

**The Seventh Star of the Confederacy:
Texas during the Civil War**



Edited by
Kenneth W. Howell

Number 10 in the War and the Southwest Series

University of North Texas Press
Denton, Texas

©2009 University of North Texas Press

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Permissions:

University of North Texas Press

1155 Union Circle #311336

Denton, Texas 76203-5017

The paper used in this book meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, z39.48.1984. Binding materials have been chosen for durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

TO COME

The Seventh Star of the Confederacy: Texas during the Civil War is Number 10 in the War and the Southwest Series

To Erin Buenger,
who is an inspiration to those who know her



Contents

List of Illustrations vi
List of Maps vii
Preface viii
Acknowledgments xii

Part I A Historical Overview of Texas and the Civil War

- Chapter 1** The Impact of New Studies about Texas and Texans on Civil War Historiography
by Alwyn Barr 1
- Chapter 2** The Civil War and the Lone Star State: A Brief Overview
by Archie McDonald 21

Part II The Time for Compromise Has Passed

- Chapter 3** Explaining the Causes of the Civil War: A Texas Perspective
by James Smallwood 31
- Chapter 4** The Knights of the Golden Circle in Texas, 1858–1861: An Analysis of the First (Military) Degree Knights
by Linda Hudson 52

Part III In Sight of My Enemy

- Chapter 5** Frontier Defense: Enlistment Patterns for the Texas Frontier Regiments in the Civil War
by John W. Gorman 69
- Chapter 6** Reckoning at the River: Unionists and Secessionists on the Nueces, August 10, 1862
by Mary Jo O’Rear 85
- Chapter 7** Without a Fight: The Eighty-four-day Union Occupation of Galveston, Texas
by Donald Willett 110
- Chapter 8** Nothing but Disaster: The Failure of Union Plans to Capture Texas

- by Edward T. Cotham, Jr.* 130
- Chapter 9** Hide Your Daughters: The Yankees Have Arrived in the Coastal Bend, 1863
by Charles D. Spurlin 149
- Chapter 10** Red and White Fighting the Blue: Relations between Texans and Confederate Indians
by Charles D. Grear 167
- Chapter 11** Defending the Lone Star: The Texas Cavalry in the Red River Campaign
by Gary D. Joiner 189
- Chapter 12** Prison City, Camp Ford: Largest Confederate Prisoner-of-war Camp in the Trans-Mississippi
by James Smallwood 208

Part IV Political, Social, and Cultural Life during the War

- Chapter 13** The Confederate Governors of Texas
by Kenneth E. Hendrickson, Jr. 226
- Chapter 14** A Sacred Charge upon Our Hands: Assisting the Families of Confederate Soldiers in Texas, 1861–1865
by Vicki Betts 244
- Chapter 15** On the Edge of First Freedoms: Black Texans and the Civil War
by Ronald E. Goodwin and Bruce A. Glasrud 266
- Chapter 16** Feed the Troops or Fight the Drought: The Dilemma Texas Beef Contractors Faced in 1861–1865
by Carol Taylor 285
- Chapter 17** Distress, Discontent, and Dissent: Colorado County, Texas, during the Civil War
by Bill Stein 300

List of Contributors 316

Index 324



Illustrations

- 1 Gov. Sam Houston 0
- 2 The Southern Confederacy a fact!!! 0
- 3 The surrender of ex-General Twiggs 0
- 4 The Battle of Nueces, by C. H. Clauss 0
- 5 Funeral of German patriots at Comfort, Texas 0
- 6 Confederate lookout at Bolivar Point 0
- 7 Soldiers digging trenches at Point Isabel, Texas 0
- 8 Union Troops in the Streets of Indianola, Texas 0
- 9 Brig. Gen. Stand Watie 0
- 10 Brig. Gen. Richard Montgomery Gano 0
- 11 A critical moment in the Red River expedition of April 1864 0
- 12 The war in Louisiana—Commodore Porter’s fleet before
Alexandria, March 26 0
- 13 Commissioned officers of the 19th Iowa Infantry who were
POWs at Camp Ford 0
- 14 Non-commissioned officers of the 19th Iowa Infantry who were
POWs at Camp Ford 0
- 15 Texas Governor’s Mansion 0
- 16 The influence of woman 0
- 17 Sarah Ford 0
- 18 Martin Jackson 0
- 19 Will Adams 0
- 20 Betty Powers 0
- 21 Branding cattle on the prairies of Texas 0
- 22 Dr. Charles W. Tait Plantation House, 1847 0
- 23 Dr. Charles W. Tait Plantation House, 1860 0



Maps

- 1 Battle of Galveston, January 1, 1863 0**
- 2 Proposed Line of Operations from Sabine Pass to Galveston,
September 1863 0**
- 3 Battle of Sabine Pass, September 8, 1863 0**
- 4 Battles of Gano's and Watie's Brigades 0**



Part I

A Historical Overview of Texas and the Civil War



Chapter 1

The Impact of New Studies about Texas and Texans on Civil War Historiography

by Alwyn Barr

The Civil War in Texas and Texans in the war have continued to attract both professional and non-professional historians. Especially notable in recent years are the first modern general history of those topics by Ralph Wooster and the first volume providing a visual sense of the people involved in the conflict across the Lone Star State by Carl Moneyhon and Bobby Roberts.¹ Thoughtful summaries of historical writings also have appeared in important essays by Randolph B. Campbell and Walter F. Bell. Campbell discussed a broader era from 1846 to 1876 with a focus on non-military topics including “population, the frontier, the economy . . . , social life and social structure, and politics.” He also raised the key questions of how much change occurred and how much continuity remained.² Bell began after secession and concentrated primarily on writings about military campaigns and leadership, political and economic activities including Confederate-state tensions, and Confederate efforts to control or eliminate Union sentiment.³

Rather than overlap with those works of historiography, this essay will focus on what writings about Texans since 1990 contribute to some of the newer debates and questions raised by Civil War historians. Have other studies clarified our understanding of the reasons for the secession movement that led to war? Social historians have influenced military history by calling for a better sense of the enlisted men, their places in society, and their attitudes about the conflict. Social historians also have encouraged a broader understanding of how the war impacted society, including the roles of women and the status of minorities—African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans. Ultimately all of these questions may be related to the ongoing discussions of how the Union won the war and why the Confederacy lost.

Two books clarify specific events of 1860 and 1861 leading to secession. Donald E. Reynolds presents a careful analysis of fires in Texas towns during 1861 that quickly came to be blamed on slaves and abolitionists. Although an unusually hot summer and faulty new matches provided a better explanation, fears by many Texans who remembered John Brown’s raid into Virginia in 1859

led to paranoia and a wave of vigilante violence against slaves and northerners in the Lone Star State. Anti-Republican newspaper editors who favored secession used the fires to promote their cause in Texas and across the South.⁴ Dale Baum, using statistical analysis, has reviewed the presidential election of 1860 and the secession referendum in 1861. He concludes that Brown's raid and the fires, often called the "Texas Troubles," led to the collapse of the Unionist coalition that had elected Sam Houston governor in 1859. Baum also notes economic and religious influences, with wheat farmers, who were often Disciples of Christ, in North Texas counties settled from the Upper South and German Lutherans in Central Texas as the strongest opponents of secession. Kenneth W. Howell offers the most detailed account of the anti-secession efforts by James W. Throckmorton during this period.⁵

Most writing on the Civil War in Texas has continued to focus on military affairs. Military campaigns and commanders have received further attention that is reviewed appropriately by Walter Bell. Three additional studies that have appeared since his essay deserve comment. Stephen A. Townsend considers the Rio Grande expedition by the Union army and navy that occupied the lower valley and the Texas coast up to Matagorda from November 1863 to March 1864. He concludes that it became the most successful Federal advance into the state by reducing the flow of cotton through Mexico and forcing a more expensive route to Laredo and Eagle Pass. Furthermore, Union forces showed United States' concern about the French role in the Mexican civil war. Finally, the expedition allowed Unionist A. J. Hamilton to return to Texas at least briefly as its appointed governor. Different views in the Federal high command led to withdrawal of most soldiers in favor of the unsuccessful Red River Campaign in the spring of 1864.⁶

Historians of the Federal advance up the Red River have presented several accounts that debate the quality of leadership on both sides and whether Confederates could have achieved more with a different strategy. Jeffery S. Prushankin offers a fresh analysis by suggesting that Edmund Kirby Smith employed a Fabian retreat in the style of Joseph E. Johnston that resulted from his need to defend the entire Trans-Mississippi Department. Richard Taylor followed the more aggressive style of Stonewall Jackson as a means of defending his smaller District of Louisiana. Prushankin concludes that their efforts led to Confederate success, while their differences generated a major "crisis in command." In a broader study, Stephen A. Dupree concludes that Gen. Nathaniel P. Banks attained most goals given him by the Union War Department, but failed as a field commander, especially in efforts to invade Texas.⁷ Federal focus on more important war goals and questionable decisions about how to invade Texas combined with successful Confederate defense efforts to limit the impact of the conflict on the state.

Two biographies further understanding of command by a Texan and by the longest-serving leader of the District of Texas. Thomas W. Cutrer presents Ben McCulloch as an able general based on experience in frontier conflicts, whose opportunity for higher rank in the Confederate army ran afoul of preference by President Jefferson Davis for United States Military Academy graduates. The complexities of commanding the Military District of Texas are explored by Paul D. Casdorff as he discusses the career of John B. Magruder.⁸

The enlisted men from Texas who fought in the Civil War have received increased attention in the growing number of regimental, brigade, and division histories. Like older accounts of such units, the new studies discuss movements and engagements. Unlike most early unit histories, some of the new volumes explore the group images that emerge from quantitative analysis of the soldiers. By comparing the profiles of units recruited in different areas at varied times a more complex picture begins to appear.

Two of the best unit histories provide useful examples and contrasting results. Douglas Hale describes Confederate soldiers recruited in 1861 for the Third Texas Cavalry regiment. They came from families in East Texas counties that averaged almost \$13,000 in property, double the level for all families in the state. Slightly over half of the men's families owned slaves, a direct commitment to the institution and again twice the percentage for families across Texas. With a median age of about 23, only about 20 percent of the men were married with families, which allowed most to pursue more easily a combination of adventure and commitment to a cause. A little over 50 percent of the men had been engaged in aspects of agriculture, compared to about 75 percent of those in the state. Sixty percent had been born in the Lower South, which seemed to generate a stronger commitment to the Confederacy. About 30 percent came from Upper South backgrounds, while less than 10 percent came from the North or another country.⁹

Almost a year later Confederate leaders raised eleven regiments and a battalion of infantry in East Texas. Richard Lowe describes the men of those units that formed Walker's Texas Division. Much like the Third Texas Cavalry and other units from the region, over three-fifths came from the Lower South, while about half as many came from the Upper South. Only one in twenty had northern or immigrant backgrounds. These soldiers differed from the volunteers of 1861 in various ways. They averaged about four years older, with roughly half already heads of families, twice as many as in the Third Texas. They more clearly fit the general pattern of Texans with three-fourths involved in agriculture, but they held only half the amount of wealth as the average family heads across the state. One in five owned slaves, compared to one of four Texans. Thus they proved to be a more middle-class group than the elite young men of the Third Texas. Their motivations appear to have been related

to concern with Union advances and maintaining a stable way of life “including white control of the black underclass.” Randolph B. Campbell, using statistics to analyze soldiers from Harrison County, offers support for most of these conclusions by Lowe and Hale. Campbell adds that a higher percentage of prosperous Texans served the Confederacy than among those of more modest means, which runs counter to the image of a rich man’s war but a poor man’s fight.¹⁰

Even greater ethnic and occupational diversity existed among Texas soldiers. Stanley S. McGowen discusses the presence of a company of German immigrants from the Hill Country in the First Texas Cavalry of the Confederate army. Charles D. Spurlin, in his introduction and conclusion to a Confederate soldier’s diary, discusses the German immigrants in some companies of the Sixth Texas Infantry from the Coastal Bend region.¹¹ Jerry D. Thompson, in two new books, reviews and clarifies the roles and attitudes of Mexican Americans in South Texas and Mexicans in Northern Mexico who served in both the Union and Confederate armies during the American Civil War as well as in the Mexican civil war of the same period.¹² These volumes offer fewer details about the backgrounds of the soldiers, however, which limits comparisons.

Regional differences also appear in units from North Texas. In his introduction to the diary and letters of a Confederate officer from Texas, Richard Lowe describes the men of Company H, Ninth Texas Cavalry, as recruited in 1861 from a North Texas county that voted against secession. Most of these young men came from Upper South backgrounds. Their families usually owned small farms with less wealth than the average Texas household. Slaveholders formed just one-sixth of the unit, less than the average for Texas families. Yet their early enlistment probably reflected greater commitment to Confederate views and set them apart from many neighbors who preferred to remain in the Union.¹³

Many of the same studies contribute to an understanding of the factors that led to a decline in the size of military units and the armies in which they served. Douglas Hale again points to key problems. In the fall of 1861 while still west of the Mississippi River the Third Texas Cavalry faced a wave of illness, primarily measles and typhoid, which left eighteen men dead and 145 discharged. Following reorganization in early 1862, the regiment had been reduced by one-third. Illness killed 9 percent of the cavalymen during the war. Another 7 percent died on the battlefield, while 16 percent suffered wounds. Fourteen percent became prisoners at some point, with 7 percent listed as deserters. The collective impact can be seen when the regiment entered the Atlanta Campaign in the spring of 1864 with 46 percent of its remaining soldiers listed as absent.¹⁴ Lowe in his discussion of the Ninth Texas Cavalry, another regiment in Ross’s Texas Cavalry Brigade, adds that as a result of “disease, death, desertion, and wounds” the brigade had fallen from its initial strength of 4,000 men to 686 present for duty, or less than 20 percent, by November 1864.¹⁵

Lowe describes similar problems as well as some differences in his history of the infantrymen in Walker's Division that served in the Trans-Mississippi region. His quantitative analysis suggests that during 1862, the first year of service for those men, disease and illness caused the death or discharge of about 2,300 out of 12,000 soldiers. Perhaps 700 more received discharges because of age. Transfers, resignations of officers, injuries from accidents, and desertions probably removed another 1,000 men from the ranks. The division had been reduced to about 8,000 soldiers by the end of the summer. Similar problems brought the division strength down to 6,000 men, half its original size, by the spring of 1863 before seeing serious combat. Thereafter the men fought in several skirmishes and battles in which over 1,400 men met death or suffered wounds, while more than 700 became prisoners or missing. Periods of desertions resulted from lack of furloughs, supplies, and pay, combined with declining morale after Confederate defeats such as Vicksburg in 1863. Opposition to possible transfer east of the Mississippi River in 1864 caused about 450 men to head home, although officers brought back many and some others later returned. Walker's Division had been reduced to a little more than one-fourth of its initial size by the end of the Red River Campaign.¹⁶ Lowe does not offer a figure for total desertions from the division. M. Jane Johansson, in her history of the Twenty-eighth Texas Cavalry, which had been dismounted to serve in Walker's command, lists total losses that were below average for the division. The 44 desertions included in her figures, when projected as an average for all twelve regiments, suggest over 500 men absent without leave at some point, which may be a low estimate. Available service records for Confederate units usually do not include figures for the final months of 1864 and early 1865 when desertions increased in many military organizations. Charles Gear suggests that even some soldiers who volunteered early in the war and served east of the Mississippi River left units to protect their families in Texas, especially in those final months. Campbell in his quantitative study of Confederate soldiers from Harrison County adds further complexity to the picture by estimating that about half of the draft-age males in Texas served in some military unit. That falls below earlier projections of 60 to 75 percent, although it is still slightly higher than the average for Union states. About 20 percent of those who joined the military died of disease, illness, or combat. Yet if almost half of military age Anglo Texans did not serve in the army, then approximately 90 percent of them survived the conflict and most could help revive the state's economy and society after the conflict.¹⁷

Because the Third Texas Cavalry faced some combat from 1861 until the end of the war, while Walker's infantry engaged Union troops from 1863 to 1865, it is difficult to compare their casualty levels. Hale does offer a comparison, however, using the losses of Hood's Texas Brigade of infantry in the East to conclude that foot soldiers suffered heavier losses than cavalry.¹⁸ Another infantry unit,

the Sixth Texas Infantry that served first in the Trans-Mississippi and later east of the Mississippi River, provides support for that pattern of losses, while adding further complexity. Spurlin shows that 157 men in the regiment died of disease or illness, 83 of them in Union prison camps, with 90 more discharged—about one-fourth of the regiment. Only 19 men deserted, but after Union forces captured the regiment at Arkansas Post, 152 men agreed to declare allegiance to the United States. Furthermore, 116 men obtained reassignment to other duty. Together these groups composed over a quarter of the regiment. Those killed in combat numbered 60, while 157 suffered wounds and 75 became prisoners of war separately after Arkansas Post—almost a third of the regiment. The combined losses totaled 826 men, over 80 percent of the original enlistments.¹⁹

Histories of units from areas outside of East Texas reveal more varied patterns. Richard McCaslin describes the Eleventh Texas Cavalry, raised in North Texas, as composed in part of prewar Unionists who shifted their support to the Texas state government in 1861, primarily to defend the frontier against possible Indian raids. Other members of the regiment had favored secession after the 1860 fires and fears of an abolitionist-inspired slave revolt. When the governor transferred the unit to the Confederate commander in Texas, who ordered the men to Arkansas, more than 20 percent refused to extend their service although many paid for substitutes to fill their places. Temporary conversion of the regiment to infantry in early 1862, followed by orders to cross the Mississippi River, led to numerous desertions, discharges for health reasons, and resignations by officers. The regimental strength fell from almost 800 to about 250 in three months. New recruits did allow the unit to survive and continue service east of the Mississippi.²⁰

National background also played a role in shaping commitment. German immigrants formed companies that served in Confederate regiments with results that varied according to circumstances. McGowen explains that a company of Germans from the Hill Country served on the nearby frontier and in South Texas except for a few weeks in Louisiana during the Red River Campaign as part of the First Texas Cavalry. Probably they felt more comfortable because a German immigrant colonel, Augustus Buchel, led the regiment for a year.²¹ Terry Jordan edited letters from an Austin County German immigrant company that participated in the service of the Fourth Texas Cavalry from New Mexico to Texas and Louisiana.²²

Walter Kamphoefner explains that German immigrants formed three companies for Waul's Legion, with most from Austin County. When Union troops captured one company, however, several of the men signed the oath of allegiance to the United States. In similar fashion German immigrants from DeWitt and Victoria counties provided one company and half of another in the Sixth Texas Infantry. When the men of that regiment became prisoners of war at Arkansas

Post in 1862, most of the German soldiers also signed oaths of support for the Union.²³ Two new studies by Jerry Thompson consider the divided and sometimes shifting allegiance of Mexican Americans in South Texas.²⁴ More German immigrants and Mexican Americans served in Confederate units than for the Union, in part because of social pressure, conscription, and practical decisions about what action would create the least disruption in their lives. Some had assimilated to Anglo Texas society, while others changed sides when faced with new circumstances such as capture and prison camps. Others made the more difficult effort to leave the state and join the Union army.

Some Civil War historians, such as Richard E. Beringer, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still, Jr., have argued that declining levels of men present for duty in Confederate armies reflect desertion and contributed to final defeat. Other historians, especially Gary Gallagher, have focused on low desertion statistics for some units to counter that view.²⁵ Valuable studies of Texas units reveal a more complex picture. Desertions remained under 10 percent in units raised early in the war, especially from East Texas when slavery and southern culture dominated. Greater levels of desertion and shifting allegiance appeared in units recruited in Texas counties near the state borders and frontiers, particularly after passage of the conscription law and in areas settled from the Upper South and by German immigrants and Hispanics with less commitment to southern institutions and society. Civil War historians have been aware that more soldiers died of disease and illness than were killed on battlefields or died of their wounds. The figures for Texas units confirm that impact, but also clarify the significance of numerous discharges based on illness, disability, and age for men who could not sustain active duty. Other men gained transfers or temporary assignments to different units or duty. Together these losses reduced the size of units to one-third or one-fourth of their initial numbers by 1864, levels that clearly undercut the chances of final success. While Union regiments in general suffered similar losses, they still could be replaced because of a larger manpower pool.

Richard Beringer and his coauthors, who emphasize the impact of internal issues within the Confederacy as causes for defeat, focus less on states' rights and more on the incomplete formation of Confederate nationalism. They also suggest that defeats in the later stages of the war raised doubts among Confederates about slavery and their religious belief that God was on their side. Wooster and Bell devote attention to the tensions between Texas Governor Pendleton Murrah and Confederate military commanders in Texas and the Trans-Mississippi Department during the latter stages of the war. They clashed over transfer of state troops to the Confederate army and which level of government would regulate the cotton trade through Mexico. These issues created distractions for all involved.

Dale Baum applies quantitative analysis to wartime elections that often revolved around support for or opposition to the Confederate government as it expanded its powers. Other issues helped produce mixed results, although supporters of the Davis administration proved more successful. Even Governor Murrah defeated a candidate who was more critical of the Confederacy.²⁶ John Anthony Moretta, in his biography of William Pitt Ballinger, adds to the sense of political complexity. Ballinger, a prewar lawyer and Unionist, served the Confederacy as a receiver of the property of alien enemies. Yet he experienced growing efforts by Texans who for economic reasons hid property owned by, or debts owed to, northerners. At other times the attorney wrote editorials defending the Confederate conscription acts and martial law, while criticizing Murrah's efforts to control state troops and the cotton trade. In the debates with state leaders, Confederate nationalism had a firm defender in Ballinger.²⁷ Texas nationalism is offered by Clayton E. Jewett as an explanation for Murrah's actions in conflict with the Confederate authorities. State efforts to stimulate industry and provide for some societal needs also are cited as aspects of Lone Star nationalism. Yet some of the state activities may be seen as complementary to those of the Confederacy, rather than as acts of separate nationalism. Jewett has posed a new interpretation, but the varied strength of his evidence and arguments leaves room for lively debate. Jewett follows his theme further by editing a complete edition of the memoir by Confederate Senator Williamson S. Oldham of Texas, a strong critic of many activities by the Confederate central government.²⁸ Governor Murrah should be ranked with his counterparts in Georgia and North Carolina as one of the most outspoken defenders of state authority during the war. Despite the Confederate-state tensions, it appears the two sides found at least temporary compromises that kept their differences from reaching the level of major disruption or a full-scale political challenge to Confederate nationalism.

Historians of Confederate women, such as Drew Gilpin Faust, have pointed to diverse situations and reactions as some wives and mothers sought to maintain traditional gender roles while others faced new conditions that forced varied degrees of change in roles and attitudes.²⁹ Two published collections of letters from the wives of East Texas slaveholders reveal their concerns and views. In a volume edited by Erika Murr, the role of planter's wife appeared to create frustrations for Lizzie Neblett even before the war. The conflict increased the tension she experienced with her absent spouse, Will, their children, and her own failings. A sense of isolation as well as difficulties in directing slaves and finding an acceptable overseer became topics for letters that at times urged her husband to come back to his family.³⁰ M. Jane Johansson has edited letters written by Harriet Perry, who worried about similar problems as well as childbirth and fears that her husband might be killed in the war. Moving in with relatives helped her morale, however, as did her decision to hire out slaves. The illness of

her children and deaths in the family added distress as did inflation and shortages. Yet she did become increasingly involved in family economic decisions with advice from her husband and father.³¹ Richard Lowe provides additional insights into women's attitudes in his chapter on the exchange of letters between husbands in Walker's Division and their wives. He notes Harriet Neblett's views, but also those of other wives who offered reassurances, encouragement, and affection to sustain the soldiers' morale.³²

Joleene Maddux Snider describes the less common case of Sarah Devereux, a planter's wife who had assumed direction of the plantation when her husband, Julien, died before the war. Previously she had borne and raised children, served as a plantation mistress, whose duties including supervising house servants, and participated in a local church. When her husband had to travel out of town, she had shared direction of the field workers with an overseer and also had paid bills. While she functioned within the family concept of gender roles while he lived, her wider range of experiences allowed her to operate a profitable plantation after his death. The Civil War brought new concerns including higher taxes, impressments of some slaves to labor for the government, and worry about sons who were nearing military age. Yet she survived the conflict and, according to Snider, "expanded her concept of the boundaries of southern femininity."³³

Angela Boswell offers the most analytical account of Texas women during the war in her study of their lives in Colorado County. Family problems ranged from men absent in the army, including some who died, to inflation and shortages. As a result, widows, single women, and some wives of soldiers had to make economic decisions even though that overlapped the realm of men's gender roles. With acceptance by most men, women created debts, leased and sold slaves and land, and directed slave labor. Some worked to operate farms. Others requested and received local government aid in feeding their families. Although divorce did not become extensive, it did increase in the immediate postwar years. Boswell concludes that the women accepted the southern ideal in gender roles, but expanded their right to act, with the goal of sustaining the family, when husbands could not or did not fulfill their roles.³⁴ These new studies focus on the East Texas region where southern ideas about gender roles would be strongest and consider primarily upper- and middle-class women whose attitudes would be more fully shaped by those roles. East Texas also avoided Federal invasion, which created greater disruption and change in several regions of the Confederacy. In other areas of Texas greater conflict as well as social, economic, and ethnic differences probably created a greater range of conditions and attitudes for women.

Texas towns remained small in the 1860s compared to southern river and seaports such as New Orleans and Mobile. Yet their significant place in trade and government activities gave them a potential influence beyond their size. Alwyn Barr has explored the impact of war on Galveston, the state's leading

port and second-largest town, which faced a Union blockade throughout the war and a brief occupation in late 1862. Many civilians became refugees to Houston and other inland towns, while Confederate soldiers garrisoned the island community. Blockade runners came and went sporadically, although trade and employment declined. Churches and schools closed at times and then reopened. Soldiers and their wives protested the quality of supplies and food provided by the army, with wives being temporarily ordered off the island as a result. Yellow fever added further disruption. Some slaves escaped to Union ships or joined whites in robbery gangs. The activities of women became more diverse including the operation of some new businesses. Postwar Galveston adjusted to the end of slavery and revived with renewed trade, however, at a faster pace than many rural areas.³⁵

Houston citizens increased their economic activities during the war, explains Paul A. Levenson, as a result of Galveston's problems and new trade through Mexico. Consumer goods remained available despite some shortages and inflation. White refugees, often with slaves, increased the population. New businesses opened and established ones expanded. Cultural and charitable activities continued, as did schools and both white and black churches. Mary M. Cronin discusses R. R. Gilbert who wrote humorous articles for Texas newspapers that helped relieve some of the wartime tensions.³⁶

Some Austin businessmen also conducted trade through Mexico, including business with northern cities, as noted by Peyton O. Abbott, who edited the diary of an Austin merchant. David C. Humphrey shows that Austin suffered problems in acquiring accurate information about wartime events—especially battles. The Union blockade and a lack of rail and telegraph connections led to frequent confusion and misinformation. Confederate editors censored some news favorable to the Federal cause, probably because of the large number of Unionists in the community. Austin Confederates often celebrated early reports of victories that sometimes proved to be defeats. Thus civilian morale fluctuated wildly at times. Both Confederates and Unionists became doubtful of all news stories. After Federal forces gained control of the Mississippi River, Texas newspapers had to rely more and more on information in the northern press about events east of that river, despite doubts about accuracy. Better reporting of Confederate victories on the Texas coast could boost morale, while fears of Union invasion in South Texas produced alarm. Humphrey suggests that perhaps the dominant themes became isolation, grasping at rumors, and doubt.³⁷ Depending on location and local conditions, urban experiences in Texas ranged from disruption to prosperity to isolation and confusion.

Randolph B. Campbell and other historians have described the impact of the Civil War on slavery in Texas as limited because Union armies did not penetrate East Texas where most slaves labored. Campbell also points to the

growth of the institution since white refugees brought slaves into the state to avoid their emancipation by advancing Federal forces in Arkansas and Louisiana. The Confederate army did impress slaves to construct earthworks for defense of coastal towns. As a result some planters expressed concern for the loss of labor, while slaves might face disease and dangers in new locations. Late in the war some owners sold slaves fearing their loss if the Union won, although others continued to buy bondsmen in the spring of 1865. Some slaves did continue to escape to Mexico, into towns, or to the Union navy, while others resisted slavery in individual acts.³⁸ As Alwyn Barr has noted, some slaves facing less supervision during the conflict did in subtle ways assume more control over punishment, work pace, and their daily lives. Milton Holland, the free black son of a Texas planter and a slave mother, had been sent north for an education. He later volunteered for the Union army and as a sergeant in Virginia during 1864 received the Congressional Medal of Honor for leadership in battle.³⁹

Historians in recent years have begun to explore more fully the instances in which Confederate soldiers shot down African Americans in the Union army who tried to surrender like other men when surrounded by the opposing army. Some Texas Confederates participated along with other troops in such actions at Poison Spring in Arkansas as well as others in the Indian Territory and Louisiana. Racial ideas and prewar fears of slave revolts apparently produced the strong emotions that led to these tragic excesses. After Poison Spring, black troops retaliated during the battle at Jenkins's Ferry in Arkansas.⁴⁰

In 1864 and 1865 Confederate military and government leaders debated the possibility of trying to recruit slaves for their army by promising some individual freedom for those who served. Philip D. Dillard offers a comparison of attitudes in Lynchburg, Virginia, and Galveston, Texas, on the proposal. In Lynchburg, close to heavy fighting in the final months of conflict, support emerged for the proposal, even though it might undercut the original reason for secession. By contrast, most Confederates in Galveston, facing no immediate threat at that time and less aware of precarious Confederate fortunes elsewhere, opposed the action as unnecessary and disruptive of society. Neither the few Galveston supporters of using black soldiers nor their numerous critics suggested that any guilt about the mistreatment of slaves influenced their views. Dillard concludes that greater war pressures had created stronger Confederate nationalism in Virginia than in Texas.⁴¹ Without a Union invasion, slavery in Texas appeared less disrupted as an institution than in most Confederate states, despite the hopes of slaves and the fears of some slaveholders. No sense of guilt about the treatment of slaves appears in the newly published collections of letters by women and their husbands in the Confederate army.

The only mentions of religious concerns appear in descriptions of revivals among soldiers in 1863 and 1864. Thomas W. Cutrer has edited the letters

written to newspapers in Texas by Robert F. Bunting, the chaplain of the Eighth Texas Cavalry, known as Terry's Rangers. Bunting preached to the soldiers, buried the dead as crusading martyrs, and tried through his letters to sustain civilian morale.⁴² It does not appear that concerns about slavery or religion played an important role in undermining Confederate morale among Texans.

Gary Gallagher has argued that Robert E. Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia through their early successes in 1862 and 1863 became the most important symbols of Confederate nationalism. Gallagher believes that view outweighed economic, social, and political concerns and helped maintain the morale of Confederates into the spring of 1865.⁴³ His evidence comes primarily from the eastern Confederacy, therefore it seems useful to consider whether the new studies of Texans in the West support that concept. Humphrey suggests that the mood of Austinites rose and fell with victories and defeats wherever they might occur, with frequent confusion as the result of false rumors. Events along or near the Mississippi River, such as the Union capture of Vicksburg, or attacks along the Texas coast seemed to stir the strongest responses. Texas soldiers in the West seemed to share those views. In their letters, Lizzie and Will Neblett and Theophilus and Harriet Perry reflected a variety of views about Lee that ranged from hopeful to worried in 1863 and 1864. The only clear exception to these patterns was Gideon Lincecum, the author of letters edited by Jerry Bryan Lincecum, Edward Hake Phillips, and Peggy A. Redshaw. Lincecum, an ardent Confederate, criticized Unionists, speculation, Confederate impressment, and wealthy families helping sons avoid conscription, while recognizing public discontent with government leaders. Yet he retained confidence in Lee as late as March 1865 and, perhaps wishfully, thought others shared his view. Among Texans in the Trans-Mississippi Department, Lee's image appeared positive but less reassuring than in the East because it was overshadowed by events closer to home.⁴⁴

If trade through Mexico and the absence of a Federal invasion allowed East Texas to live with fewer problems and frustrations than many other regions of the Confederacy, the same cannot be said of most border regions in Texas. Political differences in the state led to fears and violent suppression of dissent that reveal some limits of Confederate nationalism. Some Texas Unionists accepted the judgment of secession, while others left the state, served in frontier defense units, or avoided participation in the war until passage of the first Confederate conscription act in early 1862. Richard McCaslin has written a thorough and analytical account of the most striking event that followed. In North Texas counties that opposed secession, desertions and opposition to the draft led to talk of organizing a Peace Party. A pro-Confederate vigilante committee in the fall of 1862 seized about 150 men, formed an extralegal court and under mob pressure hanged 22 men in Cooke County north of Dallas. The killing of a

Confederate officer brought a new wave of retaliation including 24 more deaths by lynch law. Government leaders at last reestablished a degree of order. Some military officers continued to harass and kill dissenters over the following year. Confederate and state policy later shifted from hunting Unionists to accepting them for frontier defense units. McCaslin suggests that seeking order through vigilante tactics only led to more disorder.⁴⁵ Another volume, by David Pickering and Judy Falls, extends the study of Union dissent and pro-Confederate violent opposition to Hunt and Hopkins counties east of Dallas. There too vigilantes rounded up dissenters who then faced a sham trial and hanging. Other Unionists hid in thickets to avoid similar treatment. Postwar efforts to bring vigilantes to justice failed as sympathizers helped them escape jail or manipulate the judicial system.⁴⁶

Walter Kamphoefner extends the story of Unionist opposition to conscription into the central and southeastern Texas counties with large German immigrant populations, noting the Confederate use of martial law in both areas. The memoir of a Hill Country German American, edited by David R. Hoffman, lends support to that view. Stanley S. McGowen clarifies the confrontation on the Nueces River in 1862 as an attack by Confederate troops on armed Unionists headed for Mexico who initially defended themselves. Later, however, some Confederates did execute at least nine wounded Unionists. In a new general account of desertion in the Confederacy, Mark A. Weitz confirms the presence of men avoiding the draft or deserting into Mexico from Central and South Texas.⁴⁷

When the United States Army withdrew from forts in West Texas after secession in 1861, the state government sought to replace them with Texas troops who would help recent settlers control areas still claimed by American Indians. A retreat by settlers of up to 100 miles resulted from Indian raids during the war according to the standard view of earlier histories about the Texas frontier. David Paul Smith in a thoughtful study clarifies three stages of Confederate and state efforts, which involved no more than a thousand men at any time. Debate over control of troops on the frontier did add to the tension between Confederate military commanders and Governor Murrah, resulting in a short-term compromise. The tasks of the soldiers in West Texas became more complex as growing numbers of Confederate deserters, Unionists avoiding conscription, and outlaws appeared in some parts of the region. While the defense units withdrew to a second line of forts, Smith argues that the farms and ranches of most settlers lay behind that line and did not have to be abandoned. He concludes that frontier defense during the war proved comparable to that of the prewar period. Glen Sample Ely adds further complexity by arguing that Unionists, including some frontier defense rangers, left for California amid growing chaos in 1864–1865, a time in which frontier ranchers also sold cattle to the Union army in New Mexico.⁴⁸

Gary Clayton Anderson presents a different perspective on West Texas during the Civil War period in his volume on Anglo-American efforts to drive Native Americans out of Texas in the nineteenth century. He describes harsh winters and summer droughts that caused the deaths of many Plains Indians as well as their horses and left them too weakened to push back the advance of Anglo settlement. Instead he offers evidence of organized white outlaws stealing horses and trying to throw the blame on Native Americans. Men associated with political and military leader John R. Baylor seem to have played active roles in these schemes. Both Confederate and Union efforts in the Indian Territory to provide food for Indians also reduced their need to raid. Anderson agrees with Smith in focusing more attention on the struggle between loyal Unionists and Confederate troops and vigilantes, as well as on some Indian raids conducted for the purpose of taking cattle and other foodstuffs that were needed to feed starving tribes in the Indian territory.⁴⁹ A synthesis of the conclusions in these studies may lead to a better-balanced understanding of wartime events on the frontier. A comparison of the Confederate-Indian relations with the Union-Indian relations across the West, as described by Alvin M. Josephy, suggests that the larger numbers of Union volunteers made greater inroads on Indian lands than the Confederates in Texas.⁵⁰

Historians of Anglo-Indian relations in postwar Texas usually have described a time of increasing conflict. Additional studies of Reconstruction have added a sense of widespread racial violence directed at the newly freed African Americans and white Unionists as a means of reasserting Confederate dominance. Other volumes extend the study of violence by exploring the use by outlaws of Confederate imagery to gain public support. One book by Barry Crouch, Larry Peacock, and James M. Smallwood and another by Crouch and Donaly E. Brice focus on Northeast Texas, while a third volume, by Smallwood, considers the South Central region of the state. In a more sweeping analysis William D. Carrigan suggests that repeated spasms of violence and vigilantism over time, including the prewar fire scare, the extralegal wartime hangings, frontier fighting, and Reconstruction murders created a culture in which lynching would continue to be acceptable into the early twentieth century.⁵¹ This may provide a partial answer to the question by Randolph Campbell about patterns of continuity in a period of change.

Several additional studies of the Civil War in Texas and Texans in the war provide a variety of fresh insights into the attitudes and actions of soldiers and civilians during the period. Relating those views and activities to larger questions about secession, soldiers' commitments, and the impact of war on women, ethnic minorities, Confederate nationalism, and factors in victory or defeat seems more daunting and open to debate. Books related to secession in Texas suggest that fears of slave revolt and abolitionists clearly strengthened the

separatist movement. Significant reductions in soldiers present for duty probably did weaken Confederate armies late in the war. Yet health and fitness problems joined battle losses as apparently having greater impacts than desertion in East Texas units with the strongest Deep South background and commitment to slavery and the Confederate cause. Higher levels of desertion or shifts of allegiance existed in units from border areas of the state that were less involved with southern culture and institutions. Unionist-Confederate tensions contributed to greater disruption and conflict in those areas.

Additional studies suggest that responses of Texas women to the war ranged from frustrations to subtly expanded roles for meeting new problems and managing family economic affairs. With no Federal advance into most of Texas and continued trade through Mexico, women and other civilians in East Texas seem to have faced fewer disruptions than their counterparts in many Confederate states. Under those circumstances, concerns about the treatment of slaves and a loss of God's support in the war seem to have had little impact on the attitudes of Confederate Texans. With fewer military and economic pressures, perhaps Texans and their leaders felt less need for stronger Confederate nationalism in the form of controls over state troops or the possible recruiting of slaves as soldiers. The desire of Texas soldiers in the Trans-Mississippi Department to protect their families is understandable, even when it led to temporary desertions during 1863 and 1864 in response to the possibility their units might be sent across the Mississippi River. Since Confederate defeat ultimately occurred east of the Mississippi, however, their reluctance to serve farther from home could be interpreted as a form of regionalism and a further limitation on Confederate nationalism.

To the questions of continuity or change in this era there are at least two additional answers. The reoccurring instances of violence and vigilante activity across the state from the secession period throughout the war and into Reconstruction suggest a tragic example of continuity in an era of change. On a more positive note, more men seem to have survived the war than was once thought, which contributed to a more rapid revival of the postwar Texas economy and society. Discussions of change and continuity in the Civil War period can be enlivened by also considering some of the thoughtful studies about the interaction of popular myth and history. One volume on that topic offers two essays related to what appear to be contrasting popular myths, one supporting continuity and one favoring change. Kelly McMichael describes the campaign in the early twentieth century by the United Daughters of the Confederacy to build monuments honoring Confederate soldiers. Yet she sees that effort as also aimed at recognizing women's contributions to the Lost Cause and developing their own cultural influence, albeit with mixed results. Elizabeth Hayes Turner discusses Juneteenth, the annual African American celebrations of emancipation,

that kept alive hope of equality through years of discrimination.⁵² Each essay, one clearly and the other with subtlety, reflect changes that for Texans began primarily in the Civil War era.

Notes

- 1 Ralph A. Wooster, *Texas and Texans in the Civil War* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1995); Carl Moneyhon and Bobby Roberts, *Portraits of Conflict: A Photographic History of Texas in the Civil War* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1998).
- 2 Randolph B. Campbell, "Statehood, Civil War, and Reconstruction," in Walter L. Buenger and Robert A. Calvert, eds., *Texas through Time: Evolving Interpretations* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1990), 166.
- 3 Walter F. Bell, "Civil War Texas: A Review of the Historical Literature," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (hereafter cited as *SHQ*) 109 (October 2005): 205–232.
- 4 Donald E. Reynolds, *Texas Terror: The Slave Insurrection Panic of 1860 and the Secession of the Lower South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2007).
- 5 Dale Baum, *The Shattering of Texas Unionism: Politics in the Lone Star State During the Civil War Era* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1998); Kenneth Wayne Howell, "'When the Rabble Hiss, Well May Patriots Tremble': James Webb Throckmorton and the Secession Movement in Texas, 1854–1861," *SHQ* 109 (April 2006): 465–93.
- 6 Stephen A. Townsend, *The Yankee Invasion of Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2006).
- 7 Jeffery S. Prushankin, *A Crisis in Confederate Command: Edmund Kirby Smith, Richard Taylor, and the Army of the Trans-Mississippi* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005); Stephen A. Dupree, *Planting the Union Flag in Texas: The Campaigns of Major General Nathaniel P. Banks in the West* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008).
- 8 Thomas W. Cutrer, *Ben McCulloch and the Frontier Military Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Paul D. Casdorff, *Prince John Magruder: His Life and Campaigns* (New York: John Wiley, 1996).
- 9 Douglas Hale, *The Third Texas Cavalry in the Civil War* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993), chap. 3.
- 10 Richard Lowe, *Walker's Texas Division C.S.A.: Greyhounds of the Trans-Mississippi* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), chap. 2:19; Randolph B. Campbell, "Fighting for the Confederacy: The White Male Population of Harrison County in the Civil War," *SHQ* 104 (July 2000): 23–39.
- 11 Stanley S. McGowen, *Horse Sweat and Powder Smoke: The First Texas Cavalry in the Civil War* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1999), chap. 6; Charles D. Spurlin, ed., *The Civil War Diary of Charles A. Leuschner* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1992).
- 12 Jerry Thompson and Lawrence T. Jones III, *Civil War and Revolution on the Rio Grande Frontier: A Narrative and Photographic History* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2004), chaps. 1–2; Jerry Thompson, *Cortina: Defending*

- the Mexican Name in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), chaps. 4–5.
- 13 Richard Lowe, ed., introduction to *A Texas Cavalry Officer's Civil War: The Diary and Letters of James C. Bates* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).
 - 14 Hale, *Third Texas Cavalry*, 71–73, 280–83.
 - 15 Lowe, *A Texas Cavalry Officer's Civil War*, 327.
 - 16 Lowe, *Walker's Texas Division*, 27–28, 38–39, 115–17, 235–40, 263–65.
 - 17 M. Jane Johansson, *Peculiar Honor: A History of the 28th Texas Cavalry 1862–1865* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1998), 137; Charles Grear, “Texans to the Home Front: Why Lone Star Soldiers Returned to Texas during the War,” *East Texas Historical Journal* 45 (Fall 2007): 14–25; Campbell, “Fighting for the Confederacy,” 38.
 - 18 Hale, *Third Texas Cavalry*, 281.
 - 19 Spurlin, *Civil War Diary of Charles A. Leuschner*, 13–14, 59–60, 61–99.
 - 20 Richard B. McCaslin, “Conditional Confederates: The Eleventh Texas Cavalry West of the Mississippi River,” *Military History of the Southwest* 21 (Spring 1991): 87–99.
 - 21 McGowen, *Horse Sweat and Powder Smoke*, chaps. 7–8.
 - 22 Terry G. Jordan-Bychkov, Allen R. Branum, and Paula K. Hood, eds., “The Boesel Letters: Two Texas Germans in Sibley's Brigade,” trans. Irma Ohlendorf Schwarz, *SHQ* 102 (April 1999): 456–84.
 - 23 Walter D. Kamphoefner, “New Perspectives on Texas Germans and the Confederacy,” *SHQ* 102 (April 1999): 440–55; Spurlin, *Civil War Diary of Charles A. Leuschner*, 13–14, 59–60.
 - 24 Thompson and Jones, *Civil War and Revolution on the Rio Grande*, chaps. 1–3.; Thompson, *Cortina*, chaps. 4–5.
 - 25 Richard E. Beringer, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Still, Jr., *Why the South Lost the Civil War* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 327, 334, 435, 439; Gary Gallagher, *The Confederate War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 31–32.
 - 26 Beringer, Hattaway, Jones, and Still, *Why the South Lost the Civil War*, chaps. 4 and 10.
 - 27 Baum, *The Shattering of Texas Unionism*, chap. 3; John Anthony Moretta, *William Pitt Ballinger: Texas Lawyer, Southern Statesman, 1825–1888* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2000), chap. 7.
 - 28 Clayton E. Jewett, *Texas in the Confederacy: An Experiment in Nation Building* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002); Clayton E. Jewett, ed., *Rise and Fall of the Confederacy: The Memoir of Senator Williamson S. Oldham, C.S.A.* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006).
 - 29 Drew Gilpin Faust, *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
 - 30 Erika L. Murr, ed., *A Rebel Wife in Texas: The Diary and Letters of Elizabeth Scott Neblett, 1852–1864* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001).

- 31 M. Jane Johansson, ed., *Widows by the Thousand: The Civil War Letters of Theophilus and Harriet Perry, 1862–1864* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 2000).
- 32 Lowe, *Walker's Texas Division*, chap. 4.
- 33 Joleene Maddox Snider, "Sarah Devereux: A Study in Southern Femininity," *SHQ* 97 (January 1994): 479–508.
- 34 Angela Boswell, *Her Act and Deed: Women's Lives in a Rural Southern County, 1837–1873* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001).
- 35 Alwyn Barr, "The 'Queen City of the Gulf' Held Hostage: The Impact of War on Confederate Galveston," *Military History of the West* 27 (Fall 1997): 119–38.
- 36 Paul A. Levensgood, "In the Absence of Scarcity: The Civil War Prosperity of Houston, Texas," *SHQ* 101 (April 1998): 401–26; Charles A. Israel, "From Biracial to Segregated Churches: Black and White Protestants in Houston, Texas, 1840–1870," *SHQ* 101 (April 1998): 428–58; Mary M. Cronin, "'Confounding the Wise, If Not the Devil Himself': Rediscovering Forgotten Civil War Humorist R. R. Gilbert," *SHQ* 106 (April 2008): 389–416.
- 37 Peyton O. Abbott, "Business Travel Out of Texas during the Civil War: The Travel Diary of S. B. Brush, Pioneer Austin Merchant," *SHQ* 96 (October 1992): 259–71; David C. Humphrey, "'A Very Muddy and Conflicting' View: The Civil War as Seen from Austin, Texas," *SHQ* 94 (January 1991): 369–414; James Marten, ed., "The Diary of Thomas H. DuVal: The Civil War in Austin, Texas, February 26 to October 9, 1863," *SHQ* 94 (January 1991): 434–57.
- 38 Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821–1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), chap. 12.
- 39 Alwyn Barr, "Black Texans during the Civil War," in Donald Willett and Stephen Curley, eds., *Invisible Texans: Women and Minorities in Texas History* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2005), 86–93.
- 40 Gregory J. W. Irwin, ed., *Black Flag Over Dixie: Racial Atrocities and Reprisals in the Civil War* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004).
- 41 Philip D. Dillard, "'What Price Must We Pay for Victory?' Views on Arming Slaves from Lynchburg, Virginia, to Galveston, Texas," in Lesley J. Gordon and John C. Inscoe, eds., *Inside the Confederate Nation: Essays in Honor of Emory M. Thomas* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 316–31.
- 42 Thomas W. Cutrer, ed., *Our Trust Is in the God of Battles: The Civil War Letters of Robert Franklin Bunting, Chaplain, Terry's Texas Rangers, C.S.A.* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006).
- 43 Gallagher, *The Confederate War*, 85–89, 139–40.
- 44 Humphrey, "A 'Very Muddy and Conflicting' View," 369–414; Murr, *A Rebel Wife in Texas*, 138, 418, 428, 448; Johansson, *Widows by the Thousand*, 144–46, 152, 185, 237; Jerry Bryan Lincecum, Edward Hake Philips, and Peggy A. Redshaw, eds., *Gideon Lincecum's Sword: Civil War Letters from the Texas Home Front* (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2001), 7–8, 293–94, 316–17.
- 45 Richard B. McCaslin, *Tainted Breeze: The Great Hanging at Gainesville, Texas, 1862* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994).

- 46 David Pickering and Judy Falls, *Brush Men and Vigilantes: Civil War Dissent in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2000).
- 47 Kamphoefner, "New Perspectives on German Texans and the Confederacy," 440–55; David R. Hoffman, "A German-American Pioneer Remembers: August Hoffman's Memoir," *SHQ* 102 (April 1999): 486–509; Stanley S. McGowen, "Battle or Massacre?: The Incident on the Nueces, August 10, 1862," *SHQ* 104 (July 2000): 65–86; Mark A. Weitz, *More Damning Than Slaughter: Desertion in the Confederate Army* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 175, 231.
- 48 David Paul Smith, *Frontier Defense in the Civil War: Texas Rangers and Rebels* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1992); Glen Sample Ely, "Gone from Texas and Trading with the Enemy: New Perspectives on Civil War West Texas," *SHQ* 110 (April 2007): 439–63.
- 49 Gary Clayton Anderson, *The Conquest of Texas: Ethnic Cleansing in the Promised Land, 1820–1875* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005), chap. 21.
- 50 Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., *The Civil War in the American West* (New York: Knopf, 1991).
- 51 Barry A. Crouch, Larry Peacock, and James M. Smallwood, *Murder and Mayhem: The War of Reconstruction in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003); Barry A. Crouch and Donaly E. Brice, *Cullen Montgomery Baker: Reconstruction Desperado* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997); James M. Smallwood, *The Feud That Wasn't: The Taylor Gang, John Wesley Hardin, and Reconstruction Violence in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2008); William D. Carrigan, *The Making of a Lynching Culture: Violence and Vigilantism in Central Texas, 1836–1916* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).
- 52 Gregg Cantrell and Elizabeth Hayes Turner, eds., *Lone Star Pasts: Memory and History in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2007), chaps. 4 and 6.