed in the order that they appear. The author has provided all of the Spanish surnames included on the Hall of State. At least twelve names (20%, of the sixty, and the vast majority of personages alive during the conflict) carried Confederate association, Reagan and Johnston garnering prominent placement, Reagan appearing as cited above and Johnston to the immediate left of Austin. Other names of Confederate import were Scurry, Green, Lubbock, Wharton, McCulloch, Hemphill, Wheeler, Lane, Bee, and Chambers.

wilderness that preceded the "progress of civilization," the Hall's interior told "the story of Texas from the coming of the first white man." Just inside the doors of the main entrance visitors stepped into the Hall of Heroes, where bronze monuments of six of the state's founding fathers stood upon circular pedestals of polished pink granite. The statuary, all the work of Pompeo Coppini in a realistic style, were interspersed across the crescent-shaped hall between the entrances to the various satellite rooms of the edifice. The subjects of the memorials were, from left to right, James W. Fannin, Mirabeau B. Lamar, Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, Thomas J. Rusk and William B. Travis. On the opposite wall visitors found bronze plates commemorating the Alamo, "Shrine of Texas Liberty," and the battle of San Jacinto. The monuments to Austin and Houston flanked the entrance to the Great Hall in the center of the Hall of Heroes. Upon entering the "Texanic" Great Hall, visitors passed the flags of Spain, Mexico and Texas displayed from wall mountings on their left and those of the United States, the Confederacy and France on their right. Murals, depicting important scenes of the state's history, adorned the north and south walls of the hall, as they did walls throughout the rest of the building's rooms, which were themed to represent diverse geographic regions of the state. The Six Flags motif repeated again in a huge, gold medallion at the head of the Great Hall, where a lone star was surrounded by the personified female forms of the sovereignties, somewhat mirroring the Josset and Tenney pieces from the Esplanade in their placement but presented in greater detail and a more traditional aesthetic. Above the medallion, nearly six stories high, loomed the words of Anson Jones, first spoken in 1845, "The Lone Star of Texas has passed on and become fixed in that glorious

constellation which all freemen and lovers of freedom must reverence and adore, the American Union."[25]

---

25 "Inspiration to Future Ages Seen in Showy Texas Shrine," *Dallas Morning News,* September 26, 1936; *Sam Houston,* Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Stephen F. Austin,* Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Mirabeau B. Lamar,* Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *James Walker Fannin,* Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Thomas Rusk*, Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *William B. Travis*, Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; *Great Hall Medallion,* Joseph Renier, 1936, Dallas, Texas. Louis Warren notes that Buffalo Bill---"an intuitive performance genius," in Warren's estimation---"borrowed readily from a popular theory of history, 'the progress of civilization'," and that "the advancement . . . from savage disorder to enlightened civilization provided a ready-made narrative, a backstory, to every drama set there." Warren, *Buffalo Bill's America*, xiii, 177. Evidence from the Central Exposition suggests event planners shared a similar understanding of the dramatic power of the frontier narrative.

On the wall opposite the Anson Jones quote appeared the following, attributed to Mirabeau B. Lamar: "And well may we be proud to see our national standard float side by side with the star-spangled banner of the fatherland;" The flags in the Great Hall, as well as their allegorical representations in the Hall's medallion, divided into sets of three, reverse Mexico and the Confederacy in the orderings from the Josset and Tenney pieces, but still allow for a "dual allegiance" to the United States and Texas in the final position. This study avoids in-depth treatment of the murals and indeed much of the iconography of the Hall of State, see note 7 on the limited scope of this thesis.

To close out the exposition's first week it played host to perhaps the most honored visitor to the world's fair in its nearly six-month run, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The president, whose son, Elliott, lived in Fort Worth, arrived by train early that day and received "distinguished visitors" in his presidential rail car before joining Mrs. Roosevelt and their son, Governor Allred and Mayor George Sergeant in an open-top car in the motorcade. Once at Fair Park, the president and his party toured the grounds by car before entering the Cotton Bowl, filled nearly to its fifty-thousand seat capacity, the coach circling the arena before stopping at the speaker's platform in the center for the chief executive to alight and then, on the arm of his son, ascend the platform. The crowd took their feet as the Twenty-First Infantry Band struck up "The Star-Spangled Banner;" units from the armed service branches stood at attention before the dais.[26]

The president would eventually tout his "Good Neighbor" policy and find Texas historical precedents for banking reform, corporate regulation and monopoly busting, but addressing the cheering masses in the Cotton Bowl, "filled," as one observer noted, "except for a tiny spot in the negro section behind the rodeo pens," Roosevelt delivered a thumbnail sketch of Texas history that, like the exposition's Six Flags motif, lauded the state's frontier and revolutionary periods as well as its Confederate experience:

> It is not mere acres that count in this world--it is, rather, the character of the people who dwell upon it. You, the people of Texas, have been tried by fire in these hundred years. You have commenced a war for independence. You have been apparently defeated, and then you have won. You have gone through the difficult days of the War between the States and the trials of reconstruction. You have had to fight against oppressors from within and without.

---

26 "50,000 Pack Bowl Cheering Roosevelt at Every Pause," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; "Peak Throng of Texas Trip Jams Stadium," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936.

In his remarks praising the "empire of Texas," Roosevelt used language coded for a southern audience to great effect, but the ease with which he invoked both memory traditions in a single narrative of high patriotism suggests it was an idiom honed by years of practice, and both the president and those in attendance recognized a layered and complex Texas identity that, while selective, could accommodate both lineages.[27]

Along with the central exposition and the dozens of statewide "secondary fetes," the thirty larger monuments and perhaps a thousand smaller markers erected around the state by the TCC rounded out the official memorialization of state's centennial. The appointments to and composition of the relevant committees drew more than a thousand Texans from all corners of the state into the process and no doubt helped to grow interest in the movement. The centennial and attendant promotional activity spurred other groups to fund and erect their own memorials, outside of the TCC's authority, which reflected those groups' own visions of their state's usable pasts. However, despite these non-TCC efforts and the larger pool of community advisors for the TCC projects, Chairman Louis Kemp and the historical board still exercised much influence in the creation and execution of the TCC memorials, and their commissions did not represent much

---

27 "50,000 Pack Bowl Cheering Roosevelt at Every Pause," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; "Roosevelt at Centennial, Salutes Empire of Texas," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; "Peak Throng of Texas Trip Jams Stadium," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; Besides Roosevelt's characterization of the Reconstruction period as "the trials," his use of "the War between the States" reflected his adopting a distinctly southern interpretation of the Civil War.

of a "democratization of memory" outside of the names and events already memorialized in the central exposition and the Hall of State.[28]

The TCC, from its legislative inception to the time they awarded Dallas the bid for the central exposition, grew more than one-hundred fold. An August 18, 1931 news item noted that State Senate Bill No. 53, which was among eleven others signed by then-Governor Ross Sterling, called for "Increasing from nine to twenty-one the number of members of the Texas Centennial Commission." By early 1934, the number had increased to thirty-six, and plans for an "advisory board of more than 1,000 members" were being drawn, "two members from each county appointed by the State Senator representing those counties, two members from each

---

28 "The state placed about 1,100 exposition buildings, memorial museums, statues, and granite and bronze markers and monuments around Texas." http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/state-historical-markers/1936-texas-centennial-markers (accessed 4/14/15). This study considers thirty of the TCC's commissioned works for which the allocated funds were of $7,500 or more, the only exception being the Meusebach tribute at Fredericksburg, for which $2,500 was allocated. The group's remaining memorials all carried price tags ranging from $7,500 to $25,000, perhaps more for San Jacinto monument, part of a $400,000 federal allotment for "commemoration of historic sites." "Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935; Twenty monuments of this group were classified by the TCC as "Statues" while ten were classified as "Monuments." Texas, Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations, *Monuments erected by the state of Texas to commemorate the centenary of Texas independence* (Austin: Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations, 1938), 57-123.

county appointed by each Representative from that county, and 100 or more appointed by the centennial commission." Even if these members were selected from the familiar pools of "prominent citizens," the number of "advisors" grew exponentially with the change, and their collective interest in the project and its attendant anticipation and publicity were probably the desired end Texas lawmakers had in mind. Those same lawmakers sat now at the nexus of great resources and civic responsibility, poised to reward their constituencies with participation in a once-in-a-lifetime event. At the first official meeting of the TCC, in June of 1935, the board had a quorum, and "about 350 members of the centennial advisory board of more than 1,200 . . . were present." It is unclear how many of that group were female, but a number of women were elected to offices on the executive board of the larger body, Mrs. Volney Taylor of Brownsville, Mrs. C. C. Peters of Fort Worth, Mrs. Stone J. Robertson of Dallas and Mrs. John Maxwell of Waco among them. Madam Chairman Taylor was the president of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs, and many of these women, as generations before them, undoubtedly had first entered the public sphere through club participation. Now however, as members of the TCC advisory board, they served alongside and as full partners to their male counterparts. While certainly not leveled, the field of play had been changing for several decades, and the

composition of the advisory committee's executive board, and perhaps that of the greater assembly, reflected that societal shift.[29]

However, the presence of any number of prominent female citizens on the commission's advisory board was not likely to equate to a spike in commemoration of notable Texas women in the centennial monuments. Confederate veterans and their sons had attempted to raise a number of monuments to southern women in the midst of that earlier movement, even erecting a handful in that respect, but had encountered responses from their female auxiliaries that ranged from tepid to outright resistant. And, while women were represented on the executive board of the non-voting advisory committee, there is little evidence of ethnic diversity at even that level of the TCC pyramid. At the top of the temple, above even the lieutenant governor, speaker of the

---

29 "Bill to Protect Buffalo Signed," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1931; "A Group of the Texas Centennial Commission," *Dallas Morning News,* March 30, 1934; "Houston Has Hope of Being Site for Texas Centennial," *Dallas Morning News,* June 7, 1934; "1936 Centennial Bids are Received But Kept Secret," *Dallas Morning News,* September 2, 1934; "Texas Centennial Measure Is Passed," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931; "1936 Centennial Plans are Made at Austin Meet," *Dallas Morning News,* July 3, 1934. Women had, by the 1930s, won a share of the franchise, and in fact the earliest legislation which proposed the Texas Centennial had been introduced in the Senate by Miss Margie Neal, elected to that body in 1926; "Neal, Margie Elizabeth," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fne02), accessed April 14, 2015; A. Elizabeth Taylor, "Woman Suffrage," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/viw01), accessed April 16, 2015.

house, and governor and with the final say on all the TCC's commissions big and small sat the Board of Historians, chaired by Louis W. Kemp, with members J. Frank Dobie and Paul Foik. For the thirty major monuments produced by the commission, the historical board, despite their

reported dissension, did not stray far from the tried-and-true touchstone names and events of Texas memory.[30]

---

30 "Historian Visits Hall of State," *Dallas Morning News,* October 13, 1938; "Historical Board Split on Use of Centennial Fund," *Dallas Morning News,* October 8, 1935; "Centennial Board Lays Foundation for Celebration," *Dallas Morning News,* March 25, 1934. J. Frank Dobie wrote the minority recommendation, which at times closely resembled the majority opinion, and bemoaned the requests that reflected communities "that are merely joining the national movement to grab from the public barrel while it is open--a movement that is making America a nation of sapsuckers," in his estimation. At least in public it seems that disagreements of the board were focused on funding. Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western," 49-50.

On the UDC objecting to men's attempts to memorialize women of the south, see Kelly McMichael Stott, "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966," (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001), 129-132, and Kelly McMichael, "'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances': The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Power of Civil War Memory," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 111-114. Certainly an argument can be made that women, with seats on the TCC advisory board, were in a better position to advocate for monuments to Texas women in the 1930s than they had been in prior years, but the resulting monuments do not reflect such advocacy without knowing more about the processes and workings of that body.

Beginning in 1936, the thirty TCC monuments were dedicated through 1939, allowing many of the artists who had worked on Dahl's Texanic Dallas exhibition--including Allie Victoria Tennant, Raoul Josset, Pierre Bourdelle, and Pompeo Coppini--to then produce works for sites around the state. Of the thirty, roughly half memorialized Texans whose names appeared on the frieze of the Hall of State. They were drawn overwhelmingly from the Republic of Texas, the Revolution and the early frontier periods. One monument honoring both Isaac and Frances Lipscomb Van Zandt marked the only historic woman memorialized in the larger works. The only Spanish-surnamed notable honored in this group of TCC monuments was Jose Antonio Navarro, at Corsicana. While Navarro had close enough ties to the area to have inspired both the name of the county and its seat--his father hailed from Corsica--David Burnet apparently did not seem a natural fit for Clarksville in Red River County, local historians reportedly expressing "surprise" when their community was chosen for his tribute. But overall the personages and placements seemed to follow a logic. Five of the monuments commemorated historic events: *First Shot Fired for Texas Independence* at Cost, *James Walker Fannin's Men* at Goliad, the *Mier Expedition and Dawson's Men Memorial* overlooking La Grange, the monument to *Amon B. King's Men* at Refugio, and the *San Jacinto Memorial* at the San Jacinto State Park. The marker at Cost told a similar story to one commissioned by the state at nearby Gonzales in 1910, and the remaining four had all been previously memorialized and identified as important commemorative sites as early as the 1890s or before. The main thrust of this group, it can be noted, was the territorial conflict with Mexico and its bloody fallouts; the United States' war against Mexico, by contrast, remained virtually nonexistent in the commemorative landscape of

the TCC monuments, the campaign conspicuously absent from the iconography of the central exposition as well.[31]

---

31 *Isaac and Francis Lipscomb Van Zandt,* Waldine Tauch, 1937, Canton, Texas; *First Shot Fired for Texas Independence*, Waldine Tauch, 1936, Cost, Texas; *James Walker Fannin's Men*, Raoul Josset, 1939, Goliad, Texas; *Mier Expedition and Dawson's Men Memorial,* Pierre Bourdelle and Raoul Josset, 1937, La Grange, Texas; *Amon B. King's Men*, Raoul Josset, 1937, Refugio, Texas; *Come and Take It,* Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Gonzales, Texas; *Jose Antonio Navarro,* Allie Victoria Tennant, 1936, Corsicana, Texas; *Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1822-1897,* 9: 435; "Texas Independence Day," *Dallas Morning News*, March 4, 1892; Texas, Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations, *Monuments erected by the state of Texas to commemorate the centenary of Texas independence* (Austin: Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations, 1938), 77-83; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 112-113; 130-131, 132, 152, 237-238, 312, 362. It is unclear which "Smith" and "Baylor" were honored on the Hall of State frieze, and large TCC monuments were erected to memorialize Sidney Smith, Henry Smith, and R. E. B. Baylor; Stanley E. Siegel, "Navarro, Jose Antonio," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fna09), accessed April 16, 2015. Richard Slotkin notes that "as literary territory, the Mexican War barely exists" and that "some quality in the historical experience itself appears to have doomed to failure attempts . . . to assimilate the experience to the existing . . . mythology." Richard Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1985), 173-185, 183, 191.

Other factors distinguished a handful of the new projects. Although his name did not make the Hall of State frieze, the tribute to *Rene Robert Cavelier, Sieur de la Salle* at Port Lavaca was the only large work dedicated to a European explorer. The *Richard Dowling* shrine at Sabine Pass memorialized a Confederate naval victory. The *John O. Meusebach* monument, commemorating the founder of Fredericksburg and the negotiator of the Meusebach-Comanche Treaty that helped facilitate the settlement of central Texas, was the only work honoring a German immigrant to the state. *The Pioneer Woman,* on the campus of the Texas State College for Women in Denton, was the only strictly-female subject of any of the larger works. The west-facing, white Georgia marble statue was reminiscent of the 1913 *Elizabeth Crockett* memorial in Acton, in that both figures, modestly-dressed frontier women, appeared to have their gaze fixed on the far western horizon, the Acton form more realistic, as the period called for, the TCC piece more stylized and much larger. Finally, distinctive for its purely allegorical subject was Pompeo Coppini's *Spirit of Sacrifice.* With realistic bas-relief scenes of the Alamo on the lower sections of its east and west faces, the main shaft ran to sixty feet in height and depicted a twenty-three foot male figure symbolizing Sacrifice on its north face and a like-scaled female figure symbolizing Texas to the south. Although none of its representations were stylized, Coppini's creation did embrace the modern, architectural compositions of the movement yet-to-be-named

Art Deco, leading no less a critic than J. Frank Dobie to compare the work to "a grain elevator or a swimming pool slide."[32]

Perhaps inspired by the centennial celebrations and commemorations, some groups elected to sponsor monuments that memorialized Texas' revolutionary and frontier eras independent of the TCC. Chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution erected at least two monuments in 1936. The Martha Randolph Chapter of the DAR sponsored a stone marker commemorating the passage of the Butterfield stage line and Marcy's California trail through Sherman, Texas in that city's Houston Street Park. The Gonzales Chapter of the DAR funded a plaque in San Antonio's Alamo Plaza to the thirty-two Gonzales men who, answering William B. Travis' call for reinforcements, went to the Alamo to fortify the forces there. In 1938, private citizens in Austin commissioned Hugo Villa to produce a free-standing bas-relief sculpture titled *The Evolution of a Great State*, which depicted scenes of Texas developing from its frontier and pioneer eras to the present. The scale of these works tended to the smaller, more numerous TCC

---

32 *The Pioneer Woman,* Leo Friedlander, 1938, Denton, Texas; *Elizabeth Crockett,* Artist Unknown, 1913, Acton, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 195, 358-359, 368-369, 376-378. See note 24 regarding Confederate representation in the Hall of State names and note 18 regarding the use of the term "Art Deco." Dobie quoted in Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 377. Cummins states that "Only (one of these the larger monuments makes) explicit reference to the South as a source of heritage for Texas," citing the David Ellis monument at Waxahachie, which portrayed the statesman as "nurtured in the culture of the Old South." Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western," 50. However, the *Richard Dowling* piece commemorated a Confederate naval victory.

markers, and thematically their subjects aligned with the thrust of the commission's selections. Although they varied stylistically enough against that group's uniformity so as to prevent them from appearing a part of it, they fell in nicely with the commemorative landscape shaped by the Texas Centennial Commission.[33]

Another pair of larger monuments commemorated the revolutionary and frontier periods, but with subjects that represented a slight departure from the standard cast of characters. On October 11, 1936, "Italian Day" at the central exposition, Governor James Allred dedicated a monument to Italian veteran of the Battle of San Jacinto Prospero Bernardi in the Court of Honor on the grounds at Fair Park. Italian-American dignitaries, Italian emissaries and several thousand were in attendance to see the unveiling, the bronze's creator Pompeo Coppini among them. The piece featured a larger-than-scale portrait bust of Bernardi in pioneer dress atop a rectangular granite shaft. Allred referred to Bernardi as "one of many unsung heroes" of San Jacinto; "Some of them are known, like Bernardi, others are unknown, but all live in the hearts of our people." *La Tribuna Italiana*, a Dallas-based Italian-American newspaper, and Italian-American citizens had provided for the tribute. On August 21, 1938, thousands of New Braunfels residents congregated in that city's Landa Park for the dedication of the *German Pioneer Monument.* The structure consisted of a star-shaped base of pink granite, with three bronze figures above. The figures were of a father, standing, a mother, seated with a bible in her lap, and a young boy at her side. The granite base carried bronze plates which narrated various

---

33 *Sherman DAR Monument*, Artist Unknown, 1936, Sherman, Texas**;** "Marker Is Approved For Butterfield Line," *Dallas Morning News,* March 1, 1936; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 83, 393.

events in the German settlement experience in Texas. Mayor Walter Sippel accepted the monument and Dr. Rudolph L. Biesele, professor of history at the University of Texas, was the chief orator of the day. The project had been funded by the Monument Association for German Pioneers of Texas. Both of these works perhaps represented corrective measures offered by immigrant communities who felt that the TCC's program had overlooked their group's contribution.[34]

And although the state's Confederate monument movement was winding down, that tradition still held considerable sway among white Texans through the latter years of the decade. On the same day as his Cotton Bowl appearance in Dallas, President Roosevelt unveiled a mammoth double equestrian sculpture of General Robert E. Lee in that city's newly-renamed Lee Park. The monument was sponsored by the Dallas Southern Memorial Association with assistance from the Dallas Parks Board, and featured a mounted Lee upon his horse, Traveller,

---

34 "Governor Unveils Statue to Italian San Jacinto Hero," *Dallas Morning News,* October 12, 1936; "Tribute Paid to Italian Hero," *Dallas Morning News,* October 12, 1936; "Italo-Texan Hero to be Honored at Fair Next Month," *Dallas Morning News,* August 1, 1936; *Prospero Bernardi,* Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas; "Early Germans Win Praise at New Braunfels," *Dallas Morning News,* August 22, 1938; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 142-143, 342-343. The Central Exposition celebrated "Italian and Columbus Days" on October 11 and 12. The *Dallas Morning News* reported that the "Italian days are expected to draw large crowds in view of the fact there are more than 100,000 persons of Italian descent in Texas;" The TCC had gone some way in acknowledging the German settlement experience with by recognizing the contributions of John O, Meusebach with a monument in Fredericksburg.

leading a young aide-de camp, also on horseback, symbolic of "the entire youth of the South." Jesse H. Jones, of Houston, who had once chastised his fellow Texans for adopting a "chamber of commerce spirit" in the run-up to the centennial, gave the dedicatory address and spoke of Lee in epic terms, calling him a man "greater in defeat than most men are in victory." Jones declared that "We of the South believe, and in this we are supported by the writers of history, that by any measure Robert E. Lee was the equal of any leader, civil or military, the world has ever known," and thanked Roosevelt: "We appreciate your performing this rite, Mr. President, joining with us

of the South in this tribute to our great hero." Roosevelt, in turn, praised the general as being "one of the greatest American Christians and one of our greatest Gentlemen."[35]

Jones was a key operative for the Democratic Party on the national level and was praised in the day's addresses as "the financial wizard of the administration who had loaned $11,000,000,000 (billions) at no loss to the Treasury" in his role as chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In his remarks, he suggested that Centennial officials

---

35 "President Unveils Statue of R. E. Lee In Brief Ceremony,"*Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; "Peak Throng of Texas Trip Jams Stadium," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936; Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935; *Robert E. Lee on Traveller,* Alexander Proctor, 1935-1936, Dallas, Texas; *Alabama-Coushatta Confederate Monument,* Artist Unknown, 1937, Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Reservation, Texas; Little, *Outdoor Sculpture in Texas*, 161. President Roosevelt was accompanied at the Lee Park ceremony by Dallas Mayor George Sargent and Governor Allred, and Texas Congressman Hatton Sumners introduced Jesse Jones at the podium. Besides the Dallas monument, Texas Confederate groups erected memorials in Amarillo (1931), Austin (Littlefield Fountain Complex, UT Campus, 1933), Wichita Falls (1934), Gonzales (1937), on the Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Reservation near Livingston (By the Robert E. Lee Chapter 186, Houston Chapter UDC, 1937), and Fort Worth (1939); Kelly McMichael, *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009), 92-93. The Confederate monument movement in Texas beyond the 1930s would still yield a monument in Huntsville (1956). There are also a handful of monuments, in Cleburne, Galveston, Madisonville, and Mount Vernon, for which no date has been established.

invite to Dallas "the armies of the North and South" to hold a Blue-Gray reunion at the exposition, and spoke of Lee's surrender at Appomattox in the familiar tropes of reconciliation. Jones told how Union Commander Ulysses S. Grant and Lee "met and fraternized," and how Grant thought immediately of Lee's men, distributing rations, allowing the southern officers to retain their sidearms, and ordering that the men be permitted to keep their horses, noting that they would need them for planting in the spring. And while much of what was said that day fell easily within the familiar contours of the Lost Cause tradition, one point of Jones' oration represented what amounted to an innovation to that repertoire. Addressing the president directly, Jones stated "We know something of your admiration for Lee and for Sam Houston, with whom Lee, then a Colonel in the United States Army, was associated as commander of the United States forces at San Antonio during Houston's last term as Governor." Jones built upon this casual connection with the assertion that "These two great characters had much the same views with reference to secession; both were strongly opposed to it and did everything within their power to prevent war. Lee especially abhorred the thought of civil strife." After touching upon Houston as an entry point to Lee's concerns over the prospects of "civil strife," Jones then left

him as subject to detail Lee's agonizing choice of "Virginia and the South" over his commission with the United States Army, a "decision . . . [that] clearly marks his character."[36]

Had this remark comprised the sum total of instances in which Sam Houston was invoked in the service of the Lost Cause, it would perhaps have remained a curiosity and little more. However, a year earlier on the first day of the first called session of the Forty-fourth Texas Legislature, State Senator T. J. Holbrook received the unanimous consent of his peers to have printed in the legislative journal the address of Dr. Francis P. Gaines, president of Washington and Lee University, on the occasion of the dedication of a monument to Sam Houston at Richmond, Virginia, the previous June. Ascribing "Virginia" an *alma mater* personification and speculating on her appraisal of her most illustrious sons in general and of Houston specifically, Dr. Gaines spoke eloquently, quoting Shakespeare and Cicero, and attributed to Houston "good

---

36 "President Unveils Statue of R. E. Lee In Brief Ceremony," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936. Caroline Janney points out that "one aspect of reconciliation . . . re-imagined the surrender's fraternal camaraderie and the instantaneous termination of sectional animosities," Caroline E. Janney, "War over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation," *Journal of Southern History* 77*,* no. 1 (February 2011): 94-95. It is unclear if Roosevelt actually had expressed an interest in or "admiration for" Sam Houston, as stated by Jones, or if this was rhetorical, but in a ceremony during the president's visit to the central exposition he "was given the garb of an Indian and made a chief of the (El Tiguos) tribe (of El Paso). (Governor) Allred reminded the President the ancestors of these Indians had been friends of Sam Houston." "Peak Throng of Texas Trip Jams Stadium," *Dallas Morning News,* June 13, 1936.

fortune" in his successes, but reminding his audience "he takes his place here beside those whose equally heroic effort was ordained for failure; There is ultimately no great distinction." Dr. Gaines traced a parallel similar to the one Jones drew between Houston and Lee, hinging the pair on the difficult subject of secession:

> Nor yet, of course, does Virginia appraise as of great moment the particular political doctrine which any of her great sons may have cherished, however,(sic) passionate may have been their allegiance. Sam Houston's course was charted, as by a pilot star, according to his devotion to the idea of nationalism. He promoted this idea incalculably and yet the curtain of his public life went down in a tragic gloom because of this very idea; for when the fateful cleavage between his state and his nation threatened, he turned with a kind of infinite regret from the group of local associations to remain true to his basic conviction. Robert E. Lee faced the same fateful cleavage and with the same infinite regret turned from the nation to go with his own people. Today they stand together at the heart of Virginia's life; and who shall dare say that either of these supremely honest men could have been wrong?

Dr. Gaines spoke artfully of Houston's life, paying him the highest respects, praising his faith, contrasting his "bright and sparkling heroisms" with his "darkened depths of an almost fathomless dismay." He described a saint-like temperament and devotion occasionally plagued by "deviating sweeps into the swamplands of confused purposes" and "the pathetic moment when the thousands of Texans who had listened to him with glad acclaim turned resentfully from him," before ending the address with his one-word epitaph for Houston, "Honor." Back in

Austin, following a moment of silent prayer for a deceased colleague, the senate moved to adjourn without debate or comment.[37]

From the earliest conceptions of the centennial, its planners had balanced two impulses, the commemorative and the commercial, the civic obligation to recognize an important state milestone and the corresponding desire to make it a profitable venture. In the discourse regarding the proposed celebrations these impulses found their expression and rough equivalents in the dual themes of "history" and "progress," as organizers, particularly those of the Dallas contingent familiar with the State Fair model, attempted to marry the commemorative aspects of the centennial with the proven exposition attractions of the arts, sciences and industry, to say nothing of other amusements. The commercial impulse was revealed in the oft-repeated expectation that the event's success would propel the economies of the state and host city for the next "fifty years." Because centennial boosters intended that the exposition be a popular and financial success, these impulses, commemorative and commercial, were not neatly and cleanly discrete spheres of a "civic rite," but instead influenced and bled into one another; the commemorative was a product that would help drive the commercial success of the exposition. The commercial, in turn, became a part of the people they--event planners and organizers--

---

37 Texas Senate, *Journal of the Senate of Texas being the First Called Session of the Forty-Fourth Legislature*, 1935, 9-13; (http://texashistory.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metapth142186/: accessed April 27, 2015), University of North Texas Libraries, The Portal to Texas History, http://texashistory.unt.edu; crediting UNT Libraries Government Documents Department, Denton, Texas. Several hundred words in length, it appears Dr. Gaines' address was not read before the senate.

desired to describe and that their consuming public desired embody: a dynamic, vital, prosperous people who went forward in the modern world as their pioneering and revolutionary forbears had in cutting out a place for themselves called "Texas." When assessing the artifacts of Texas memory produced in and around the centennial, the commercial aspect of their intent and the professional status of their creators must be considered, for memory was only part of the centennial's making of Texas. The "progress" of the centennial was an incantation of mid-twentieth century American boosterism.[38]

The memorial geography of the state required some fleshing out for the centennial, its mission having been laid out in only the most general terms, a need to pay appropriate homage to "the heroic period of early Texas history." The evolution of the commemorative repertoire of the centennial occurred in the midst of what Cummins calls "a grassroots, *sui generis*, intellectual movement," that understood the American west as a source of national regeneration. TCC members crafted a dramatic provenance for Texas that told of the "progress of civilization," and, like other products of frontier mythology, "erased part of a larger, more confusing and tangled, cultural story to deliver up a clean, dramatic and compelling narrative." As a memory repertoire, the frontier, like the Lost Cause, proved to be as plastic as it was versatile, capable of being appropriately streamlined or scrubbed. Any inconvenient or unpleasant historical chapters could be softened or written out completely. The "Cavalcade of Texas," ubiquitously expressed in the

---

38 "Centennial Plan Delay is Hurtful to State-Wide Aim," *Dallas Morning News,* March 28, 1934; "Texas Centennial Measure Is Passed," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931; "Contennial (sic) Plea To Be Expressed Via Film Screen," *Dallas Morning News,* August 6, 1934; Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 41.

centennial's Six Flags motif, established a 400-year European presence in the region that passed down as a birthright through western "civilization" to its rightful heir, collapsing Native Americans down to secondary players and scenery all the while. Under this umbrella, however, not all sovereignties were created equal. The Mexican era was reduced to the villainous tyranny of Santa Anna in the Ceremony of Flags and celebrated for "(fostering) the entry of the first American colonists, a people destined to mould a Great Empire" in its portico mural. But the composition of the motif allowed for a finished product of "dual allegiance," of Texas and American citizenship that had been practiced for some time, refined by this point, stacked as on a totem here with Spain, France, Mexico and the Confederacy. In doing so, the TCC deftly accessed a national narrative of a regenerative frontier and the country's natural progression through westward expansion.[39]

Texas' bona fides of its frontier history and as progenitor of American cowboy culture made the state an attractive cultural commodity for local, national and international consumers, but in emphasizing these points centennial planners revealed something of their audiences and of themselves. Although the Mexican War was a narrative in which the state and the nation could share, it hardly broke the surface, the Texas Revolution resonating much more with Texans and

---

39 "Centennial Plan Delay is Hurtful to State-Wide Aim," *Dallas Morning News,* March 28, 1934; "Texas Centennial Measure Is Passed," *Dallas Morning News,* May 21, 1931; *France, Mexico, and United States* (Murals) Pierre Bourdelle, 1936, Dallas, Texas; Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 41; Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment*, 173-185, 183, 191; Warren, *Buffalo Bill's America*, xiii; White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill," 9; Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 145.

Americans alike, allowing Anglo-American colonists to assume the posture of "white victimization" at the Alamo in a recast "inverted conquest," Santa Anna's siege of the San Antonio mission and its avenging at San Jacinto a more clean, dramatic and compelling narrative than General Zachary Taylor's forces breaching "the Halls of Montezuma." The choice of the Texas Rangers as state symbol was a shrewd bit of marketing as it traded on the Rangers' considerable profile and image in popular culture, but that outfit's reputation among the state's Mexican American citizens, particularly those of the border region, made them a dubious standard of an Anglo-Texan heritage. Whether or not their presence at the central exposition constituted a conscious attempt by planners to cast them as physical representatives of a "white vanguard" on the grounds of Fair Park, their symbolic significance within the greater narrative scope of the event was exactly that. While the Central Exposition executives did not strain the conventions of the Six Flags motif to stress the state's Confederate heritage, neither did they shy from it, and certainly no critique of or challenge to the Lost Cause presented itself in their celebration of the centennial. Dallas' $25,000,000 Fair Park, as much a conceptual progeny of Chicago's 1893 Columbian Exposition's "White City" as of the more recent "Century of Progress," presented a vision of economic prosperity and industrial progress couched in a society of rigid racial segregation, and white America codified that vision with their enthusiastic endorsement of the event. That an orator could declare before a segregated audience that "today

the United States knows no boundaries, no divisions" spoke as much to a national acceptance of the Jim Crow south as to the boundless optimism meticulously fostered for the centennial.[40]

The TCC monuments told essentially the same story that the commemorative face of the central exposition told, that of early, Anglo settlers of the state and events leading to and of the

---

40 Américo Paredes notes that the border Spanish form of "ranger," *rinche,* was "extended to cover not only the Rangers but any other Americans armed and mounted and looking for Mexicans to kill," and that Rangers knowingly killed innocent Mexicans because "terror makes an occupied country submissive," among numerous other observations that shed light on Mexican American attitudes toward the Rangers. Paredes, "*With His Pistol in His Hand*," 24, 26; White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill," 9, 18-22; Warren, *Buffalo Bill's America*, 158, 177; http://www.hqmc.marines.mil/hrom/NewEmployees/AbouttheMarineCorps/Hymn.aspx (accessed 5/8/2015); http://www.texasranger.org/ReCenter/popular.htm (accessed 5/8/2015); Chicago's 1893 Columbian Exposition's "White City" was also known as the "Court of Honor," which was the name given to the plaza in front of the Hall of State at the Central Exposition at Fair Park; Lawrence Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 208-213. Texans' attempts to participate in the 1893 Columbian Exposition led to some of the state's early commemorative efforts, namely the Elisabet Ney sculptures of Stephen F. Austin and Sam Houston that in 1903 were unveiled in the capitol building; Gregg Cantrell, "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin: History and Memory in Progressive-Era Texas," in *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), 42-45. Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 4-5, 158.

Texas Revolution. Fourteen of the thirty TCC monuments, or about forty-seven percent, memorialized persons or events that had previously been commemorated by Texans. When this catalogue is considered against the state's previous monuments and sites of memory, it can noted that the centennial expanded the number more than the scope of the state's memory repertoire. The monuments, like the Six Flags motif, favored white European bloodlines, but even within that group, the vast majority were Anglo-Americans, most having emigrated to Texas from "the fatherland," the relatively young American republic. The only "ethnic" Mexican honored with a large tribute was Navarro, and he, by the Mexican standard of the day, was creole. Even the additions of *Prospero Bernardi* and the *German Pioneer Monument,* standouts that they were, did little to expand the repertoire; without the backing of state educational standards, their stories were likely unknown much beyond their respective communities. The TCC commissions were in their own way a correction, a commemorative service that elite Texans felt they needed fulfill

as their state approached its centenary, and while much the same story they had spun over the previous decades, they told it in some greater detail in 1936.[41]

The dedication of the Lee monument concurrent to the centennial, President Roosevelt ceremonially participating in both, demonstrates that the Lost Cause was alive and well in the state throughout the wave of Texas memory harnessed for the celebration; it demonstrates that the two memory repertoires, Confederate and Texas frontier, were accessed and invoked by the

---

41 "Texas Independence Day," *Dallas Morning News,* March 4, 1892; *Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1822-1897,* 9: 435. The fourteen monuments the author counts as subjects previously memorialized by Texans are the *San Jacinto Memorial, First Shots Fired for Texas Independence, James Walker Fannin's Men, Mier Expedition and Dawson's Men Memorial, Amon B. King's Men, Richard Dowling, Spirit of Sacrifice, Stephen F. Austin, James Butler Bonham, David Gouverneur Burnet, Henry Smith, Ben Milam* (in San Antonio and Cameron) and *Davy Crockett*. The last six, beginning with James Bonham, were recognized on the 1900 *Texas Heroes Monument*. Besides Navarro, the only "ethnic" Mexican among the Hall of State names was Zavala, who, based upon his family's high standing and his level of education, was most likely a creole, as was Navarro; Raymond Estep, "Zavala, Lorenzo De," *Handbook of Texas Online* (http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/fza05), accessed May 05, 2015. "Fatherland" citation refers to Lamar quote cited in note 25; for the establishment of Confederate-friendly curriculum in Texas and southern schools, see Fred Arthur Bailey, "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas: A Study of Social Control in the New South," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly 97,* no. 3 (January 1994): 457-464; and Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 127-128.

same community of white elites and that there was no ideological or philosophical contradictions in moving easily between the two; it demonstrates that outsiders, from Washington D. C. and beyond, understood Texas identity to be composed of roughly equal parts of the two, and they could access and communicate with these idioms perhaps as well as Texans and other southerners could. Most important, it demonstrates that when asking whether Texans identified themselves as southern or western, inquiring how much they subscribed to either tradition is not as instructive as asking how, in what way, in what contexts, each was deployed by the state's elite citizens.

Both Buenger and Cummins argue, rightly, that Texans by the 1930s were different from the rest of the south in significant, largely economic, ways: availability of land, an oil-driven economy, urbanization, industrialization, and "a transportation revolution" constituted by the concurrent development of an infrastructure of state highways and a growing dependence on air travel. However, on the subject of segregation there was no question that Texas was devoutly southern. Buenger notes that "by the 1920s most white Texans remembered the original Klan as a force for good in trying times." The organization's fall from grace in the early part of that decade, at least in the eyes of "the majority of white protestants," occurred due not to some seismic shift in racial attitudes that left the Klan outside the mainstream, but because that faction got away from their base and began targeting marginal white communities that were Catholic (or Jewish), spoke German (or Spanish), and drank alcohol. "Tellingly, they defined whiteness as being Anglo Saxon, Protestant, and English speaking," and while the majority of white protestants probably did to a large extent as well, extending the Klan's campaigns of intimidation and vigilante methods to those communities was, for upstanding Texans citizens, beyond the

pale. That Texas could be economically and demographically different but culturally of a kind with the south speaks to the luxury Texan elites enjoyed with their two memory repertoires; that they could be considered culturally and socially southern while still celebrating their exceptionalism, political and economic power was a feather in their cap. But they valued their place in the hierarchy of southern states, and took seriously their duty in establishing and enforcing racial segregation; their geographic location at the junction between south and west perhaps made their role all the more crucial in enforcing the southern code. As one observer of the central exposition noted, "Texas is South and Southwest. There the traditions of race relations which characterize the South are vigorously maintained." What is significant is that elite white Texans used these respective memory repertoires to define themselves, alternating between the two as needed. However, when it came to the state's use of southern memories and its celebration of Confederate culture, the meaning and resonance of that memory repertoire

resided in its translation to a racially-segregated society and a narrowly-defined Texas citizenship.[42]

---

42 Jesse O. Thomas, *Negro participation in the Texas centennial exposition* (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1938), 99; Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas," 52; Walter L. Buenger, "Texas and the South," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 103*,* no. 3 (January 2000): 311. Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," 120-122, 126,129, points out that Irish immigrants that were Catholic and "wet" were another marginal white community that drew the Klan's ire. In his biography of Oscar Branch Colquitt, Huckaby details how this shift in the Klan's focus to German Texas communities nearly prompted the former governor to publicly take on the Klan and go as far as running against their senate candidate on an anti-Klan platform in 1922. George Portal Huckaby, "Oscar Branch Colquitt: A Political Biography," PhD diss., (University of Texas, 1946), 451-452. One window into the culture of segregation in the state's public life was the fundraising for the Hall of Negroes at the Central Exposition. Although federal funds came with the stipulation that the TCC construct the hall, Texas officials held a special barbeque fundraiser "between Gladewater and Kilgore" that was expected to be "the largest gathering of Negroes ever to be held in Texas." Although the fundraiser was held before the federal funds were allocated, evidence suggests the fundraising event anticipated the stipulation calling for the inclusion of the hall. At the barbeque "it (was) hoped to dispose of $50,000 or more in Centennial bonds . . . sold to members of the race." *"*Negroes to Raise Funds At Centennial Barbeque," *Dallas Morning News,* June 25, 1935; *"*Centennial Fete Set for Negroes," *Dallas Morning News,* July 15, 1935; *"*Central Exposition to Get $1,200,000 of Federal Funds," *Dallas Morning News,* August 18, 1935.

Buenger argues that the celebration of the Lost Cause and "southern memories did not disappear in Texas, but they did become less combatively un-American," citing Roosevelt's participation at the Lee monument dedication and pointing out that "by this point the president and most of the rest of the country as well accepted Lee as a hero." This, however, indicates a shift had occurred in which the federal government and "the rest of the country" accommodated the south rather than vice versa. Nor does this "less combatively un-American" Lost Cause reconcile very well with Buenger's assertion that ". . . Texans lived in a world with competing memories and competing identities . . . Boldly put, on the one had stood the Confederacy and separation from the rest of the United States . . .". As a case in point, the assumption of Sam Houston into the Lost Cause, this strain seemingly originating in Virginia before being adopted by Texans, and its portrayal of his anti-secession stance as the nadir of his life--and by implication, vindicating those Texans and southerners who supported the noble but unsuccessful Confederate cause--reads as combatively southern as his utility in that tradition would have seemed unlikely a generation or two before. That this innovation occurred at the centennial, when Houston may have been at his zenith as a national symbol, probably signified that Lost Cause proponents made timely use of the Virginia native's memory, and certainly indicated the sophistication and plasticity of that repertoire and the ingenuity of its producers. That Texans would offer up perhaps their greatest hero, surrendering him to the service of that tradition he

had forsworn in favor of his "pilot star . . . nationalism," suggests that, for white elite Texans, no plausible countervailing narrative existed.[43]

---

43 Buenger, *The Path to a Modern South*, 260; Buenger, "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas," 135, 138. For the north's acceptance of the Lost Cause, see Cox, *Dixie's Daughters,* 4-5, 158; see note 5 on the problem of juxtaposing "Confederate" and "American" heritages. Buenger makes a valid point throughout his scholarship on the level of reciprocity southerners or Texans were comfortable with in their relationships with the federal government, and while this can be a valid lens through which to read products of the Lost Cause, to oversimplify such cooperation as "American" seems somewhat problematic. The final mention of "white elite Texans" of this chapter carries with it the implied question of whether alternative narratives of Houston's stance on secession existed among white immigrant communities, German, Italian and Irish, or for that matter, among Mexican- and African American communities, all of whom may well have had their own antebellum memories of struggles over secession.

Conclusion

Texas' seventy-six Confederate monuments were permanent, public expressions of the Lost Cause, conspicuous reminders of the racial and class hierarchies of the Old South, the closest possible approximation of which the state's white elite zealously intended to imprint upon the new. Their prominent placement, often on the grounds of county courthouses and administrative centers, and their elaborate and widely-attended dedication ceremonies which functioned as civic holidays imbued their message with an official sanction as they provided ideological justification for the means of segregating society and limiting citizenship by both law and custom. That Democratic Party luminaries eagerly attached themselves to these unveiling events demonstrates that they were indeed political and that their message was one understood to resonate with the electorate. These monuments stood as visible markers of the UDC's much broader, multi-faceted campaign to promote a usable Confederate memory that reached from the state's public school classrooms to the halls of the Capitol and well beyond. The success of the Daughters and the efficacy of the Lost Cause in helping them achieve their objectives should not, however, obscure or call into question the sway that the tradition had on Texas identity as the state's citizens celebrated their southern heritage alongside the rest of the region. White Texans whole-heartedly bought in to and repeatedly espoused such cultural markers as "Southern honor" and "Southern pride," and even those in a position to comprehend the utility of the repertoire

took pride in exhibiting the entire catalogue of attitudes and behaviors that distinguished them as southern.[1]

More than as an affront to the Confederate culture of the state's elite class, the 1910-1915 monuments that honored icons of the Texas revolutionary and frontier eras should be read as a corrective flourish, an organic if abrupt expansion of the existing frontier and revolutionary repertoires. Aside from the stream of Confederate monuments raised across the state through these years and into the 1920s and 1930s, Confederate concerns such as veteran pensions and homes for aged widows remained important components of party platforms through the first decades of the twentieth century, and any ideological critique of the Lost Cause would have been akin to heresy, tied as that tradition was to honoring the men and women of the sixties. There is scant evidence that contemporaries understood the two repertoires to be even marginally conflicting, while much evidence suggests that Texans of the period believed them to be simply different chapters of a common narrative. Four of the historical subjects of the five 1910-1915 monuments were southerners who had emigrated to Texas, like Governor Colquitt and many of his generation, and the fifth, the anonymous Anglo militiaman of the Gonzales tribute, likely would have been of their ilk as well.

---

1 The monument at Brownsville was sponsored and raised by a national UDC chapter as opposed to a Texas chapter. While the tribute is a Texas monument and falls within other guidelines qualifying it as a part of the state's Confederate monument movement, this distinction should be noted. Kelly McMichael, *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009), 76.

The early prominence of the Lost Cause in the state says much about Texans' robust participation in the regional network of southern society, and that membership, in the eyes of Texans as well as other southerners, diminished little over time. The state's citizens were for the most part on their own in fashioning its frontier and revolutionary repertoire, which goes some way in explaining the timeline of its development and the similarity of monument dedication ceremonies across traditions. The 1910-1915 monuments' main innovation, aside from almost equal representation of female subjects, was the shift in their producers and funding, from heritage organizations (largely the UDC and DRT) soliciting donations to elected officials using state monies. Although the legislature had taken an interest in memorializing the revolutionary period since at least the 1880s, and private citizens would continue to have a hand in shaping the state's commemorative landscape throughout the twentieth century, the 1910-1915 monuments exhibited an evolution in the way politicians viewed their role in the business of commemoration and, it would seem, an understanding of its potential cultural power that perhaps foreshadowed and influenced the larger-scale efforts in celebration of the state's centennial two decades later.[2]

While memorialization of the Texas Revolution was a key facet of the centennial, references to and symbols of the Confederacy were noticeably present as well, suggesting that rather than diminishing with time or in submission to more powerful Texan memories, expressions of Confederate Texas had become part of the fabric of Texan identity. Texans were happy to debate many things: the relative merits of their communities, history versus progress,

---

2 Texas business leaders began conceiving of and preparing for the centennial at least a decade before, around the time of the Groesbeck (first stage 1922) and Houston (1925) memorials, both of which were realized through a mix of public and private funding.

industry versus independence, solemn reflection versus spectacle, even which persons, places, and events deserved accolade and which were merely grabs at the open "public barrel"--but little evidence suggests that there was much agonizing, at least in public, over the state's Confederate heritage as they readied for their World's Fair. In 1936, when the monuments funded by the Texas Centennial Commission began to appear across the state, the dozens of large memorials and over a thousand smaller markers took their place alongside the state's tributes to the Confederacy. A few years later, when the installations were complete, the centennial celebrations would have still been top-of-mind for Texans, and the commemorative landscape reflected the attendant upsurge in Texas memory. The basic premise of a cultural shift, that Southern expressions proved to be more prominent than Texas memories early, and that Texas narratives later caught and somewhat eclipsed the Confederate celebration in the state, is sound. Unfortunately, this interpretation never accounts for the ample evidence that bucks the trend (i.e., later Confederate or earlier revolutionary/frontier commemorations) other than as aberrations. The contradictory examples suggest instead that the two traditions happily coexisted for several decades. This extended period of overlap reveals a second problematic assumption of a shift framework: that the development of a vibrant catalogue of Texas memory represented a rejection of the Lost Cause. That Texans concurrently celebrated the two signifies that they were highly-compatible aspects of the state's cultural landscape. Whatever ideological shift was afoot in the first few decades of the twentieth century meant little with regards to the Lost Cause in Texas.

The state's citizens had internalized its lessons, and it remained a powerful memory repertoire they would access and invoke whenever the context required it.[3]

The artifacts of Texas memory produced for the centennial represented a sea change in the state's commemorative movements in that their producers were now government agencies, political and business leaders with budgets running to millions of dollars and whose commissions were undertaken with an unabashed commercial intent. Earlier memorialization efforts in the state, whether honoring its Confederate or frontier eras, were largely aimed at the communities in which the monuments were raised and did not concern themselves with audiences beyond the local, or at most, state citizenry. Planners sold the centennial to Texans but also to a global clientele, adopting a world's-fair model and using the media to reach national and international consumers. Facilitated by the "grassroots, *sui generis*, intellectual movement" that prized the American west as a source of national regeneration, centennial organizers opted in and leveraged this trend in their marketing of the event. Texas memory became commodified in the process.[4]

---

3 "Historical Board Split on Use of Centennial Fund," *Dallas Morning News,* October 8, 1935; Carol Morris Little, *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 13-14; http://www.thc.state.tx.us/preserve/projects-and-programs/state-historical-markers/history-state-texas-historical-markers (accessed 1/14/15).

4 Light Townsend Cummins, "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western for the 1936 Centennial," in *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013), 41.

The narrative that emerged from the centennial, both the Cavalcade of Texas showcased at the central exposition and the persons and events of the Texas frontier and revolutionary periods memorialized in the statewide TCC monuments, functioned in some ways like the Lost Cause in that both repertoires highlighted positive aspects of their story arcs while minimizing, glossing over or omitting unsavory chapters as needed. Contextualized within the frontier narrative, centennial planners accessed and deployed a memory repertoire that had developed over a long period of time and was a well-established idiom to explain both American and Texas exceptionalism. The commemorative face of the centennial reinforced elite Texans' image of citizenship, in that it favored white European bloodlines and assigned an almost mythical quality to the Anglo settlers who found their way to Texas from the American "fatherland." White Texans were not unlike white Americans in this respect; although the centennial celebrated Texas in the context of a dual allegiance to state and country, allowing visitors from out of state to share in the experience as Americans, full participation in this celebration, as in society, was not intended for everyone. Centennial planners' vision of a modern, dynamic and progressive Texas that upheld the rigidly-segregated society of the Jim Crow south was palatable, even admirable to visitors from around the country.[5]

The dedication of the Lee monument concurrent to the centennial, President Roosevelt ceremonially attending both, demonstrates that the Lost Cause was alive and well in the state throughout the wave of Texas memory harnessed for the celebration; it demonstrates that the two

---

5 "Fatherland" citation refers to quote attributed to Mirabeau B. Lamar on the wall of the Great Hall in the Hall of State at Fair Park: "And well may we be proud to see our national standard float side by side with the star-spangled banner of the fatherland."

memory repertoires, Confederate and Texas frontier, were accessed and invoked by the same community of white elites and that there were no ideological or philosophical contradictions in moving easily between the two; it demonstrates that outsiders, from Washington D. C. and beyond, understood Texas identity to be composed of roughly equal parts of the two, and that they could access and communicate with these idioms perhaps as well as Texans and other southerners could. White elite Texans used these respective memory repertoires to define themselves, alternating between the two as needed. However, when it came to the use of southern memories and the celebration of Confederate culture, the meaning and resonance of that memory repertoire in the state resided in its translation to a racially-segregated society and a narrowly-defined Texas citizenship, and it was this meaning and resonance that was the more powerful in Texas society of the period. That the memory of Sam Houston could be co-opted by Lost Cause proponents even as his cultural relevance reached its zenith demonstrates that this tradition was alive and well in Texas well into the fourth decade of the twentieth century, and given the opportunity to amend this narrative and contest this memory, elite Texans deferred.

A Note on Monuments and Sources

The first point I would like to address is in regards to the dates of monuments, in that there may be instances in this thesis where a single monument is attached to two different dates over the course of the text. Although I have tried to keep dates of monuments consistent throughout, I may have missed a few. Any discrepancy likely comes from my not reconciling the different methods of assigning dates to monuments from my secondary sources, chiefly, Carol Morris Little's *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas,* and Kelly McMichael's *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas.* Little states that in her work "(unless) otherwise indicated, the date refers to the year in which the work was created," while McMichael's book uses the year in which the tribute was dedicated. At any rate, I have endeavored to be as clear as possible and use a monument's city for clarification or its specific location when more than one exists in the same city, but I apologize beforehand for any confusion this oversight may cause.[1]

Having said that, I must point out that although this thesis admittedly uses monument dates, along with other evidence, to fashion its arguments concerning the chronologies of memorialization movements, the dates of a monument's creation or dedication in and of themselves are imperfect indicators of a monument's life cycle in that they only tell a part of the

---

1 Carol Morris Little, *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), viii; Kelly McMichael, *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009), 92-95. Any other discrepancies of a similar nature, not due to error on my part, likely can be attributed to conflicting citations in various secondary sources.

story. Without some idea of the duration and relative success of a project's fundraising campaign, a dedication date tells us very little, and in fact can be in some instances quite misleading. The UDC-sponsored Confederate memorial at Huntsville, for example, dedicated in 1956, could be cited as evidence that such tributes were being erected into the second half of the century, thus demonstrating the vitality and longevity of the UDC's memorialization crusade. However, when one considers that the Huntsville Daughters' fundraising efforts began in 1900, and that the monument they eventually realized was a rather modest commission by the movement's standard, this argument becomes somewhat less compelling. But, when considered in conjunction with other available evidence, monument creation and dedication dates offer at least a rough chronology of the memorials and their respective commemorative movements.[2]

A few words should probably be spent acknowledging sources used in completing this thesis. For primary sources, aside from the monuments, *Confederate Veteran* magazine and the *Dallas Morning News* were especially valuable. *Confederate Veteran* offers a fascinating and extensive window into what historian Karen Cox terms "Confederate culture," and provides what is in my view a somewhat unique example of a periodical, in that its readers were also its chief contributors, so that the myriad expressions of the Lost Cause to be found in the pages of its forty years of publication disseminated not from its offices in Nashville, but were merely collected there; the magazine functioned as a sort of pre-internet, Lost Cause-themed social media. The *Dallas Morning News* stands out in that it endeavored to cover news of the state and

---

2 McMichael, *Sacred Memories*, 20-21. For another example of a somewhat misleading monument dedication date, see note 20 of Chapter Two of this thesis regarding Galveston's *Texas Heroes Monument.*

nation in addition to that of Dallas and the surrounding communities. Compounding this utility is that extensive and exceedingly legible online editions are available, which greatly facilitated this project. With regards to secondary sources, the above mentioned *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas* by Carol Morris Little and *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas* by Kelly McMichael proved invaluable. Any study of the Confederate monuments in Texas would do well to begin with Dr. McMichael's work, and Little's book is an equally vital starting point for such a study or a more broad survey of memorialization in Texas, besides being a lot of fun to browse through. Rounding out my list of important secondary sources on Texas monuments is the Texas Veterans Commission 1985 publication *Directory of Memorials, Monuments and Statues for Veterans*. I found it by chance, online, and it helped me very much in finding a handful of Confederate monuments that had previously eluded scholarly attention.[3]

Finally, it was suggested that I should make note of my own efforts in documenting Texas monuments and commemorations. I have attempted to visit and photograph all of the state's Confederate monuments except the one at Brownsville, which was raised by a national UDC chapter. Two, in Houston, I missed for not allowing myself enough time in Hermann Park and a closure at Sam Houston Park, but I have seen photographs of both of these. The monument at Bryan I have not yet found in three visits, and I remain unclear on what exactly is the cemetery monument in Cleburne, which is why I have cited it as "Year Unknown." I was able to visit all five of the monuments to Texas' frontier and revolutionary period raised from 1910 to 1915, and

---

3 Karen L.Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003), 1-2.

many of the state's monuments to these eras raised before and after these years. I have travelled to Fair Park in Dallas a number of times to see the products of the Texas Centennial's Central Exposition, and I have visited about a dozen of the thirty major centennial monuments created by the Texas Centennial Commission, as well as the Confederate monument in Dallas' Lee Park and the *Prospero Bernardi* tribute at Fair Park. Also, some pains were taken to document and explain instances when monuments that have been moved from their original placement.[4]

---

4 McMichael, *Sacred Memories*, 76. McMichael notes a masoned arched entry to a Confederate section of a Cleburne cemetery, featuring "Confederate Memorial Park" across its face and with the dates "1861" and "1865" on its two supports. I did not find this arch, but encountered what appeared to be another Confederate monument, but one for which I have yet found no corroborating evidence. My working solution is to for the time assume that there is at least one Confederate cemetery monument (and at least three Confederate grave complexes, as I found two besides the one McMichael cites) in Cleburne.

I visited and photographed all of the monuments listed in the bibliography, with the exception of the Houston monuments listed above and the *Isaac and Francis Lipscomb Van Zandt* monument in Canton, Texas, which I was able to view in Little's book. Any monument described or cited in the text not found in the bibliography was viewed in Little or McMichael's books, in *Confederate Veteran* or in contemporary newspaper accounts.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A Confederate Soldier. Alex Park, 1925, Hillsboro, Texas (Hill County Courthouse Grounds).

Alabama-Coushatta Confederate Monument. Artist Unknown, 1937, Alabama-Coushatta Tribal Reservation, Texas.

Albert Sidney Johnston. Elisabet Ney, 1903, Austin, Texas (Texas State Cemetery).

Alvin Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1924, Alvin, Texas (Confederate Cemetery).

Amon B. King's Men. Raoul Josset, 1937, Refugio, Texas.

Austin Confederate Monument. Pompeo Coppini, 1901, Austin, Texas (Capitol Grounds).

Austin Weekly Statesman (Austin, Texas) 1884. Archives of Americana Data Base, Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Bastrop Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1910, Bastrop, Texas (Bastrop County Courthouse).

Battle of the Alamo. James Senille Clark, 1891, Austin, Texas (Capitol Grounds).

Ben Milam. Bryant Baker, 1938, Cameron, Texas (Milam County Courthouse Grounds).

Ben Milam. Bonnie McLeary, 1936, San Antonio, Texas (Milam Park).

Buffalo Hunt. George Dahl, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park)

Call to Arms. Louis Amateis, 1907, Corsicana, Texas (Navarro County Courthouse Grounds).

Camp Worth Plaque. Joseph Lorkowski, 1921, Fort Worth, Texas.

Cleburne Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1917, Cleburne, Texas (Johnson County Courthouse Grounds).

Come and Take It. Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Gonzales, Texas (Texas Heroes Park).

Confederate Memorial. Frank Teich, 1897, Dallas, Texas (Convention Center Grounds).

Confederate Memorial. Frank Teich, 1899, San Antonio, Texas (Travis Park).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, 1906, Ennis, Texas (Myrtle Cemetery).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, 1903, Linden, Texas (Cass County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, Unknown Year, Madisonville, Texas (Madison County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, 1925, Marlin, Texas (Falls County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, 1908, Marshall, Texas (City Cemetery).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, Unknown Year, Mount Vernon, Texas (City Plaza).

Confederate Memorial. Unknown Artist, 1910, Orange, Texas (Evergreen Cemetery).

Confederate Memorial Monument. Unknown Artist, 1915, Goldthwaite, Texas (Mills County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Frank Teich, 1906, Marshall, Texas (Harrison County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Pompeo Coppini, 1904, Paris, Texas (Lamar County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Warren Reed, 1897, Sherman, Texas (Grayson County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Waldron Shield and Company, 1915, Weatherford, Texas (Parker County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, Year Unknown, Wharton, Texas (Wharton County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1914, Halletsville, Texas (Lavaca County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1900, Livingston, Texas (Polk County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1923, Lockhart, Texas (Caldwell County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1903, Comanche, Texas.

Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1937, Gonzales, Texas (Jail Square).

Confederate Mothers Monument. Albert Weiblem Marble and Granite Co., 1918, Texarkana, Texas (Confederacy Park at 5th Street and State Line Avenue).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Whitacre, H. A., Marble Company, 1931, Amarillo, Texas (Ellwood Park).

Confederate Soldier Statue. McNeel Marble Company, 1913, Bay City, Texas (Matagorda County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Georgia Marble Company, 1916, Belton, Texas (Bell County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. E. Anderson, 1905, Bonham, Texas (Fannin County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, c.1920, Clarksville, Texas (City Square).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1901, Dallas, Texas (Greenwood Cemetery).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1917, Farmersville, Texas (City Park).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Fannie Nunnally, 1939, Fort Worth, Texas (Oakwood Cemetery).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Frank Teich, 1908, Gainesville, Texas (Leonard Park).

Confederate Soldier Statue. McNeel Marble Company, 1911, Gainesville, Texas (Cooke County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. McNeel Marble Company, 1916, Georgetown, Texas (Williamson County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Frank Teich, 1909, Gonzales, Texas (Jail Square).

Confederate Soldier Statue. North Texas Marble and Granite Works, 1926, Greenville, Texas (Audie Murphy/American Cotton Museum Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Frank Teich, 1907, Jefferson, Texas (Marion County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1911, Kaufman, Texas (Kaufman County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Jack Finlay and James Finlay, 1915, Llano, Texas (Llano County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, c.1911, Mount Pleasant, Texas (Titus County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1907, Rusk, Texas (Cherokee County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1909, Tyler, Texas (Oakwood Cemetery).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1916, Vernon, Texas (Wilbarger County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Soldier Statue. Unknown Artist, 1912, Waxahachie, Texas (Ellis County Courthouse Grounds).

Confederate Veteran. Nashville. 1894, 1896, 1898, 1900, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1915, 1917, 1918, 1931.

Dallas Morning News (Dallas, Texas) 1894, 1897, 1900, 1909, 1910, 1913, 1915, 1920, 1925, 1927, 1930, 1935, 1936. Archives of Americana Data Base, Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Dallas Morning News (Dallas, Texas) 1924, 1931, 1934, 1937, 1938. Online archive accessed at http://nl.newsbank.com.

Dawson Monument. A. J. Adkisson & Son, 1884, La Grange, Texas (Fayette County Courthouse Grounds).

Dick Dowling. Frank Teich, 1905, Houston, Texas (Hermann Park).

Dignified Resignation. Louis Amateis, 1911, Galveston, Texas (Galveston County Courthouse Grounds).

Elizabeth Crockett. Unknown Artist, 1913, Acton, Texas (Acton Cemetery).

El Paso Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1919, El Paso, Texas (Evergreen Cemetery).

Fannin Memorial. Gustave Stolz, 1885, Goliad, Texas (Fannin Square).

Fireman, Save My Child. Frank Teich, 1896, Austin, Texas (Capitol Grounds).

First Shot Fired for Texas Independence. Waldine Tauch, 1936, Cost, Texas.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram (Fort Worth, Texas) 1921. Archives of Americana Data Base, Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

France, Mexico, and United States. Raoul Josset, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Texas Centennial Installation, Fair Park).

France, Mexico, and United States. Pierre Bourdelle, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Texas Centennial Portico Murals, Fair Park).

Fort Parker Memorial. Roy Weldert and W. H. Dietz, 1922-1932, Groesbeck, Texas (Fort Parker Memorial Cemetery).

General Hiram B. Granbury. Youngblood Monument Company, 1913, Granbury, Texas (Hood County Courthouse Grounds).

General Sam Houston. Pompeo Coppini, 1911, Huntsville, Texas (Oakwood Cemetery).

Governor Peter Hansborough Bell. Agop Agopoff, 1936, Belton, Texas (Bell County Courthouse Grounds).

Great Hall Medallion. Joseph Renier, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Hall of State. George Dahl, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Hood's Texas Brigade Monument. Pompeo Coppini, 1910, Austin, Texas (Capitol Grounds).

Isaac and Francis Lipscomb Van Zandt. Waldine Tauch, 1937, Canton, Texas.

James Walker Fannin. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

James Walker Fannin's Men. Raoul Josset, 1939, Goliad, Texas.

Joanna Troutman. Pompeo Coppini, c.1915, Austin, Texas (Texas State Cemetery).

John Bankhead Magruder Monument. Artist Unknown, Year Unknown, Galveston, Texas (Episcopal Cemetery).

John H. Reagan Memorial. Pompeo Coppini, 1911, Palestine, Texas (Reagan Park).

Jose Antonio Navarro. Allie Victoria Tennant, 1936, Corsicana, Texas (Navarro County Courthouse).

La Salle Monument. Frank Teich, 1930, Navasota, Texas.

The Last Stand. Pompeo Coppini, 1912, Victoria, Texas (De Leon Plaza).

Lawrence Sullivan Ross. Pompeo Coppini, 1919, College Station, Texas (Texas A&M University Campus).

Littlefield Memorial Fountain. Pompeo Coppini, 1933, Austin, Texas (University of Texas Campus).

Mier Expedition and Dawson's Men Memorial. Pierre Bourdelle and Raoul Josset, 1937, La Grange, Texas.

Mirabeau B. Lamar. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Our Confederate Heroes. Frank Teich, 1911, Longview, Texas (Gregg County Courthouse Grounds).

Our Confederate Patriots. Unknown Artist, 1956, Huntsville, Texas (Walker County Courthouse Grounds).

Our Confederate Soldiers. McNeel Marble Company, 1912, Beaumont, Texas (Weiss Park).

Our Confederate Soldiers. Unknown Artist, 1918, Denton, Texas (Denton County Courthouse Grounds).

Our Patriots. G. W. Backus, 1924, Memphis, Texas (Hall County Courthouse Grounds).

Percy, William Alexander. *Lanterns on the Levee: Recollections of a Planter's Son.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941.

Prospero Bernardi. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Queen of the Sea. Pompeo Coppini, 1915, Corpus Christi, Texas (Bluff Balustrade).

Robert E. Lee on Traveller. Alexander Proctor, 1935-1936, Dallas, Texas (Lee Park).

R. E. B. Baylor. Pompeo Coppini, 1938, Waco, Texas (Baylor University Campus).

Richard Ellis Statue. Attilio Piccirilli, 1936, Waxahachie, Texas (Ellis County Courthouse Grounds).

Sam Houston. Enrico Filberto Cerracchio, 1925, Houston, Texas (Hermann Park).

Sam Houston. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

San Antonio Express (San Antonio, Texas) 1900, 1906. Archives of Americana Data Base, Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Scottsville Confederate Monument. Frank Teich, 1915, Scottsville, Texas (Scottsville Cemetery).

Sherman DAR Monument. Artist Unknown, 1936, Sherman, Texas (Grayson County Courthouse).

Spain, the Confederacy, and Texas. Laurence Tenney Stevens, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Texas Centennial Installation, Fair Park).

Spain, the Confederacy, and Texas. Carlo Ciampaglia, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Texas Centennial Portico Murals, Fair Park).

Spirit of the Centennial. Raoul Josset, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Spirit of the Confederacy. Louis Amateis, 1908, Houston, Texas (Sam Houston Park).

Stephen F. Austin. Pompeo Coppini, 1912, Austin, Texas (Texas State Cemetery).

Stephen F. Austin. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Tejas Warrior. Allie Victoria Tennant, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Temple Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1910, Temple, Texas (Hillcrest Cemetery).

Terry's Texas Rangers Memorial. Pompeo Coppini, 1907, Austin, Texas (Capitol Grounds).

Texas Heroes Monument. Louis Amateis, 1900, Galveston, Texas (25th Street and Broadway).

Texas Centennial Commission. *Texas Centennial Review* (Austin, Texas) 1935, 1936.

Texas. Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations. *Monuments erected by the state of Texas to commemorate the centenary of Texas independence.* Austin: Commission of control for Texas centennial celebrations, 1938.

Texas Legislature. *Journal of the House of Representatives.* 1909, 1910, 1911.

Texas Legislature. *Journal of the Senate of Texas being the First Called Session of the Forty-Fourth Legislature. 1935.*

The Pioneer Woman. Leo Friedlander, 1938, Denton, Texas (Texas Woman's University Campus).

Thomas Rusk. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Union Soldier Statue. A. P. Chamberlain, 1906, Denison, Texas (Fairview Cemetery).

Victoria Advocate (Published as *The Texian Advocate,* Victoria, Texas) 1848. Archives of Americana Data Base, Mary and Jeff Bell Library, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

Waco Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1893, Waco, Texas (Oakwood Cemetery).

Wichita Falls Confederate Monument. Unknown Artist, 1934, Wichita Falls (Memorial Auditorium).

William B. Travis. Pompeo Coppini, 1936, Dallas, Texas (Fair Park).

Secondary Sources

Abolafia-Rozenzweig, Mark. "Monument Hill State Historic Site: The Dawson and Mier Expeditions and Their Place in Texas History." Austin: Texas State Publications, 1986.

Apfelbaum, Erica. "Halbwachs and the Social Properties of Memory." In *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 77-92. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.

Assmann, Jan. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." Translated by John Czaplicka, *New German Critique,* no. 65 (Spring-Summer, 1995): 125-133.

Bailey, Fred Arthur. "Free Speech and the 'Lost Cause' in Texas: A Study of Social Control in the New South." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 97*,* no. 3 (January 1994): 452-477.

Blair, William Alan. *Cities of the Dead: Contesting the Memory of the Civil War in the South, 1865-1914.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Buenger, Walter L. "Memory and the 1920s Ku Klux Klan in Texas." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 119-142. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Buenger, Walter L. *The Path to a Modern South: Northeast Texas Between Reconstruction and the Great Depression.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001.

Buenger, Walter L. "Texas and the South." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 103*,* no. 3 (January 2000): 308-324.

Buenger, Walter L. "Texas Identity: Alternatives to the Terrible Triplets." In *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B.

McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget, 2-35. Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013.

Campbell, Randolph B. "History and Collective Memory in Texas: The Entangled Stories of the Lone Star State." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 270-282. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Cantrell, Gregg. "The Bones of Stephen F. Austin: History and Memory in Progressive-Era Texas." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 39-74. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Cantrell, Gregg and Elizabeth Hayes Turner. "A Study of History, Memory, and Collective Memory in Texas." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 1-14. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Coski, John M. "The Confederate Battle Flag in Historical Perspective." In *Confederate Symbols in the Confederate South,* edited by Ron McNinch-Su, J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson, 89-129. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Cox, Karen L. *Dixie's Daughters: the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2003.

Cummins, Light Townsend. "History, Memory and Rebranding Texas as Western for the 1936 Centennial." In *This Corner of Canaan: Essays on Texas in Honor of Randolph B. Campbell,* edited by Richard B. McCaslin, Donald E. Chipman, and Andrew J. Torget, 36-57. Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2013.

Eaton, Clement. *A History of the Southern Confederacy.* New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Feuchtwang, Stephen. "Ritual and Memory." In *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 281-298. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.

Fritzsche, Peter. "The Archive and the Case of the German Nation." In *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History,* edited by Antoinette Burton, 184-208. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Friends of Fair Park. "Esplanade Walking Tour." Fair Park, Texas http://www.Fairpark.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=184 (accessed March 15, 2012).

Grow, Matthew J. "The Shadow of the Civil War: A Historiography of Civil War Memory." *American Nineteenth Century History* 4, no. 2 (Summer 2003): 77-103.

Hale, Grace Elizabeth. *Making Whiteness: The Culture of Segregation in the South, 1890-1940.* New York: Random House, 1998.

Harris, Robert M. and J. Michael Martinez. "Graves, Worms, and Epitaphs: Confederate Monuments in the Southern Landscape." In *Confederate Symbols in the Confederate South,* edited by Ron McNinch-Su, J. Michael Martinez and William D. Richardson, 130-194. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Huckaby, George Portal. "Oscar Branch Colquitt: A Political Biography." PhD diss., University of Texas, 1946.

Janney, Caroline E. "War over a Shrine of Peace: The Appomattox Peace Movement and Retreat from Reconciliation." *Journal of Southern History* 77, no. 1 (February 2011): 91-120.

Kiel, Frank Wilson. "*Treue der Union:* Myths, Misrepresentations, and Misinterpretations." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 115*,* no. 3 (January 2012): 283-292.

Levine, Lawrence. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Little, Carol Morris. *A Comprehensive Guide to Outdoor Sculpture in Texas.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

McMichael, Kelly. *Sacred Memories: The Civil War Monument Movement in Texas.* Denton: Texas State Historical Association, 2009.

McMichael, Kelly. "'Memories Are Short but Monuments Lengthen Remembrances': The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Power of Civil War Memory." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 95-118. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

McMichael Stott, Kelly. "From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966." PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2001.

Neff, John R. *Honoring the Civil War Dead: Commemoration and the Problem of Reconciliation.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2005.

Nord, David Paul. "The Uses of Memory: An Introduction." *The Journal of American History* 85*,* no. 2 (September 1998): 409-410.

Paredes, Américo. "*With His Pistol in His Hand*:" *A Border Ballad and Its Hero.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1958.

Price, Margaret Nell. "The Development of Leadership by Southern Women through Clubs and Organizations." Master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1945.

Simpson, John A. "Cult of the Lost Cause." *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 34 (Winter 1975): 350-361.

Slotkin, Richard. *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890.* Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1985.

Somers, Margaret R. "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach." *Theory and Society* 23, no. 5 (October 1994): 605-649.

Smith, Timothy B. *The Great Battlefield of Shiloh: History, Memory, and the Establishment of a Civil War National Military Park.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004.

Texas Historical Commission. *1936 Texas Centennial Markers.* http://www.thc.state.tx.us/.

Texas State Historical Association. *Handbook of Texas Online.* https://tshaonline.org/handbook.

Texas Veterans Commission. *Directory of Memorials, Monuments and Statues for Veterans.* Austin, Texas, 1985.

Thomas, Emory. "Rebellion and Conventional Warfare: Confederate Strategy and Military Policy." In *Writing the Civil War: The Quest to Understand,* 36-59. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998.

Thomas, Jesse O. *Negro participation in the Texas centennial exposition.* Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1938.

Tijerina, Andrés. "Constructing Tejano Memory." In *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas,* edited by Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, 176-202. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007.

Warren, Louis S. *Buffalo Bill's America: William Cody and the Wild West Show.* New York: Random House, 2005.

White, Richard. "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill." In *The Frontier in American Culture,* edited by James R. Grossman, 7-65. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Winter, Jay. "Sites of Memory." In Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates, edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, 312-324. New York: Fordham University Press, 2010.

Wrobel, David M. *Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002.