ABSTRACT

Render Unto Caesar, Render Unto God: Texas Denominational Colleges and Universities and the Politics of the Civil War Era

Daniel G. Karppi, Ph.D.

Mentor: Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D.

This dissertation is a study of church-state relations. Its overarching goal is to illuminate the manner in which religion and government interact. The setting for this study is the Civil War era, which includes the period from the 1840s to the 1880s. The actors in this study are the state of Texas, Texas denominational colleges and universities, church leaders, and key educational pioneers. Analysis is limited to three specific denominations: the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians. Its central argument is that Texas denominational colleges and universities reflected and promoted the social and political values of Texas during the Civil War era.

Supporting evidence for this argument is provided by bringing together religious history and educational history. The topics and questions examined are varied. One chapter is devoted to the question of how both church and state viewed the role of denominational colleges and universities. The remaining chapters focus on specific political and social questions. They cover the response by Texas denominational colleges and universities to slavery, secession, and Reconstruction. To document this response, particular attention is paid to the formal and informal curriculum.

Render Unto Caesar, Render Unto God: Texas Denominational Colleges and Universities and the Politics of the Civil War Era

by

Daniel G. Karppi, M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the J. M. Dawson Institute of Church-State Studies

_____

Christopher Marsh, Ph.D., Interim Director

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

_____

Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____

T. Michael Parrish, Ph.D.

_____

J. Wesley Null, Ph.D.

_____

Perry L. Glanzer, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
May 2008

_____

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Page bearing signatures is kept on file in the Graduate School.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An endeavor such as this could not have been completed without the help and support of many people. First among them is my mentor, Dr. Barry G. Hankins. His persistent enthusiasm for this project and his willingness to share his expertise were helpful in ways too numerous to mention here. I would also like to thank the Department of History and the School of Education at Baylor University. Both departments opened their doors to me. In the Department of History, Dr. Michael Parrish consistently offered insights into the process of historical writing. In the School of Education, Dr. Wesley Null and Dr. Perry Glanzer helped me to understand the importance of the curriculum in a college's identity. That realization gave this study a distinct focus throughout. Without the assistance of these two departments, it is unlikely that this study could have lived up to the interdisciplinary expectations of church-state studies.

Archivists assist researchers in immeasurable ways. With that in mind, there are many archivists who deserve my thanks. They include: Kristy Sorensen at Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary's Stitt Library, Justin Banks at Austin College's Archives and Special Collections, Kathryn Stallard and Sheran Johle at Southwestern University's Special Collections, and Ellen K. Brown at Baylor University's Texas Collection. The staff of the Archives and Information Services Division, Texas State Library and Archives Commission was also very helpful. Lastly, I would also like to thank the staff of the Center for American History at the University of Texas at Austin.

For Georgie

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Statement of Problem

In a 1998 collection of essays entitled *Religion and the American Civil War*, Randall M. Miller, Harry S. Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson observe that "the religious history of the war has yet to be written."[1] While it is most likely accurate to suggest that the military history and the political history of the Civil War tend to dominate the scholarship of that conflict, the evidence shows that there exists a small cadre of scholars that has carved out a place for the role played by religion. Moreover, interest in religion's role in the Civil War seems to be on the rise. This dissertation will endeavor to add to this growing interest. Its approach will be interdisciplinary in that it will bring together multiple disciplines, namely, social history, political history, educational history, and religious history. The central question it hopes to answer is: How did Texas denominational colleges and universities respond to the political problems and disputes of the Civil War era? As the question implies, the interplay between religion, society, and politics during the Civil War will be viewed through the prism of denominational colleges and universities.

Few historians of American religion appreciate the role played by denominational colleges and universities during this contentious period. The research and writing discussed in the review of literature that follows will show that most authors give these

[1]Randall M. Miller, Harry S. Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson, eds., *Religion and the American Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 3.

denominational institutions little or no place in their methodology, analysis, and conclusions. Instead, their methods and analysis focus on individual ministers, individual churches, and denominational conferences and conventions. By focusing on denominational efforts at supporting higher education, this study hopes to view the role of religion through a new set of lenses.

Educational institutions are often at the center of social, religious, and political conflict. One of the more prolific scholars in the field of educational history, Frederick Rudolph, writes that the school curriculum "has been one of those places where we have told ourselves who we are."[2] For Rudolph, the curriculum is seen as a "transmitter of values."[3] If Rudolph is correct, the political events of the Civil War period should have found their way into denominational colleges and universities. In short, through the microscope of the denominational college and university, the interaction between religion and politics should come into sharp focus.

This dissertation is first and foremost a study of church-state relations. As such, it is relevant to the field for one important reason; namely, tragedy and crisis often make religion and politics more sensitive and responsive to one another. Therefore, tragedy and crisis provide a good laboratory for studying the way in which politics and religion interact. No one would doubt that the Civil War was the largest crisis America has faced. Major social and political questions were at stake, hundreds of thousands of Americans were killed, and, in the final outcome, American society was dramatically changed forever. Throughout the conflict, America's religious character showed itself as a

---

[2]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), 1.

[3]Ibid., 3.

primary actor. Religion and religious concerns were never too far removed from politics and political concerns.

This study will argue that by serving God, society, and the state, Texas denominational colleges and universities actively participated in Texas's social and political development during the Civil War period. Rudolph's view of colleges surely applies in this case. They were, indeed, transmitters of social and political values.

Methodology

Historical methodology pertains in large measure to procedures. Anthony Brundage lists three specific procedures that must be a part of any historical research and writing project: proper historical questions must be asked, appropriate historical sources must be used, and findings and interpretations must be properly presented.[4] The methodology of this dissertation will address all three of Brundage's requirements. First, each chapter will begin with a presentation of the specific historical questions that will be the focus of analysis. Second, as an interdisciplinary study, this dissertation will incorporate source material used in American religious history with source material used in educational history and Texas history. Where appropriate, consideration will be given to the secondary literature. Therefore, whatever conclusions are made about the manner in which denominational colleges reacted to the politics of the Civil War era, they will be based on more than simply denominational church records. Rather, they will employ many of the sources used in various areas of historical investigation. Third, particular care and consideration will be given to the manner in which findings are presented. Brundage reminds the reader that historians are not in the business of presenting the past

[4]Anthony Brundage, *Going to the Sources: A Guide to Historical Research and Writing* (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2002), 2.

as static; rather, they should seek out "fresh sources, approaches, methodological tools, and interpretations in an effort to offer an ever-new past to the present."[5] This dissertation will endeavor to uncover such fresh sources and approaches but will be ever-mindful of the work that has been conducted heretofore.

There is, of course, a variety of ways for historians to present their findings and to define the scope of their research. The arguments, evidence, and conclusions herein are presented in the form of a narrative. While statistics are relied upon where appropriate, this study is not a work in cliometrics. Emphasis is on qualitative source material rather than on quantitative data. The scope is defined chronologically and in terms of specific topics. Chronologically, the study covers the period from the mid-1840s to the mid-1880s. Therefore, this research project sees the Civil War era as involving the antebellum period, the war years, and Reconstruction. The questions asked in each chapter may not follow in exact chronological order. The emphasis here is on the *political* questions, not the chronology of specific events. Certain time periods are given more emphasis in order to accommodate the gravity of individual political events. By contrast, some time periods and events are passed over in favor of others. Emphasis will be placed on four specific topics: the role of denominational colleges as seen by both church and state, the question of slavery, the question of secession, and the social and political issues of Reconstruction and its aftermath. Central to the analysis of these topics is the college and university curriculum.

The colleges and universities selected for analysis in this study have been chosen because they have three fundamental similarities. First, all were founded between the

[5]Ibid., 3.

years 1836 and 1877. This period covers Texas's history from the founding of the Republic through the end of Reconstruction. Institutions founded outside these dates are not relevant, as they were not part of the Civil War era. Second, the analysis and conclusions are based solely on colleges and universities that were founded by churches or by some other church-related organization or individual. Colleges founded by non-denominational or secular organizations are not included. Institutions with firm connections to a specific church or denomination provide better evidence and stronger conclusions related to church-state relations in Texas during the Civil War era. Third, all of the colleges selected were founded by, or in some other way firmly connected to, one of three major evangelical denominations, namely, the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians.

The third of these three similarities requires a more detailed explanation. There is, for instance, the problem of defining "evangelical." Richard Kyle notes that "considering evangelicalism's extreme diversity, any definition is very difficult."[6] His observation may well be accurate; however, he does identify what he calls the "common denominators"[7] of evangelical theology: belief in the need for Christians to be born again; the commitment to spreading the Gospel to others; the belief that the Bible is the ultimate authority in one's life; and the belief that redemption comes through Christ's death on the cross.[8] Moreover, many scholars agree with him to one extent or another.[9]

---

[6]Richard Kyle, *Evangelicalism: An Americanized Christianity* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2006), 9.

[7]Ibid., 10.

[8]Ibid., 11.

[9]See Mark A. Noll, *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 8; Donald G. Bloesch, *Essentials of Evangelical Theology*, vol. 2, *Life*,

Kyle hesitates to limit the definition of evangelical Christianity to Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. He suggests that many other denominations may well be included.[10]

The Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians are the focus of this study not only because of their theological similarities but also because of their experiential similarities during the Civil War era. C.C. Goen echoes the theological similarities of these three denominations when he observes, "The chief institutional forms of evangelical Christianity were the large popular denominations (churches of the people, namely, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian), each with nationwide constituencies."[11] However, his interest in these denominations is not in their theological similarities but in the fact that all three divided along sectional lines more than a decade before the Civil War. He writes that these church schisms "marked the first major national cleavage between slaveholding and nonslaveholding sections."[12] Goen's work will be described in greater detail in the review of literature that follows. While the religious similarities of Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians are certainly important to this study, the political similarities, and in some cases the differences, are also important. This is why they are chosen for analysis.

In any study of Texas colleges and universities during the Civil War era, one particular methodological problem is evident, namely, nomenclature. Determining which

---

Ministry, and Hope (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979), 1-2, 7, 156; Martin E. Marty, "The Revival of Evangelicalism and Southern Religion," in *Varieties of Southern Evangelicalism*, ed. David Edwin Harrell, Jr. (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1981), 9-10.

[10]Kyle, *Evangelicalism*, 9.

[11]C. C. Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 13.

[12]Ibid.

institutions were true colleges and which were colleges in name only is difficult. The most comprehensive effort to identify all colleges and universities in Texas is Donald W. Whisenhunt's *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historic Profile*. Indeed, his stated goal for the *Encyclopedia* is nothing less than to "compile a list and write a brief sketch of every college that ever existed in Texas."[13] Regarding the issue of nomenclature, he writes,

> In Texas many of the schools that called themselves colleges were not colleges at all. Although it is difficult to prove, the word college seemed to be an almost generic term like the word school. Some of the schools established in Texas with college in the name never offered college work and never had aspirations to do so. On the other hand, quite a few institutions that were called academies, institutes, or seminaries did indeed offer college work, sometimes even at the doctoral level.[14]

The colleges and universities investigated in this dissertation were, by all accounts, true collegiate institutions of higher learning. All were chartered as colleges or universities by the state; all maintained college curriculums; and all were led by educational leaders who desired that their institutions be recognized as true colleges and universities. No attempt is made by the present work to inventory or catalog all Texas higher educational institutions. Whisenhunt's *Encyclopedia* is by far the definitive effort at this task.

Review of Literature

Religion and American History

In the spring of 1994, Wheaton College hosted a conference dedicated to the question of how religion is treated in the study and teaching of history. Harry Stout

---

[13] Donald W. Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historic Profile* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1986), iv.

[14] Ibid., iii-iv.

recognized a shared feeling expressed by the participants. He writes, "There is a common perception, namely, that the relationship of religious commitment to scholarship is a subject worthy of serious discussion in the academy. No longer can it be left on the sidelines of polite academic discourse."[15] Stout places blame for the lack of respect for religion's role in history on the secularization of American academia. For both personal and professional reasons, many scholars had become suspicious of religion. Personally, says Stout, scholars assume religion creates in people an inability to engage in free thought. Professionally, scholars often view religion as something that has promoted many of the less noble aspects of humanity.[16] George M. Marsden also writes with some candor about the status afforded to religion's role in American history. He blames academia's commitment to the scientific method for keeping religion out of what he calls "mainstream academia."[17] This dominant method of historical inquiry, says Marsden, asserts that "only that which [deals] with strictly natural causes [will] count."[18] In other words, only those things that can be subjected to the scientific method are worthy of study.

Whether the lack of respect afforded religion in the academic community is the product of secular impulses, commitment to the scientific method, or outright prejudice, a cursory view of the historiography demonstrates that there has been no corresponding lack of interest by scholars in researching religion's role in American history. Indeed,

---

[15]Harry S. Stout, foreword to *Religious Advocacy and American History*, ed. Bruce Kuklick and D. G. Hart (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), viii-ix.

[16]Ibid., vii.

[17]George M. Marsden, "Christian Advocacy and the Rules of the Academic Game," in *Religious Advocacy and American History*, 4.

[18]Ibid., 3.

one of the main complaints registered by scholars of American religious history is not that there is a lack of interest but that their work rarely filters down into American history textbooks. Paul Boyer's research serves to confirm that this complaint may well be valid. He argues, "Religious history is, indeed, only slowly filtering into the textbooks and the survey courses. This is especially true of high school textbooks and courses, but impressionistic evidence suggests that college-level texts and survey courses reveal the same deficiency, though perhaps to a lesser degree."[19]

The failure of their work to trickle down to the elementary, middle, and high school curriculums has not deterred scholars from vigorously examining the role of religion in all periods of American history. This enthusiasm has certainly impacted the historiography of the Civil War era. Religion is increasingly becoming a focal point in the effort to understand and explain that conflict.

The Role of Evangelical Protestantism in American History

Scholars specializing in American religious history often express different ideas and come to different conclusions about the role that religion has played in American history and culture. One conviction that seems to have nearly universal acceptance, however, is the notion that evangelical Protestantism has been one of the most important driving forces in both culture and history in the United States. Many scholars argue that this was particularly true during the Civil War era. Donald Mathews, for example, explains the nature of this connection in terms of its impact on Southern social relationships. In his book *Religion in the Old South*, Mathews argues that evangelical

[19]Paul Boyer, "In Search of the Fourth 'R': The Treatment of Religion in American History Textbooks and Survey Courses," in *Religious Advocacy and American History*, 117.

Protestantism "enabled a rising lower-middle/middle class to achieve identity and solidarity, rewarding its most committed religious devotees with a sense of personal esteem and liberty."[20] Other studies, like Curtis Johnson's *Redeeming America*, focus on the theological beliefs of evangelicals. Johnson argues that to fully understand the place of religion in antebellum culture one must understand those beliefs. Accordingly, he structures his book around five specific elements of evangelical theology.[21] Still other scholars make the connection between evangelicalism and American culture by way of political ideas. One such historian is Nathan Hatch. His book *The Democratization of American Christianity* describes Christianity as one of the many battlegrounds over democratic ideals and social change during the antebellum period. In their attempt at spreading evangelicalism to the masses, religious leaders, says Hatch, "could rarely divorce that message from contagious new democratic vocabularies and impulses that swept through American popular cultures."[22] Hatch sees the effort by Americans to unshackle themselves from the chains of the British Empire and their increasing attraction to a populist-style religion as mutually reinforcing phenomena. That is to say, ordinary Americans expected to have full participation in their political lives as well as in their religious lives. They became increasingly less likely to bow to authority and traditional leadership in either arena.[23] Finally, scholars like Charles Hambrick-Stowe

---

[20]Donald G. Mathews, *Religion in the Old South* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977), xv.

[21]Curtis D. Johnson, *Redeeming America: Evangelicals and the Road to Civil War* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993), vii.

[22]Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 7.

[23]Ibid., 6-7.

make use of the biographical approach to study the link between evangelical Protestantism and American culture. An example of this is his book *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism*. The author's stated purpose is to show how "the 'spirit' of evangelical Protestantism has exercised a powerful influence alongside economic, cultural, and political developments in American history, for both weal and woe."[24] Of Finney's place in this history, he writes, "Finney's career embodied that spirit to a great degree."[25]

Evangelicals and Slavery

The above examples are but samples of the work that has been done to study the historical relationship between evangelical Protestantism and American culture. The next question to be addressed is: How did evangelical Protestantism's dominance in American culture manifest itself? There could be many answers to this question, but the focus of this dissertation is on politics. Therefore, a brief review of the scholarship addressing various aspects of religion's place in Civil War politics is necessary.

No political issue dominated Civil War politics like slavery. Therefore, the problem of slavery looms large in any analysis of how and why religion became so important to antebellum Southern society. Donald G. Mathews asserts that slavery and religion were directly linked. According to Mathews, "By making religious institutions the means by which blacks were to be given values that would guarantee the stability of southern society, whites reinforced the claims of Evangelical theorists that their churches

---

[24]Charles E. Hambrick-Stowe, *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996), xii.

[25]Ibid.

were the foundation of social order. Indeed, more than anywhere else in the United States–with the exception of Mormon Utah–religion became identified with an essential, public reaffirmation of social solidarity."[26] Mathews's book is intended to focus on the impact of religion on Southern society. It makes little attempt to delve into the inner workings of individual evangelical denominations. His methodology does not rely on denominational church structures and processes. For example, little attention is given to how individual denominations addressed the challenges presented to them by slavery. Moreover, his book does not attempt to analyze the sectional divisions within denominations created by the slavery question.

The sectionalizing of evangelical denominations had its roots in the history of slavery itself. According to Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, the first Africans arrived in English North America in 1619 at Jamestown, Virginia. It is unknown whether they were indentured servants or slaves. By about mid-century, however, colonial laws designed to affirm the institution of slavery were beginning to appear.[27]

The institution of slavery raised more than just legal questions; it raised religious ones as well. John B. Boles' introduction to his book *Masters & Slaves in the House of the Lord* provides a detailed account of how the early English settlers dealt with the relationship between slavery and religion. The central question was: Were slavery and Christianity compatible? The English found the answer in what they called the heathenism (non-Christian nature) of the Africans. Boles observes, "To the extent that they needed any noneconomic justification, they assumed that the Africans not being

---

[26]Mathews, *Religion in the Old South*, 248-249.

[27]Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, *The American Nation*, 11th ed., vol. 1, *A History of the United States to 1877* (New York: Longman, 2003), 53.

Christians made it morally acceptable to enslave them."[28] During the mid-seventeenth century, many slaves had in fact won their freedom by proving that they had been baptized. However, by the late seventeenth century, as Boles notes, the English enacted laws designed to separate one's religious status as a Christian from one's legal status as a slave. One's baptism no longer led to one's freedom from slavery.[29] In essence, slavery in the English colonies became a matter of race.

The fact that one's legal status as a slave became a matter of race rather than religion did not end the debate over the relationship between slavery and Christianity. In fact, the rise to prominence of evangelical Protestantism during the first half of the nineteenth century led to intense clashes between slavery and religion. In an effort to study the connection between evangelical Protestantism and the slavery debate, Victor B. Howard's *Conscience and Slavery* argues that the millennial expectations of northern congregational churches and the politics of westward expansion were directly intertwined. Accordingly he observes,

> The belief that America had a special mission in the divine scheme of things to come was generally held by Americans. . . . Christians of the West believed they were destined to lead the nation in the great mission, but to exercise leadership the section must remain free soil. . . . Both Christian laymen and evangelical clergymen believed the West would be the future battleground of good and evil.[30]

Evangelicals, says Howard, expressed their millennial beliefs through the American Home Missionary Society. He argues that the Society "gave divine sanction to the belief

---

[28]John B. Boles, ed., *Masters & Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740-1870* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), 2.

[29]Ibid., 2-3.

[30]Victor B. Howard, *Conscience and Slavery: The Evangelistic Calvinist Domestic Missions, 1837-1861* (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1990), xiii.

in manifest destiny."[31] The politics surrounding the westward expansion of slavery were "the decisive factor in the posture of the northern evangelical church."[32] In the same year that he published *Conscience and Slavery*, Howard published *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement* in which he also examined the impact of evangelicals on American politics. In it he develops the argument that evangelicals played a significant role in defining the Radical Republican movement. According to Howard, "Religion was undoubtedly a significant component in the value system of most Radical Republicans."[33]

When tracing the links between Civil War politics and evangelical Christianity, however, many scholars caution that although evangelicals may have led the abolitionist crusade and the Radical Republican movement, one should *not* assume that their churches also led the way. One such scholar is John McKivigan. His research demonstrates that churches as institutions and Christians as individuals were rarely in concert with one another on the issue of abolitionism. He observes, for example, that abolitionists thought they would find like-minded individuals among the clergy. However, high hopes for the involvement of the clergy in advancing abolitionism were soon dashed.[34] McKivigan's work demonstrates that many Northern evangelicals were more committed to their beliefs than to their institutions. It also serves to highlight the tension that often existed between the clergy and the laity.

---

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Victor B. Howard, *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990), 4.

[34]John R. McKivigan, *The War Against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984), 13.

The work of scholars like Howard and McKivigan addresses primarily the reaction of the Northern evangelical community. Short shrift is given by these authors to the reaction of Southern evangelicals to the institution of slavery. However, there is a wealth of research designed to advance a more complete understanding of the relationship between evangelical Protestantism and slavery by outlining the specific arguments made by evangelicals *for* and *against* slavery. One of the first scholars to have recognized that Southerners defended slavery on numerous fronts–including the religious front–was Eric L. McKitrick. In his 1963 book entitled *Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South*, he encourages historians to see that politicians, slaveholders, and intellectuals were not the only defenders of slavery in the Old South. On the religious front, McKitrick highlights the writings of Thornton Stringfellow. Stringfellow was a Baptist minister from Virginia. McKitrick describes Stringfellow as "one of the most forceful exponents of Scripture in defense of slavery."[35] Through the use of excerpts from Stringfellow's pamphlet "A Scriptural View of Slavery," McKitrick demonstrates that Southern divines found in Scripture historic, legal, and constitutional foundations for slavery.[36] Given the evangelical commitment to the authoritative and literal meaning of the Bible, McKitrick rightly includes this pamphlet in his book. It is a good example of a defense of slavery through the citation of specific passages from the Bible. However, he makes no attempt to illuminate the true importance of the evangelical commitment to the doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* to the pro-slavery and anti-slavery arguments.

---

[35]Eric L. McKitrick, *Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), 86.

[36]Ibid.

Mark A. Noll's 1998 article "The Bible and Slavery" does just that. In it he outlines the logic of Southern evangelicals concerning the authority of the Bible: "If the Bible was God's revealed word to humanity, then it was the duty of Christians to heed carefully every aspect of that revelation. If the Bible tolerated, or actually sanctioned, slavery, then it was incumbent upon believers to hear and obey. The logic was inescapable."[37] Noll observes that evangelicals wishing to advance the idea of abolitionism read the Bible with the same logic as the defenders of slavery. When making arguments against slavery, abolitionists were well aware that their attacks on the peculiar institution might be misconstrued by the public as an attack on Scripture itself.[38]

Noll continued to develop the importance of evangelical interpretations of Scripture to the debate over slavery in his 2006 book-length study entitled *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. In it he argues that there existed a definite mix of theology and politics. "In the uncertain days of late 1860 and early 1861," he writes, "the pulpits of the United States were transformed into instruments of political theology."[39] In his analysis, slavery is the issue which takes center stage. With that in mind, he concludes, "The Bible, or so a host of ministers affirmed, was clear as a bell about slavery."[40]

The competing views of slavery had already, during the 1830s and 1840s, led to schisms between North and South within America's three largest evangelical denominations: the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians. One of the most

---

[37]Mark A. Noll, "The Bible and Slavery," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 43.

[38]Ibid., 44.

[39]Mark A. Noll, *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 1.

[40]Ibid., 2.

important questions related to these church schisms is: Why were evangelicals unable to overcome their differences? Three schools of thought exist at present. First, scholars such as Conrad James Engelder and Donald G. Mathews suggest that the answer lies in church structure. Engelder's dissertation "The Churches and Slavery," argues that to varying degrees, Protestant churches were more likely to be under the control of the laity. That is to say, clergymen were impacted by the views and beliefs of the laity. For example, clerical salaries and social prestige were dependant on the laity. A minister risked losing both his salary and his prestige if he offended the people in the pews.[41] Therefore, "in the midst of this growing hostility to emancipation and increasing defense of slavery, which quickly spread throughout the Southern states, it is not surprising to find a similar agitation within the American churches."[42] Engelder's analysis seems to suggest that the more democratic the church structure, the more the clergy could be expected to espouse views in concert with the laity.

Likewise, Donald G. Mathews's book *Slavery and Methodism* argues that the organizational structure of the Methodist church in the United States made Methodist churches very sensitive to agitation for and against slavery.[43] As a result, he argues, "Methodist conference records reveal much about the nature of abolitionism and its harried opposition."[44] In addition to making the connection between church structure and lay views of slavery, Mathews is careful to explain what motivated the laity in the South

---

[41]Conrad James Engelder, "The Churches and Slavery: A Study of the Attitudes Toward Slavery of the Major Protestant Denominations" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1964), 10.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Donald G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), viii.

[44]Ibid.

to abandon Methodism's anti-slavery roots. He notes that Methodist laymen had neither the desire nor the intention to free their slaves. Economics, not religion, seemed to be the driving force. According to Mathews, many whites hoped one day to experience the promise of America, namely, prosperity. For Southerners, prosperity meant the ability to own slaves. In short, Southerners' commitment to slavery and the wealth it created was stronger than their commitment to religious idealism.[45]

A second group of scholars likewise explains the abandonment of anti-slavery views within Southern churches as the result of democratic church structures. However, this group, including scholars such as John Lee Eighmy and H. Shelton Smith, argues that the move toward a pro-slavery position was made by the clergy with much greater hesitancy. These historians see Southern evangelical churches as captives of their pro-slavery congregations and communities. John Lee Eighmy's book *Churches in Cultural Captivity* focuses on Southern Baptists, the most democratic evangelical tradition. His use of the word *captive* in the title sets the tone. It suggests that ministers, as church leaders, were prevented from holding views about society that did not conform to those held by the laity, even if they wanted to. According to Eighmy, the local autonomy of Baptist churches "exposed the fundamental weakness of the denominational structure in providing leadership to interpret the church's responsibility to society."[46] More specifically, he observes that "state conventions and Baptist journals generally would not advance social ideas that might prove divisive."[47] Slavery was clearly one such issue.

---

[45]Ibid., 22-23.

[46]John Lee Eighmy, *Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987), 19.

[47]Ibid.

Regarding the impact of Baptist church organization on the question of slavery, Eighmy declares, "Thus, when these churches supported slavery, they were confirming on moral grounds a position that their region had already determined on secular grounds."[48]

H. Shelton Smith's book *In His Image, But…: Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910* focuses on all three major evangelical traditions. Like Eighmy, he sees the Southern evangelical churches as captives to the pro-slavery argument. That is to say, Southern churches were driven to abandon their anti-slavery views because of increased support for slavery among the laity. Smith observes, for example, that "far from cutting their ties with the institution of human bondage, they actually admitted more and more slaveowners into membership until they became captive to the slaveocracy."[49] Like Eighmy, Smith uses the word *captive*. This choice of words suggests that the churches unwillingly abandoned anti-slavery views.

A third school of thought on the question of evangelicals' abandonment of their anti-slavery roots suggests that ministers were neither passive supporters of nor helpless captives to the dominant view of slavery held by the Southern laity. Indeed, much of this research suggests that ministers actively supported slavery. This school of thought portrays the Southern clergy as promoting the views and interests of the South from the pulpit. In other words, ministers are viewed as leading their congregations rather than being led by them. James W. Silver's *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda* is one such work. In it he argues that because of their status in the community, ministers led Southerners into a war to defend slavery. He writes candidly, "Because of Southern

---

[48]Ibid., 19-20.

[49]H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image, But…: Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972), vii.

piety, clergymen were leaders of tremendous influence in every community. When the show-down [over slavery] came, the more militant men of God were easily in the vanguard of the secession movement."[50]

Anne C. Loveland agrees with Silver's contention in part. While recognizing the traditional evangelical view that Christians were "a 'peculiar people' set apart [from the world] by their profession of religion,"[51] she argues that "Southern evangelicals saw themselves as guardians of the religious and moral purity of the southern people and felt that it was their duty to concern themselves–even, in some cases, to the point of engaging in political action–with issues and problems relating to the social order."[52] Ministers, according to Loveland, were to "preach obedience to the laws of the land,"[53] and were also justified in "speaking out on political questions that involved moral and religious principles."[54] Moreover, "evangelicals argued that ministers should show the application of religious principles to the political and social order, reproving magistrates and citizens when necessary."[55] Slavery was, of course, central to the Southern social and political order.

---

[50]James W. Silver, *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964), 23-24.

[51]Anne C. Loveland, *Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980), 92.

[52]Ibid., ix.

[53]Ibid., 111.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Ibid.

The Role of Evangelical Churches in Political Disunion

Aside from the question of how evangelicals and their ministers responded to slavery, some scholars are interested in the relationship between the denominational schisms of the 1830s and 1840s and the political schism of secession and the Civil War. The central question is: Did the divisions within America's evangelical churches contribute in any way to the eventual political disunion of the 1860s? One of the first historians to research this question specifically was C. C. Goen. In his 1985 book *Broken Churches, Broken Nation*, Goen, using the words of Seymour Martin Lipset, argues that "religion cannot exist without seriously affecting the nature of political discourse."[56] With this fundamental assumption as a starting point, Goen suggests that the denominational schisms in the 1830s and 1840s provided "a persuasive example for reluctant secessionists [to follow]."[57] More importantly, Goen argues that America's evangelical churches were the glue that kept society united. Once they divided over the slavery question, there was nothing left to prevent political disunion. He writes that "it seems plausible to hypothesize that when Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches divided along North-South lines, they severed an important bond of national union."[58] However, Goen is the first to caution the reader that one should not speak too confidently

[56]Seymour Martin Lipset, "Religion and Politics in the American Past and Present," in *Religion and Social Conflict*, ed. Robert Lee and Martin E. Marty (New York: n.p., 1964), 70; quoted in C. C. Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 12.

[57]Goen, *Broken Churches, Broken Nation*, 9.

[58]Ibid., 6.

about causation. For Goen, the assertions he is making "are not propositions to be 'proved' but theses to be examined."[59]

Mitchell Snay's book *Gospel of Disunion* also examines the relationship between the denominational schisms of the 1830s and 1840s and the political schism that followed in the 1860s. Snay seems slightly more confident in the link between these two events. First, he argues that the religious discourse over slavery within the evangelical churches strengthened sectionalism in the South. One piece of evidence used by Snay to defend this point is the abolitionist crisis of 1835. This crisis was the result of an attempt by Lewis Tappan, an evangelical abolitionist, to send Southerners abolitionist literature via the postal service. Conflicts like this, argues Snay, politicized the Southern clergy with regard to the dispute over slavery.[60] He writes, "By confronting the South with an assault on the morality of slavery, the postal campaign of 1835 created a political crisis that drew Southern ministers into sectional politics."[61] Second, Snay contends that the relationship between religious discourse and political discourse was reciprocal. That is to say, politicians and clergy borrowed rhetoric and ideas from each other. On the one hand, the religious debates which took place during the denominational schisms of the 1830s and 1840s were filled with political concepts such as constitutionalism, sovereignty, majority tyranny, and minority rights. Similarly, sectional political debates were often colored with religious significance thanks to the evangelical church schisms. Snay contends that

---

[59]Ibid. 13.

[60]Mitchell Snay, *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 19-20.

[61]Ibid.

this religious discourse resulted in heightening the sectionalism in antebellum America.[62] He observes,

> In their experience with separating from their Northern brethren, Southern churchmen articulated ideas of union and division that would help facilitate secession in 1860-1. . . . With the impending dissolution of the Union, the denominational schisms acquired a new and powerful relevance. Southern churchmen recognized the contribution they had made and urged the rest of the South to heed the lessons learned in the 1840s.[63]

In contrast to Goen's emphasis on the cultural impact of the church schisms and Snay's emphasis on the political arguments surrounding them, Victor B. Howard's book *Conscience and Slavery* evaluates the connection between religious disunion and political disunion from the standpoint of the role played by evangelical theology. For Howard, the significant contribution of the church schisms to political disunion is found in the evangelical emphasis on millennialism. For evangelicals, says Howard, the West was the place where the battle between good and evil would take place. The political controversies over the westward expansion of slavery quickly acquired religious significance. As a result, America's churches oriented themselves to their political section of the country.[64]

Evangelical Response to Secession and War

The national debate over slavery had numerous political consequences. All three branches of the United States government weighed in on the controversy. The Congress passed legislation including the Missouri compromise, the Compromise of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska Act in an attempt to find some sort of legislative solution. In 1857, the

---

[62]Ibid. 145.

[63]Ibid., 147, 149.

[64]Howard, *Conscience and Slavery*, xiii.

Supreme Court weighed in on the slavery controversy in the *Dred Scott* case. In addition, the question of slavery's future became the dominant issue in presidential politics. Outside the official channels of government, numerous aspects of American politics were impacted by the slavery question. Political parties rose or fell over slavery, and some Americans chose to circumvent the political process altogether. John Brown's raid in 1859 was the most dramatic example of extra-legal political activity. The ultimate political consequence was, of course, secession. Secession was soon followed by civil war.

Scholars have spent less time investigating the response by evangelicals to these political consequences of the slavery question. However, interest in this area seems to be on the rise. One recent area of interest is the relationship between evangelicals and party politics. Richard J. Carwardine's book *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America* looks at the impact of evangelical beliefs on political behaviors such as voting and support for political parties. Carwardine writes that "hundreds of thousands of American citizens felt a commitment to a particular party (and, increasingly, to a section) because they understood that party (and their section) to be most in tune with their religious concerns and with the material ambitions which their religion fostered or sanctioned."[65] Likewise, Victor B. Howard's book *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement* sees a direct relationship between Northern evangelicals and the Radical Republican movement. For Howard, evangelicals were the driving force behind this movement. He argues, for example, that "the radicals of the Civil War era were either Christian reformers of the prewar years who had tried to remove slavery by moral suasion or men

[65]Richard J. Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), xviii.

who were influenced to take a radical stand during the late antebellum period because of the maturity of their own moral imperative or of that of the churches."[66]

In addition to investigating the impact of evangelicals on antebellum party politics, scholars of American religious history have begun to investigate the impact of evangelicals on the secession crisis specifically. In their recent compilation of essays entitled *Religion and the American Civil War*, Randall Miller, Harry Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson include a few essays that attempt to do just that. Bertram Wyatt-Brown's essay entitled "Church, Honor, and Secession," for example, relies partly on the work of C. C. Goen in that he acknowledges that the division in America's evangelical churches provided a blueprint for secessionists to follow. However, Wyatt-Brown contends that Southern churches and their leaders hesitated to embrace the calls for political disunion.[67] By contrast, George M. Fredrickson describes the coming of the Civil War as a transforming event. He contends that while Jacksonian influence over America from the 1820s through the 1840s tended to favor a separation of church and state, the national debate over slavery provided Protestant ministers with an opportunity to increase their influence over political affairs.[68] In Fredrickson's words, "'Political preaching,' including open partisanship on the political choices before the country, became acceptable to a majority of church-going northerners, and a campaign was launched to give interdenominational Protestantism quasi-official recognition as the national

---

[66]Howard, *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870*, 1.

[67]Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "Church, Honor, and Secession," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 89.

[68]George M. Fredrickson, "The Coming of the Lord: The Northern Protestant Clergy and the Civil War Crisis," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 110-111.

religion."[69] The impact of this transformation on the Civil War is, for Fredrickson, clear: "The outbreak of the war for the Union found the clergy of the principal Protestant denominations unified and fervent in its support for the northern cause."[70]

The Civil War receives more popular and scholarly attention than any other event in American history. One of the primary areas of scholarly interest is investigating the role of evangelicals during the Civil War years. A central question raised by scholars is: How did evangelical beliefs affect the way in which Americans interpreted the meaning of the Civil War? Daniel Stowell's recent essay "Stonewall Jackson and the Providence of God" addresses this question directly. According to Stowell, Southern evangelicals believed that the Civil War was to be God's judgment on the nation. He argues that Southerners saw the successes of the Confederate army as a sign of God's favor. By contrast, Jackson's untimely death was seen as a sign by many evangelicals of God's punishment for Southern sins, specifically the sin of idolatry. That is to say, Southerners sinned against God by idolizing Jackson.[71] Phillip Shaw Paludan's research confirms the importance of the concept of judgment in the interpretation of the war.[72]

In addition to investigating the role played by religion in assigning meaning to the Civil War, some scholars have investigated the role played by religion in boosting wartime morale, especially among the troops. Much of this research suggests that ministers tapped into many evangelical beliefs in the hopes of boosting the morale of

---

[69]Ibid., 111.

[70]Ibid., 118.

[71]Daniel W. Stowell, "Stonewall Jackson and the Providence of God," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 190, 192.

[72]Phillip Shaw Paludan, "Religion and the American Civil War," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 23.

troops in the field. Kurt O. Berends' essay "Wholesome Reading Purifies and Elevates the Man: The Religious Military Press in the Confederacy" is one such example. Berends argues that the religious military press was the primary vehicle through which evangelical beliefs about the Civil War were transmitted to soldiers. In addition to reporting the specific events of the war, the religious military press sought to *explain* these happenings. Giving meaning to defeat was central to this effort.[73] Berends observes, "Implicit in many stories of battle losses stood the conviction of a special relationship between the Christian Confederacy and God."[74]

Harry S. Stout's recent work agrees that religious leaders played a role in boosting wartime morale. He observes, "Tragically, no less than everyone else, the clergy were virtually cheerleaders all."[75] However, his goal is not to document the manner in which the American clergy supported the war effort. Rather, he describes the Civil War as it relates to just-war theory. He writes, "In a moral history of the Civil War, it is not enough merely to say that the end of human bondage in the United States was worth a million white lives, true as that may be. The separate question of war remains: was it just?"[76]

Finally, there is particular interest in investigating the manner in which the Civil War changed the way evangelicals thought about their faith. One such example is the traditional Christian understanding of gender. Berends argues that in order for soldiers to

---

[73]Kurt O. Berends, "Wholesome Reading Purifies and Elevates the Man: The Religious Military Press in the Confederacy," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 147.

[74]Ibid.

[75]Harry S. Stout, *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War* (New York: Viking, 2006), xvii.

[76]Ibid., xvi.

find relevance in religion, the traditional feminine-centered Christianity needed to be replaced with a masculine interpretation. That is to say, men tended to see Christianity in feminine terms. A Christian was "gentle, soothing, pure, virtuous, and sensitive."[77] The religious military press intentionally defined Christianity in masculine terms. Focus was on the Christian soldier, who had an advantage over the non-Christian. Men were taught that "with his eternal destiny secure, the soldier of the cross could boldly and confidently face the enemy, for the most important battle was already won."[78] Following the Civil War, as Reid Mitchell suggests, this Christian soldier image was used by Southern proponents of the Lost Cause.[79]

Men's views of Christianity were, of course, not the only ones affected by the Civil War. Women also saw many of their beliefs challenged. Drew Gilpin Faust argues that the circumstances of war caused women to assume more leadership in worship, as most ministers were off to war. She observes that "as the gender of civilian worshipers shifted, so too religious practice moved from a more public and male to a more private and female sphere."[80] In the South, Confederate defeat also impacted women's views of religion. Faust observes of Southern women, "Suffused with rage and betrayal, some women even for a time explicitly rejected God."[81] After the war, claims Faust, most women saw this lost faith in God return; however, "neither religion nor society would be

---

[77]Berends, "Wholesom Reading Purifies and Elevates the Man: The Religious Military Press in the Confederacy," 136.

[78]Ibid.

[79]Reid Mitchell, "Christian Soldiers?: Perfecting the Confederacy," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 297.

[80]Drew Gilpin Faust, "'Without Pilot or Compass': Elite Women and Religion in the Civil War South," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 253.

[81]Ibid., 257.

as it has been before the war."[82] In sum, scholarly work in the field of religion and the Civil War indicates that evangelicals were important participants in the political debate over secession and war. At the same time, many scholars have demonstrated that evangelicals' religious beliefs and views were affected by secession and war.

Evangelicals, Nationalism, and the War

Scholars working in the field of political theory often associate the nineteenth century with the rise of nationalism. One such scholar, Leon P. Baradat, argues that nationalism rose to prominence with the French Revolution and spread throughout Europe and the Americas as a consequence of the Napoleonic Wars.[83] Concerning the impact of nationalism, he asserts,

> Nationalism is the most powerful political idea of the past two hundred years. . . . Millions of people have been sacrificed and died, property has been destroyed, and resources have been plundered in the name of the state. Yet, individuals have also risen to noble heights and made great contributions to humanity for the sake of the nation-state.[84]

It should be no surprise, then, that scholars studying the history of American religion would endeavor to understand the relationship between religion and nationalism. This is particularly true of the Civil War era.

Scholarly investigation into the nature of nationalism during the Civil War indicates that Northerners and Southerners both claimed to be the standard bearers for American nationalism. Moreover, both had similar understandings of what American nationalism meant. James M. McPherson argues, "Americans in both North and South

---

[82]Ibid., 258.

[83]Leon P. Baradat, *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 8th ed. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2003), 56.

[84]Ibid., 46.

believed themselves custodians of the legacy of 1776. The crisis of 1861 was the great test of whether they were worthy of the heritage of liberty bequeathed to them by the founding fathers."[85] Utilizing letters from Confederate soldiers, McPherson demonstrates that for Southerners the legacy of 1776 was expressed in terms of preserving their liberty by fighting against a Northern war of aggression and oppression. Therefore, Southerners saw themselves as fighting a second Revolutionary War. In their minds, parallels were drawn between the colonists' war with King George and the South's war with the North.[86]

Whereas McPherson sees the political ideals of the American Revolution as the driving force behind the nationalistic impulses of the Civil War generation, historians Charles Reagan Wilson and Samuel J. Watson argue that religion was the primary pillar supporting nationalism during the war. Wilson observes, "Both Northerners and Southerners, in fact, recognized the potential significance of the Civil War in fulfilling America's destiny of witnessing to the world. The evangelicals in both sections thought American democracy would influence the world, but the issue was whether it would testify for a slave civilization or a free one."[87] Like McPherson, Wilson recognizes that Northerners and Southerners shared similar ideologies. He argues that "republicanism had given meaning to American political life in the antebellum era, and both sides affirmed it, although with differing emphases."[88] Whereas Northerners viewed the

---

[85]James M. McPherson, *What They Fought For, 1861-1865* (New York: Anchor Books, 1995), 6.

[86]Ibid., 9.

[87]Charles Reagan Wilson, "Religion and the American Civil War in Comparative Perspective," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 402.

[88]Ibid., 395-396.

preservation of the Union as central to "the protection for the self-government that enabled Americans to pursue economic opportunity and self-rule,"[89] Southerners saw the war as protecting "the freedom of whites to control local institutions, to resist government interference, and to pursue economic opportunity."[90] Wilson's observations demonstrate that nationalism in both sections centered on the government's role in society, especially in the area of economic freedom. However, economics alone do not explain sectional understandings of nationalism. Religion, says Wilson, served to define freedom (economic or otherwise) as "a *sacred* right, part of the growing sacralization of the nation."[91] In short, where McPherson sees political passions as the driving force behind sectional nationalism, Wilson sees religious passions. In Wilson's words, "The American Civil War thus became a holy war, on both sides."[92] Watson's research, like Wilson's, emphasizes the religious factor. His focus is on demonstrating how the combat motivation in the Confederate army was grounded in religion and religious belief more than in any other motivation.[93]

Because this dissertation will focus on Texas, a brief review of scholarship relating specifically to Confederate nationalism seems appropriate. The question is: How could Southerners in Texas have transferred their allegiance from the United States to the Confederate States so easily? Between 1836 and 1861 Texans swore allegiance to four

---

[89]Ibid, 396.

[90]Ibid.

[91]Ibid.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Samuel J. Watson, "Religion and Combat Motivation in the Confederate Armies," *Journal of Military History* 58 (January 1994): 34.

different nations: Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the United States of America, and the Confederate States of America. In spite of the fact that Texas had an anti-secessionist governor, Sam Houston, who also happened to be recognized as a founding father of Texas, Texans voted overwhelmingly for secession. Texas, then, should provide a particularly interesting window into the nature of Confederate nationalism.

Historians are beginning to study the nature of Confederate nationalism, and interest in this subject seems to be on the rise. However, their assessment of the role of religion in driving this nationalism often differs. For instance, in her book *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism*, Drew Gilpin Faust contends that for Southerners "the most fundamental source of legitimation for the Confederacy was Christianity."[94] Religious leaders, claims Faust, were central to the process of legitimizing the Confederate state. She writes, "In a region where evangelical commitment was at once widespread and profound, the authority of the clergy at least rivaled that of the new Confederate state, for preachers possessed in their weekly sermons one of the most effective and influential means of reaching the southern population."[95] Whereas slavery had served to divide America's churches and ultimately the nation itself, in Faust's analysis, it served to unite the Confederacy. Religion gave its blessing to this part of Confederate nationalism. She observes, "Slavery became, in both secular and religious discourse, the central component of the mission God had designed for the South. . . . [Southerners] were struggling to carry out God's designs for a heathen race."[96] In Faust's work, therefore,

---

[94]Drew Gilpin Faust, *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 22.

[95]Ibid.

[96]Ibid., 60.

one can see that two elements defined Confederate nationalism: religion and the defense of slavery. The Confederacy gained the allegiance of Southerners precisely because it sought to defend both of these elements.

In contrast to Faust, James W. Silver is far less convinced that Southerners easily accepted, supported, and adopted allegiance to the Confederacy. He does not deny that Christianity and slavery were central to the Southern way of life; however, he argues that Southern acceptance of the Confederacy was not easily achieved. According to Silver, "The legend of a united people who went down fighting as one man against overwhelming odds simply could not stand serious investigation."[97] Silver's interpretation of the Southern response to secession asserts that it was, in fact, necessary for Southern leaders to engage in an out-right propaganda campaign. Clergymen were among the leaders of this effort. Tapping into the Christian identity of Southerners, churchmen led the masses toward secession and the Confederacy, a place where many initially did not want to go. Silver's interpretation implies that Confederate nationalism was heavily influenced by Southern religious identity.[98] In his own words, this argument is asserted as follows: "Above all else [Southern religious leaders] had been instrumental in creating a state of mind definitely 'Southern,' one which made possible the disruption of the Union."[99] As he sees it, the role of the clergy in promoting a sense of Confederate nationalism cannot be overstated. He asserts,

> It seems reasonable, though, to conclude that, as its greatest social institution, the church in the South constituted the major resource of the Confederacy in the

---

[97]Silver, *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda*, 7.

[98]Ibid., 93-94.

[99]Ibid., 24.

> building and maintenance of civilian morale. As no other group, Southern clergymen were responsible for a state of mind which made secession possible, and as no other group they sustained the people in their long, costly and futile War for Southern Independence.[100]

As a result of following their leaders into supporting the Confederacy, "at least three generations of Southerners have paid a terrible price for the erratic behavior of their Confederate ancestors. That's a fact."[101] Whether secession was a conscious choice made by nationalistic-minded Southerners or whether Southern leaders manipulated the population to choose secession through the use of nationalistic impulses is a controversy that has yet to be resolved. However, both Faust and Silver recognize the importance of religion in defining Southern nationalism.

Evangelicals, Nationalism, and the Lost Cause Myth

After the defeat of the Confederacy, Washington politicians battled over constitutional questions for which the Constitution itself had few answers. Simply put, the Constitution did not anticipate secession and civil war. Consequently, Congress and the president were entering uncharted territory during Reconstruction. In spite of the gravity of the constitutional questions for Southerners, scholars of American religious history have paid little attention to them. Instead, much of their focus has been on how evangelicals contributed to Southern nationalism and identity after the war. Silver's investigation of the role played by churches in boosting the morale of Southerners for the Confederate cause is based on the author's skepticism of Southern unity. For Silver, the belief in unified Southern support for the Confederacy before and during the war was created by the generation that followed the war. The post-war generation of Southerners

[100]Ibid., 101.

[101]Ibid., 8.

created the myth of the Lost Cause.[102] However, Silver's work focuses primarily on the antebellum and war years; it does not focus on the Reconstruction period. That task has been taken up by other historians.

Concerning the role of religion in the development of Southern nationalism in post-war America, the main question is: What role did evangelicals, especially the clergy, play in the creation and promotion of the Lost Cause? Charles Reagan Wilson's book *Baptized in Blood* argues that the Lost Cause myth became the most important element in Southern culture. Southerners had lost their bid for a *nation-state* and settled for a *nation*. That is to say, rather than realizing their political dream, Southerners realized their cultural dream of a unified white South. Most importantly, Wilson observes that religion was a central part of white Southerners' national identity.[103] The first task of the Lost Cause was to explain defeat. Ministers, argues Wilson, helped a defeated people to see the Civil War in religious terms. He observes, "In light of defeat, the ministers cautioned against decline: they feared throughout the late nineteenth century that their society would not measure up to its past heroic standards of virtue."[104] A more recent essay by Phillip Shaw Paludan relies directly on Wilson's work when he defends the contention that religion was a central theme of the Lost Cause. Paludan argues that the Lost Cause myth was made into something holy. Consequently, Southerners came to believe that it was unnecessary to reform their society in light of post-war realities. The holiness of the Lost Cause, argues Paludan, helped give rise to groups like the Ku Klux

---

[102]Ibid., 7.

[103]Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980), 1.

[104]Ibid., 8.

Klan, which ferociously resisted social change.[105] Like Wilson, Paludan highlights the defense of Southern virtue as an important component of the Lost Cause. He observes that "the white South claimed, as the repository of virtue and godliness, the right to judge the nation, while it lost the capacity to judge itself."[106]

Religion and the Development of American Education: The Puritans

Historians specializing in the history of American education have long recognized the direct connection between religion and the development of America's schools. Implicit in this recognition is the fact that educational institutions have always served a calling higher than simply educating the youth for the sake of intellect. They are, indeed, the place where society's values are transmitted, to repeat Frederick Rudolph's declaration. It is a major contention of this study that any attempt to comprehend the impact of religion during the Civil War era must include an examination of higher education during the period. The validity of this assertion is supported in large measure by the historiography of the history of American education. Before proceeding with an investigation of the response by Texas denominational colleges to the social and political questions of the Civil War era, a brief review of relevant literature seems warranted.

Evidence that education has served a higher calling than education for intellect's sake is found early in the American experience. The Puritans are, perhaps, the definitive example. In his book *An Education History of the American People*, Adolphe E. Meyer contends that the Puritan commitment to advancing education at all levels was the result of three social needs, all of which were inherently religious in nature. First, like all

[105]Paludan, "Religion and the American Civil War," 33.

[106]Ibid.

Protestants, the Puritans believed that reading the Bible was a holy obligation. As such, the need to advance literacy among the population took on a much more profound significance than it might otherwise have.[107] Second, the Puritans had a great desire to ensure that their faith was advanced through the generations. Literacy was one way to guarantee this.[108] Finally, Meyer observes that Puritan society was driven above all else by the belief in an unconditional obedience to almighty God. Every person and every institution was subject to this mandate.[109] Schools, colleges and universities were not exempted from it.

Lawrence A. Cremin's book *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* devotes much of its attention to the connection between religion and the development of education in the colonies. Like Meyer's work, Cremin's contends that a religious worldview helps to explain the move toward public education. In part one, Cremin outlines three primary social goals, which were also to be the goals of education: piety, civility, and learning.[110] In part two, Cremin outlines the social institutions which were to have the responsibility for advancing these educational goals. They include: the household, the church, the school, the college, and the community.[111] Of these, Cremin argues that schools stood out from the rest. Moreover, social institutions were understood in explicitly religious terms. He notes, for example, "But schooling was

---

[107]Adolphe E. Meyer, *An Education History of the American People* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), 24.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Ibid., 21.

[110]See part I of Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970).

[111]See part II of Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783.*

rarely far behind [other social institutions], since it was viewed by the colonists as the most important bulwark after religion in their incessant struggle against the satanic barbarism of the wilderness."[112] As the colonies developed, education quickly moved from the private to the public sphere. In Cremin's words, "The companies, the legislatures, the county and village courts, and the towns were early involved in education, but, as in England, their involvement took quite different forms."[113]

Tony W. Johnson and Ronald F. Reed document the movement of education from the private sphere to the public arena. This shift, argue the authors, required changes in the law. Accordingly, the Massachusetts Bay Colony promoted education as a civic responsibility. In 1642 the Commonwealth passed the School Law, under which parents were required to teach their children religious doctrine and the laws of the state. The authors contend that this law was not universally enforced. Therefore, the Commonwealth moved quickly to take over many educational responsibilities from parents. In 1647 the General Court passed the Massachusetts School Law. This bill was commonly known as the Ould Deluder Satan Act, just in case anyone forgot the purpose of publicly supported education. The Puritan fathers believed that without a literate population to stand firmly against evil, Satan would most certainly prevail.[114]

Religion and the Development of American Education: The Founders

By the time of the American Revolution, the stage was set for a new set of ideas about education to emerge. This was an age in which the ideas of the Enlightenment and

---

[112]Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783*, 176-177.

[113]Ibid., 193.

[114]Tony W. Johnson and Ronald F. Reed, eds., *Historical Documents in American Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002), 4-7.

the ideas of classical republicanism had taken center stage among the educated elite. To be sure, these ideas were foremost in the minds of many of the Founders. Pangle and Pangle's book *The Learning of Liberty* outlines many of the most important ideas held by the Founders concerning the nature of education. Focusing in detail on the ideas of Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, Pangle and Pangle demonstrate how the status of religion in the curriculum shifted from the Puritan model to a republican model. Of Benjamin Rush, the authors argue that while he believed that Christian education was necessary to counteract or resist the assault on Christianity by Deism, he also supported many of the Enlightenment ideas about education such as the need for skepticism.[115]

Benjamin Franklin's plan for the future of education in America was less hesitant in its abandonment of key aspects of the Puritan model. First, religion would remain a part of the academy, "but Franklin treated religion as a necessary supplement to, rather than the inspiration and guiding light for, morality."[116] Moreover, "the religion in question was 'public' or 'civil' religion; i.e., that minimal popular creed which history showed to be essential for social health."[117] Second, Franklin's curriculum plan de-emphasized ancient languages such as Latin and Greek and replaced them with instruction in English. The goal was to give students more practical skills, which would in turn prepare them for a wider range of professions.[118]

---

[115]Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas L. Pangle, *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideas of the American Founders* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1993), 30.

[116]Ibid., 76.

[117]Ibid.

[118]Ibid., 78-79.

Pangle and Pangle's research on Thomas Jefferson's educational ideas indicates that his plan for an education system emphasized the role education would play in preserving republican government. The researchers describe Jefferson's plan as serving several key goals. Among them are protecting rights, stamping out tyranny, and identifying natural-born leaders. First, said Jefferson, since the legitimacy of government is based on its capacity to protect individual rights, citizens must know what those rights are. Education of the masses must, therefore, include a curriculum that stresses political theory. Second, a republican education would serve to prevent tyranny. That is, it would serve to inject students with a desire to be constantly on the lookout for signs of tyranny. Finally, Jefferson believed that public education served to cultivate a natural aristocracy. From this elite group, the republic's leaders would be elected.[119]

In his book *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876*, Lawrence A. Cremin puts forward the argument that ideas about education are as important as the institutions of education. With regard to the Founders, Cremin contends that in spite of the differences among them, this seminal generation agreed on the same basic ideas about education. First, the founding generation believed that a country's education system must match its form of government. For example, whereas the school curriculum in a monarchy would teach students about class distinctions, the school curriculum in a republic would teach students about virtue. Second, rather than simply transplanting European educational norms and curricula, they advocated for a curriculum that would serve American society. Third, education should be practical. For example, particular attention would be paid to such subjects as the sciences, economics, and politics. Finally,

[119]Ibid., 108-109.

American education should strive to be an example to the rest of the world. Just as schools often sought to train religious missionaries to spread the faith, so, too, would schools train missionaries to spread the ideals of liberty across the far reaches of the globe.[120] Cremin writes of this educational agenda, "The goal was nothing less than a new republican individual, of virtuous character, abiding patriotism, and prudent wisdom, fashioned by education into an independent yet loyal citizenry. Without such individuals, the experiment in liberty would be short-lived at best."[121]

The goal of the founding generation to promote public education along the lines of republican ideals and practicality went largely unrealized. Only with few exceptions did the public support the building of public schools on a large scale. This development would have to wait until the mid to late nineteenth century. Pangle and Pangle describe the reason for this failure in the following terms: "In the end, the Founders' argument that the nation's civic health depended on good public schools was simply ineffective in persuading the country to build them."[122] The task of convincing Americans to provide financial support for a comprehensive, universal system of education throughout the country was left to the next generation. Horace Mann and his contemporaries in the Common School Movement of the 1830s and 1840s would succeed where the Founders failed. They would sell the idea of universal, tax-supported education by tapping into America's religious identity, not its republican idealism.

---

[120]Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980), 2-4.

[121]Ibid., 5.

[122]Pangle and Pangle, *The Learning of Liberty*, 144.

Religion and the Development of American Education: The Common School Movement

The early decades of the republic ushered in many changes in religious expression, politics, the economy, and the ethno-cultural composition of society. Evangelists like Charles G. Finney were bringing a new level of enthusiasm to American religion; Andrew Jackson and his followers were ushering in a new broadly democratic style of American politics; the industrial revolution was poised to transform the American economy; and the massive influx of immigrants from Europe, many of whom were Irish Catholics, were unknowingly on the verge of changing America's cultural landscape. In 1825, Daniel Webster declared that his age was one in which "events so various and so important that might crowd and distinguish centuries, are, in our times, compressed within the compass of a single life."[123] This was the cultural milieu in which Horace Mann found himself.

Many Americans did not endure these changes well. Particularly disturbing were the effects of industrialization and immigration on the old Puritan Commonwealth. Horace Mann was one of those who saw evils in both of these developments. In their recent work entitled *Historical Documents in American Education*, Tony W. Johnson and Ronald F. Reed argue that Mann and other school reformers saw public schools as a way to counteract what they considered to be the evils of both industrialization and immigration. Public schools would provide the glue which would hold together the social fabric of the old Puritan commonwealth.[124] Following his appointment to the position of Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education in 1837, Mann was

---

[123]Daniel Webster, quoted in Steven M. Gillon and Cathy D. Matson, *The American Experiment: A History of the United States* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002), 418.

[124]Johnson and Reed, *Historical Documents in American Education*, 79.

eager to realize his vision. For Mann, building a public system of education became his mission in life, and he embarked on it with great enthusiasm. "Henceforth, so long as I hold this office," he wrote shortly after his appointment, "I devote myself to the supremest welfare of mankind upon earth. . . . If we can get this vast wheel into any perceptible motion, we shall have accomplished much."[125] Mann did, indeed, accomplish much.

In his 1983 book *Pillars of the Republic*, Carl F. Kaestle argues that Americans accepted the notion of tax-supported public education because of their commitment to three widely-accepted cultural values: republicanism, Protestantism, and capitalism.[126] Horace Mann's educational philosophy served all three of these. However, in analyzing the educational philosophy of reformers like Mann, Kaestle emphasizes the importance of Protestantism's values. He notes, "The uncertainty of native Protestants was not about the superiority of their moral values and cultural preferences. It was about whether they would prevail."[127] Therefore, assimilation of new immigrants became one of the primary functions of common schools.[128]

Protestant values and morality, thus, occupied center stage in the common school curriculum developed by Mann and others. In his summation of this curriculum, Kaestle observes that textbooks made it abundantly clear that the words "Christianity" and "Protestantism" were interchangeable; that is, they were one and the same. Moreover,

---

[125]Horace Mann, "Thoughts on Being Chosen Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education (1837)," in *Historical Documents in American Education*, 83.

[126]Carl F. Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), x.

[127]Ibid., 77.

[128]Ibid.

Protestant nations of the world were categorized as more powerful, more learned, more just, and more apt to be filled with benevolence and kindness. By contrast, Catholic countries were categorized by the same textbooks as degenerate.[129] Tony W. Johnson and Ronald F. Reed echo Kaestle's assessment:

> Offering both a more tempered version of the moral absolutism bequeathed to us by the Puritans and a patriotic vision of America that would make Noah Webster proud, the textbooks of the nineteenth century suggested that prosperity and salvation result from hard work, truthfulness, obedience, sobriety, and kindness. Although supposedly nonsectarian and nonpartisan, these works advocated both Protestant religious beliefs and a conservative political ideology.[130]

Textbook authors of the nineteenth century were successful precisely because they promoted this Protestant view of society. The most successful was probably William Holmes McGuffey, who is reported to have sold some five million copies of his textbooks during his lifetime.[131]

Protestantism's impact on textbooks was hardly subtle. Kaestle explains, "Seen through a twentieth-century lens of pluralism and cultural relativism, these beliefs may seem brash and chauvinistic, but their validity was crystal clear to nineteenth-century Protestant writers, who expressed them fervently, without apology."[132] Consequently, examples are easily found. In Noah Webster's *The American Spelling Book* (1831), for example, there is a lesson entitled "Lessons of Easy Words, To Teach Children To Read, And To Know Their Duty." Its contents could surely be used in either school or church. It reads in part:

---

[129]Ibid., 93.

[130]Johnson and Reed, *Historical Documents in American Education*, 101.

[131]Ibid., 102.

[132]Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 93.

> Sin will lead us to pain and wo
> Love that which is good, and shun vice.
> Hate no man, but love both friends and foes.
> A bad man can take no rest, day or night.[133]

Specific praise for the successes of Protestantism is also easily uncovered. In his book *A Child's History of the United States* (1859), John Bonner connected the successes of the early American colonists and of the Founders to their fidelity to God. He wrote,

> No other people, since the world began, ever grew out of so small a beginning to so towering a height of power and prosperity in so short a time. If you seek to know why your countrymen have outstripped all the nations of the earth in this respect, the reason is easily found. The founders of this nation were honest, true men. They were sincere in all they said, upright in all their acts. They feared God and obeyed the laws.[134]

The scholarship surrounding the Common School Movement and its leaders seems to suggest that without a curriculum that reflected the so-called lowest common denominator Protestant belief system, support for public education would have been too weak. Americans wanted more from their schools than simply a curriculum based on republicanism and practical training for an industrializing economy. They expected schools to serve as agents of assimilation. The assimilation of new immigrants, especially Irish Catholics, required, first and foremost, an education in the dominant Protestant worldview. "Too often," writes Kaestle, "educators equated Anglo-American Protestant traditions and values with something mislabeled American culture and then insisted that newcomers take it or leave it."[135]

---

[133]Noah Webster, "Good Pronunciation with Moral Lessons," from *The American Spelling Book* (1831), in *Historical Documents In American Education*, 104. This quote is reproduced line by line as shown in Johnson and Reed.

[134]John Bonner, "The Lesson of American History," from *A Child's History of the United States* (1859), in *Historical Documents In American Education*, 111.

[135]Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 72.

Twenty-first century Americans may find this take-it-or-leave-it attitude somewhat uncomfortable; however, there is no arguing with Mann's success. By mid-century, taxpayer-supported school systems were operating in nearly all states. Southern states were the one major exception. Some northern states and a few southern states had even begun to support high schools and colleges.[136] Scholarly research in this area indicates that religion had played a seminal role in this success.

Religion and the Development of American Education: The Denominational College

Historians involved in the study of American education have produced a wealth of scholarship relating to the role played by religion in higher education. This is particularly true of scholarship relating to the nineteenth-century denominational college. Indeed, at the same time that Horace Mann was convincing Americans to support public education, denominational leaders were convincing a great many of their adherents to support denominational colleges. In his *Search for the Summit*, a history of Austin College, George L. Landolt argues that this effort was particularly strong in Texas. It was so strong, in fact, that Landolt describes present-day Texas as a "graveyard" of denominational colleges.[137] Austin College and Baylor University are the only two Texas denominational colleges founded during the antebellum period that survive uninterrupted down to the present. Regardless of the poor survival rate, the denominational colleges of the nineteenth century serve as yet another example of the

[136]Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, *The American Nation: A History of the United States*, 12th ed. (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2006), 307.

[137]George L. Landolt, *Search for the Summit: Austin College Through XII Decades, 1849-1970* (Austin: Von Boeckman-Jones Co., 1970), viii.

direct relationship between religion and the development of education in the United States.

Scholars are divided on the question of what accounts for the fervor with which denominational colleges sprung up in the nineteenth century. In his *American Education: The National Experience*, Lawrence A. Cremin suggests that the push for denominational colleges was the result of many factors. First, the legal separation of church and state meant that religion was voluntary and that churches received no government sanction or support. "As voluntary churches," writes Cremin, "they were forced to seek continuing renewal from within, hence their commitment to revivals, and continuing replenishment from without, hence their commitment to missions."[138] What resulted from cutting churches loose from state support? According to Cremin, rather than damaging churches, disestablishment made churches more vibrant.[139] Second, the rise to prominence of the evangelicals during this period impacted the founding of colleges in that their activities represented more than just a spiritual movement. According to Cremin, evangelicals were also great organizers. One of the institutions they organized was the college.[140] Finally, in the *Dartmouth College Case* (1819), the Supreme Court ruled that corporate charters, in this case a college charter, were, in fact, contracts. Therefore, these charters were protected by the U.S. Constitution.[141] Many have seen this case primarily as a stimulant to American business during the nineteenth century. Commenting on the meaning of this case in 1885, Sir Henry Maine wrote that the legal principle established

---

[138]Cremin, *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876*, 381.

[139]Ibid., 380.

[140]Ibid., 401.

[141]Ibid., 402.

in the *Dartmouth College Case* "has in reality secured full play to the economical forces by which the achievement of cultivating the soil of the North American Continent has been performed."[142] Maine's assessment may well be correct; however, business corporations were not the only corporations that were founded upon charters. This case was, after all, about a college charter. Just as the *Dartmouth College Case* spurred on American business, so, too, did it help to stimulate the proliferation of denominational colleges. "For many who have studied the decision," writes Cremin, "it represented a clear victory for private over public interests, and thereby encouraged the founding of innumerable private colleges in the succeeding decades."[143] In short, a denominational college, once granted a charter, was assured that the state was prohibited from manipulating it.

Cremin's analysis seems to place the development of denominational colleges in the flow of the social, religious, and legal evolution of American society. One gets the sense from Cremin that denominational colleges were simply swimming with the current of change as well as capitalizing on it. This may well be an accurate way of explaining the founding of denominational colleges. However, not all scholars have categorized it this way. Frederick Rudolph's book *The American College and University* argues that the founding of denominational colleges was driven less by social or legal changes and more by religious zeal. On the one hand, notes Rudolph, colleges of the period found support from those who wished to fight against other evangelical denominations, against Rome, and against public schools. On the other hand, there were more positive motives.

---

[142]Sir Henry Maine, *Popular Government* (1886), 248; quoted in Bernard Schwartz, *A History of the Supreme Court* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 50.

[143]Cremin, *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876*, 402.

These included the need for ministers of the Gospel and missionaries to Christianize the world. Colleges were to train them.[144] Denominations were aware, however, that bold, unapologetic sectarianism on campus could be detrimental to a college's well-being. "The colleges could not really afford to make themselves any more unattractive than they frequently were," writes Rudolph, "and for most Americans there was something unattractive about the bickering controversies which denominations sometimes got themselves into, much to the damage of their own reputation and to the good name of religion itself."[145]

Whereas Cremin identifies social and legal changes in America, and Rudolph identifies the missionary zeal of denominations as the driving force behind the founding of church colleges, Albea Godbold adds to this list of motives. He suggests that in addition to social change and religious zeal, denominational colleges were also driven by a need to serve the nation. "As the denominations grew in numbers and influence," he writes, "they considered themselves an important part of the nation and therefore under obligation to make a definite contribution to the cultural life of the country."[146] Their charge was to educate the nation's leaders not only in the ways of law, medicine, and politics but also in the ways of morality and virtue. Through their colleges, churches believed that they were fulfilling a solemn duty to the country.[147]

---

[144]Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 70-72.

[145]Ibid., 75.

[146]Albea Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944), 60.

[147]Ibid., 60-61.

Believing themselves to be in service to the nation in general was, however, not enough. There was, according to Godbold, more to it than that. Given the politics of the antebellum period, especially as it relates to the conflict over slavery, denominational colleges increasingly saw themselves in the service of their section rather than the nation as a whole. He writes, "Self-conscious and sensitive to criticism, the ante-bellum South came to regard education as one means of defending, justifying, and maintaining its peculiar institutions and interests."[148] To be sure, Godbold cautions that the defense of the South and its institutions was not the sole motivation for founding colleges, but it "did play a part in the establishment of some schools."[149] He observes, for example, that in addition to spreading Christianity, denominational colleges in the South also served to spread Southern beliefs about slavery to Southern youth. Rather than attending Northern schools, where students would be exposed to the ideas abolitionism, Southern youth would stay in the South and learn to defend its institutions.[150] In sum, current research seems to suggest that sectional politics as well as denominational identity came to define campus life in the antebellum denominational college.

The Southern College Response to Slavery

The sectionalization of Southern denominational colleges meant that the political questions of the day found their way into campus life. The problem of slavery was one such question. What exactly motivated college presidents and faculty to open the doors of their colleges to the dispute over slavery? Drew Gilpin Faust's book *A Sacred Circle*

---

[148]Ibid., 72.

[149]Ibid.

[150]Ibid., 74-75.

argues that intellectuals in the Old South often felt unwanted and out of place. "As violent conflict with the North approached," writes Faust, "Southerners exhibited decreasing patience with individuals whose primary allegiance was to abstract and disinterested speculation."[151] Intellectuals found themselves often pushed to the fringes of society. What a crisis needs is action, not disinterested speculation. Nonetheless, says Faust, "during the 1840s a number of Southern thinkers united in an effort to establish a role for men of mind in their region."[152] The defense of slavery was one way to accomplish this goal. With the increase in intensity of abolitionist criticism of slavery, Southerners became increasingly defensive about their "peculiar" institution. Indeed, defending slavery became the task of all Southern spokesmen, be they politicians, ministers, or intellectuals. Of Southern intellectuals Faust claims, "They identified their values with the South's distinctive way of life by defining moral stewardship as the ultimate basis for the system of human bondage. Ironically, they turned to the evangelical conceptions that underlay reform sentiment throughout the nation to justify the South's peculiar institution."[153] While Faust's study does not focus on the denominational college, her observation that intellectuals often defended slavery by using the ideas of evangelical Protestantism is reinforced by the fact that the denominational college was a place where the defense of slavery found a home.

Many scholars have documented that the defense of slavery was often part of the formal curriculum at Southern denominational colleges. The place in the curriculum,

---

[151]Drew Gilpin Faust, *A Sacred Circle: The Dilemma of the Intellectual in the Old South, 1840-1860* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), x.

[152]Ibid.

[153]Ibid., xi.

more than any other, where the affairs of the outside world entered the denominational college was the moral philosophy course. David Robert Huehner's research on pre-Civil War colleges highlights the importance of this course: "It was the point in the curriculum that tied church and college together, for here a religious code that could be applied to social situations was imparted to the students."[154] Huehner's study focuses primarily on Northern colleges and their attempt to advocate for an end to slavery. It says little about Southern colleges and their attempt to advocate for the defense of slavery. However, Godbold's study seems to confirm that the topic of slavery did, indeed, enter into moral philosophy courses in the South.[155] A formal defense of slavery was, more often than not, the main goal. "The attitude of the colleges toward slavery," writes Godbold, "is further revealed by the fact that the trustees of Wake Forest College voted to bar the use of Francis Wayland's book entitled *The Elements of Moral Science*."[156] Godbold speculates that Wayland's opposition to slavery was one reason for barring his work. This book was particularly problematic in the sense that Wayland's opposition to slavery was based on his belief that slavery violated Scripture.[157]

Moral philosophy courses were, however, not the only place on campus where the debate over slavery raged. Extra-curricular activities also involved the slavery controversy. The most popular extra-curricular activity was participation in literary societies. Several scholars have argued that these societies, though not part of the official

---

[154]David Robert Huehner, "Reform and the Pre-Civil War American College" (Ph. D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972), 63.

[155]Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South*, 89-90.

[156]Ibid., 91.

[157]Ibid.

curriculum, were just as important to campus life. E. Merton Coulter's study of the University of Georgia seeks to demonstrate that Southern colleges were central to the formation of Southern leaders. "The college," writes Coulter, "occupied the position of greatest strategy in the making of Southern leadership."[158] A large part of leadership training involved the skills of oratory and debate. Literary societies allowed such training to flourish. Debates involved every conceivable topic; however, slavery was most popular. "The great slavery debate," writes Coulter, "which began vigorously in the 'thirties and did not end until the Civil War intervened, was carried on in the halls of Phi Kappas and Demosthenians scarcely less than in the halls of Congress."[159] So powerful was the position of literary societies on the antebellum college campus that the faculty often expressed concern over their activities. Simply stated, these societies were often seen by students as more important than tending to their official academic responsibilities.[160]

Coulter's work focuses, of course, on one of the few state-sponsored universities in the antebellum South. However, other scholars looking at denominational colleges confirm that literary societies did not limit their presence to state schools. George L. Landolt's institutional history of Austin College in Texas notes that the earliest literary societies included the Clay Union and the Philomathean Society. Moreover, these societies were considered an important part of campus life at Austin College. They even

---

[158]E. Merton Coulter, *College Life in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951), xi.

[159]Ibid., 122.

[160]Ibid., 126.

had the explicit support of the faculty.[161] Literary societies, including the Philomathesian Society, were operating on the Baylor University Campus by the 1850s. However, according to Lois Smith Murray, the administration at Baylor was cautious in its support for such groups. According to Murray, Rufus C. Burleson, Baylor's president, "had encouraged the organization of the literary societies, but their attitudes toward student life gave him pause."[162] Neither Landolt nor Murray comment in any detail on the specific debates held by these societies. However, it will be one of the goals of this study to determine the extent to which slavery was debated at Texas denominational colleges through such extra-curricular groups.

The Southern College Response to Secession and War

Scholars disagree over the extent to which Southern colleges actively supported secession. On the one hand, John Hope Franklin argues that Southern colleges "became a hotbed of secession."[163] On the other end of the spectrum are scholars such as E. Merton Coulter. He argues, for example, that Southern college presidents and faculty were, at best, hesitant about secession. Given the fact that Southern colleges and universities largely catered to the planter class, whose political persuasion was largely of the Whig variety, this hesitancy, says Coulter, made perfect sense. He is quick to point out, however, that the students were more enthusiastic about secession than their elders. College presidents could not keep students from leaving to join the army.[164]

---

[161]Landolt, *Search for the Summit*, 230.

[162]Lois Smith Murray, *Baylor at Independence* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1972), 137.

[163]John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery To Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), 263.

[164]Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 237-238.

This seems to be the case in Texas as well. Following the secession of Texas, for example, records show that the men of Baylor University's senior class petitioned the college president to be granted leave from the University in order to join the Confederate army. The petition was granted.[165] At Austin College administrators were hesitant to support secession and war. This fact, however, did not prevent the upper classmen from petitioning their president to be released from the college.[166]

Coulter suggests that students in the Old South, even before the outbreak of the Civil War, often had a tendency toward militarism. He writes, "The wars the United States periodically found herself in produced real military enthusiasm on the campus."[167] Conflicts such as the War of 1812, the war for Texas independence, and the clashes with the Seminole Indians, claims Coulter, often spawned student military units on campus. The faculty, however, were not as excited as their students. The reason was simple: the presence of firearms on campus was strictly forbidden.[168] With the outbreak of the Civil War, however, Southern colleges faced a new set of challenges.

The most critical of these new challenges was survival itself. Rachel Bryan Stillman describes in detail the nature of this challenge. Her analysis seems to suggest that the hesitancy of college presidents to support secession was not rooted simply in Whig political theory or concern over militarism on campus; rather, it was mainly rooted in an awareness that if war broke out students would leave and take their tuition payments with them. Tuition was often the major source of funding; in many cases it

---

[165]Murray, *Baylor at Independence*, 208.

[166]Landolt, *Search for the Summit*, 235-236.

[167]Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 45.

[168]Ibid.

was the only source. For state-supported schools, vital financial support was often withheld so that valuable resources could be diverted to the war effort. Without large numbers of students, many schools were forced to close.[169]

Even if colleges and schools were able to overcome the financial difficulties presented to them by the loss of students, other financial challenges loomed. According to Stillman, the war caused the prices of all sorts of necessary commodities to rise dramatically. Schools, like everyone else, felt the pinch.[170] Paper shortages hit education particularly hard, as they tended to disrupt normal school operations as well as the publishing of textbooks.[171] The consequences of the financial troubles suggested by Stillman are evident in Texas. George L. Landolt observes, "A graveyard of college buildings and campuses dotted the land in every section of the State. Of 135 institutions of learning, chartered by the Texas Legislature from statehood in 1845 until the Civil War, only Austin College survived."[172]

The Southern College and the Interpretation of Confederate Defeat

This review of literature has already outlined the research on the question of how evangelical Protestants infused the social and political issues of the antebellum and war years with religious significance and meaning. Where applicable, the role played by colleges and universities in this process, especially denominational ones, has been noted.

---

[169]Rachel Bryan Stillman, "Education in the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972), 337-339.

[170]Ibid., 350.

[171]Ibid., 355-357.

[172]Landolt, *Search for the Summit*, 151. Landolt is technically correct, as Baylor University and Baylor Female College (known today as the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor), were both chartered by the Republic of Texas. Austin College was chartered *after* Baylor by the *state* legislature. Baylor and UMHB survive down to the present.

Moreover, a general discussion of research surrounding the role played by evangelicals in explaining Confederate defeat has also been included. What remains to be addressed is the question of how evangelical Protestantism influenced the college and university curriculum after the war–especially regarding the problem of Confederate defeat.

Postwar challenges to rebuild Southern colleges were many. In his book *Thinking Confederates*, Dan R. Frost catalogues many of these challenges. "The Civil War," he writes, "devastated Southern higher education."[173] The sources of this devastation included the following: college records were confiscated and buildings were burned; college resources were often commandeered by both armies for use by the military; and many Southern colleges lost their antebellum endowments after having invested them in Confederate bonds.[174]

Physical and financial devastation was only part of the postwar challenge of rebuilding Southern colleges. Southerners needed explanations for defeat. Having invested so much in the idea that God was on their side, the defeat of the Confederacy brought about a spiritual crisis. Colleges rose to the challenge of reconciling the belief in God's favor for the South with the reality of its defeat. Two trains of thought developed in Southern academics to accomplish this task. The first was known as the New South. In his famous work *The New South Creed*, Paul M. Gaston describes the New South as an idea that helped defeated Southerners come to terms with the demise of antebellum Southern society. At the same time, the New South helped them to look toward the future with great anticipation. Gaston writes,

---

[173]Dan R. Frost, *Thinking Confederates: Academia and the Idea of Progress in the New South* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000), 39.

[174]Ibid.

> The conquered Southerners, abandoned forever their dream of separate nationhood, and having to share with Northerners the desire to restore the Union, they wished keenly for that result to come about quickly. Cherishing memories of the Republic, and proud of their conspicuous role in creating it, they likewise wished to see it regain its former glory, and to share in its fame.[175]

Some New South prophets like Edwin DeLeon argued that the South should embrace industrial and agricultural changes. Moreover, he advocated active reconciliation with the North.[176] A few, like Benjamin Harvey Hill, even blamed the South's defeat on its steadfast commitment to slavery. He encouraged his fellow Southerners to look upon the end of slavery as a great opportunity for Southern economic advancement.[177]

According to Frost, the ideas of the New South were brought to Southern colleges and universities primarily by former Confederate military and civilian officials. It was these individuals who were hired as college presidents, administrators, and faculty members. Moreover, Confederate veterans made up a large percentage of the post-war student body.[178] Of this generation of educational leaders, Frost writes, "Veterans who entered academia brought not only their fame but also their wartime experience, which included a brief encounter with industrialization and the legacy of defeat."[179] They had experienced the power of Northern industrialization first hand on the battlefield and now

---

[175]Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (Montgomery: NewSouth Books, 2002), 25.

[176]Ibid., 51.

[177]Ibid., 53-54.

[178]Frost, *Thinking Confederates*, 39-40.

[179]Ibid., 41.

envisioned a New South that would embrace an educational system oriented toward science and other skills needed for such industrialization.[180]

According to Frost, the reorientation of the curriculum from its antebellum focus on the classics to a new focus on science and industry placed state colleges at odds with denominational colleges. Educators realized that funding and maintaining a science and technology curriculum was costly, a cost that most denominational colleges would most likely not be able to bear. Therefore, denominational colleges would have to serve a different purpose. He argues that postwar education reformers saw state schools serving the needs of society through the new curriculum and denominational schools serving the needs of society through an age-old aspect of the American college curriculum, namely emphasis on the classics and the moral development of students.[181] In other words, postwar Southern society needed its colleges to reflect a new program of industrialization as well as support common values.

Frost identifies a second train of thought to enter postwar Southern academics. It was essentially religious in character. It explained Confederate defeat by connecting the economic ideas of the New South with divine providence. He articulates its ideas most succinctly. First, Southern academicians rejected the idea that Southerners should be blamed for or feel guilty about slavery and secession. They saw no need to apologize for slavery. Slavery was not to be condemned on moral grounds. Second, they affirmed the widespread belief that divine providence had a hand in human actions, including the defeat of the Confederacy. What was God's motive in allowing the South to be defeated?

---

[180]Ibid., 46.

[181]Ibid., 73.

Simply stated, the South's defeat allowed the United States to solve the problem of slavery. With slavery gone, America could fulfill its destiny of building a strong, prosperous republic.[182] In sum, current scholarship relating to post-war Southern colleges suggests that even though a large part of the postwar academic reform program focused on largely secular issues such as economic reform, the impact of evangelical Protestant thought still remained central to this program and to Southern college life.

Summation

The Civil War has been written about and studied more than any other conflict in American history. Yet many historians believe that a major part of the story has largely been ignored, namely, the role played by religion. The review of literature presented above demonstrates that scholarly interest in this subject seems to be on the rise. It shows that historians have endeavored to understand many religious facets of the conflict: how evangelical Protestantism reacted to slavery, how church schisms impacted political disunion, how religious communities and their leaders responded to secession and war, how evangelicals helped to define American and Confederate nationalism, and how religious communities and their leaders responded to the end of slavery. To be sure, scholarly controversies relating to all of these topics abound.

Given the fact that the present study focuses on the role played by denominational colleges in Texas during the Civil War era, the review of literature also included the scholarly work that has been done in relation to the impact of religion on the development of American education. The evidence shows that the development of

[182]Ibid., 50-51.

America's schools was often tied to religious concerns. The Puritans and the Common School Movement serve as key examples.

As for higher education, historians have found a definite religious impulse behind the development of colleges. The evidence indicates that the denominational college dominated the educational landscape, especially in Texas where all colleges before the Civil War were private, and most of them were denominationally grounded. Evangelical Protestant denominations were particularly active in supporting institutions of higher learning. Moreover, denominational leaders often expressed religious motives for supporting colleges.

Finally, American education historians have also recognized that religious concerns were not the only impulses behind the work of denominational churches to found colleges. Denominational leaders often saw religious concerns and public concerns as synonymous. This meant that their colleges, far from shying away from political debate, often responded directly to the worldly controversies of the day. This was especially true during the Civil War era.

This dissertation will endeavor to make a relevant contribution to current scholarship by attempting to bring together the approaches of what seems to be two distinct fields: American religious history and American educational history. On the one hand, historians working in the field of religious history have produced large amounts of evidence showing how evangelical Protestants impacted the political questions of the Civil War era. However, their analysis rarely includes the role played by denominational colleges. On the other hand, historians working in the field of educational history have produced evidence showing that denominational colleges often found themselves serving

two masters, one sacred and one worldly. Their work documents a religious impulse behind the development of American education. It also suggests that colleges were often impacted by the politics of the day. However, educational historians, as a group, seem more interested in tracing the development of institutions and their curricula than they are in focusing on evaluating the political nature of those institutions. The Civil War, for example, is often described as an event that happened *to* colleges rather than an event in which colleges were directly involved. Little effort has been made to look comprehensively at the political nature of denominational colleges during the Civil War. The following chapters will argue that Texas denominational colleges and universities reflected and promoted the social and political values of Civil War-era Texas. Proof of this argument will be provided by bringing together the approaches, methodologies, and questions of two fields: religious history and educational history. In this sense, the present project stays true to the field of church-state studies, which is by its nature interdisciplinary.

CHAPTER TWO

The Role of Denominational Colleges and Universities as Seen by Both Church and State

Introduction

The review of literature in the preceding chapter highlighted the effort made by many historians to discover what motivated various denominations to found colleges. Several motives were given. Lawrence Cremin's *American Education: The National Experience* asserts that legal, social, and religious developments account for the drive to establish colleges. Frederick Rudolph's *The American College and University* cites the religious zeal of evangelical denominations as the primary motivation for such efforts. Finally, Albea Godbold's *The Church College of the Old South* argues that evangelicals felt their denominational colleges served the nation. To focus solely on the motives of denominational leaders, however, tells only part of the story. The state's interest in supporting (or opposing) the founding of denominational colleges and universities must also be considered. Therefore, this chapter is a discussion of two interrelated questions. First, how did the Texas government view denominational colleges? Was its response to them enthusiastic, indifferent, or hostile? The evidence used to evaluate this question will include a review of specific state actions. Special attention will be paid to such actions as the granting of college charters and land. Second, how did churches view these colleges? Were colleges seen as serving purely denominational concerns, or did church leaders hope that their colleges would have a broader impact on Texas society? Church conference and convention records will be used to gain insight into these questions. Denominational newspapers will also be relied upon for evidence.

Contemplation about the future role of higher education in Texas began almost immediately after the establishment of the Republic of Texas. Two of the Republic of Texas's early political leaders, Sam Houston and Mirabeau B. Lamar, were contacted regularly by parties interested in the status of education in Texas. The appeals to these two men on the subject suggest many motives. For example, Sam Houston received several letters of introduction written on behalf of Reverend Martin Ruter. Donald Whisenhunt's *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities* claims that although Ruter came to Texas in 1837 as a missionary, he was also a driving force in the founding of the state's first Protestant college. Its founders named it Rutersville College in his honor.[1] One such letter of introduction highlighted his affiliation with the Methodist Episcopal Church as well as his reputation as a scholar. Written by William McLean it read in part,

> Allow me to introduce to your acquaintance, the bearer, the Rev. Doctor Ruter, a highly respectable clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who goes to Texas with a view of making it his permanent residence. Doctor Ruter is a fine scholar, a gentleman of general intelligence, and in every respect a most estimable man, and may well be considered as a valuable acquisition to any community.[2]

Another letter of introduction highlighted specifically Dr. Ruter's mission in Texas. "He is a gentleman of great moral worth," wrote Henry Raguet to Sam Houston, "and any aid you may afford him to effect the object of his mission to our Country, will doubtless do much to spread the seeds of Christianity among its inhabitants."[3] Though these letters of

---

[1]Donald W. Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historical Profile* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1986), 108.

[2]William McLean to Sam Houston, 21 August 1837, A. J. Houston Collection Documents, Texas State Library, Austin, Texas.

[3]Henry Raguet to Sam Houston, 26 November 1837, A. J. Houston Collection Documents, Texas State Library, Austin, Texas.

introduction told Sam Houston that Ruter's mission was primarily religious and that he was, perhaps, a reputable scholar, specific reference to founding a college is absent. Appeals by others to the Republic of Texas government more directly addressed the need for a system of education.

Mirabeau B. Lamar received several direct appeals from individuals inquiring about the future prospects for an education system in the Republic of Texas. Some, like R. M. Chapman, expressed personal motivations. Chapman declared, "I purpose removing to Texas and establishing there a school for instruction in the classics and higher branches of English. Is there demand for such an institution in Texas? Would I there be recompensed for the relinquishment of a flourishing and profitable business here?"[4] Chapman's motives were, however, more than simply financial. Texas, he thought, was a place where he would not only feel at home but also feel as though he were contributing something important to the Republic's development:

> I would carry to Texas no prejudices against her institutions, for I am by birth, and in feeling a southerner – a Virginian. After a long absence I wish to return to the South and spend there my life. Would not such an institution as I purpose, be an object of national benefit to your young Republic? Would I not, if my duty be well discharged, more than repay you for the personal gratification of living among those whom I am most ready to call my countrymen?[5]

By highlighting his Southern heritage and the fact that he held no prejudice against Southern institutions (most likely a reference to the institution of slavery), Chapman felt that his appeal would be received more positively. His comments indicate a recognition

---

[4]R. M. Chapman to Mirabeau B. Lamar, 1 January 1838, in *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, ed. Charles Adams Gulick, Jr., et al., vol. 2 (Austin: Pemberton Press, 1968), 13.

[5]Ibid., 13-14.

that educational institutions operate as part of the community and, therefore, cannot easily run counter to community values, identity, and expectations.

History confirms Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas L. Pangle's conclusion (cited in the previous chapter) that "the Founders' argument that the nation's civic health depended on good public schools was simply ineffective in persuading the country to build them."[6] However, this fact did not stop many antebellum educators from making their appeal to the Republic of Texas on the grounds of the Jeffersonian vision of republican education. Mirabeau Lamar received one such appeal. It was made by Alexander Jones, who was writing to Lamar on behalf of a teacher name Nathaniel W. Holley. In this letter of introduction, Jones observed, "Education, must forever form a subject of the deepest and most paramount interest in all Republics. It is the main foundation of their existence."[7] Nathaniel Holley presented his own letter to Lamar along with Jones's introduction. In it Holley likewise promoted the importance of education in terms of Jefferson's republican model. He wrote,

> Under a proper direction all children might be early initiated into habits of attention and habits of study, which would in a great measure preserve their minds from the contamination of folly & vice, and thus by the constant acquisition of useful knowledge and the adoption of correct principles and sentiments, they would be enabled to come forward into active life as wise, honorable & useful citizens. It is the mind that makes the man. The cultivation and improvement, then, of all its powers and faculties are deserving our highest attention and consideration. If your young republic should aim at this point, and undeviatingly pursue it, she would necessarily become the most intelligent virtuous and honorable nation in the world. All others have started wrong and it is difficult, extreemly [*sic*] difficult, now to remedy the evil.[8]

---

[6]Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas L. Pangle, *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideas of the American Founders* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1993), 144.

[7]Alexander Jones to Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, August 1837, in *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, vol. 1 (Austin: Pemberton Press, 1968), 568.

[8]Nathaniel Holley to Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, 15 September 1837, in *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, vol. 1, 571.

Holley's references to ideals such as wisdom, honor, virtue, and citizenship were unmistakably republican in orientation. Jefferson himself would have surely appreciated Holley's line of argumentation.

Such republican ideals were not always at the heart of all petitions received by Lamar, however. Other motives appeared in his correspondence. Samuel Rowland's petition, for example, relied heavily on religious prejudices. On the one hand his interpretation of history linked ignorance with the Catholic Church. He wrote,

> In Europe, a most impure mixture of Christianity and Idolatry, a hideous monster, was set up. This Monster took upon it the name of Christianity and in some things resembled it. But, being very different in its origin, its nature, disposition and power were also of a very different character. This Monster propagated and encouraged vice of every description by its indulgence and dispensations.[9]

Although Rowland never mentioned the Catholic Church by name in his letter, his metaphorical references were unmistakable. What accounted for the rise of this "Monster?" For him, more than anything else, it was the failure of society to attend to the matter of education. He claimed, "A kind of lethargy seized the public mind. General knowledge and education became entirely neglected; and even those whose immediate duty it was to give instruction and administer such remedies as the case required, became themselves supine, slothful and negligent."[10] On the other hand, said Rowland, the rise of Protestantism brought an end to this neglect, and with it, an end to tyranny. He exclaimed,

> No sooner did the light of science begin to glimmer at the first dawn of the Reformation than the reign of tyranny and oppression trembled to the very centre. . . . Institutions for Education were established; the spirit of inquiry and enterprize

---

[9]Samuel Rowland to Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, 31 January 1838, in *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, vol. 2, 31.

[10]Ibid.

> [*sic*] were gradually unfettered; and the glorious work of regeneration in Church and state made rapid advancement. Instead of ignorance and superstition bright Science now diffused vivifying and cheering influence throughou[t] [*sic*] the land. And in proportion to Education developes [*sic*] its boundless resources, the reign of darkness ceases to exist, oppression and violence are no more. Peace, good order, justice and uprightness communicate strength and energy throughout the whole community.[11]

In Rowland's view, then, Texas had a choice to make. If it chose to support education, liberty and free government would follow. He asserted, "Whatever excellencies we possess as individuals or as a nation we owe entirely to Education. . . . Education is the palladium of free Government, the bulwark of every country, and the glory of every land."[12] Rowland's history lesson was intended to remind Lamar of the consequences to Texas if it failed to support education.

Finally, some would-be education pioneers in the Republic of Texas were more concerned about the pragmatic aspects of education. In his letter to Lamar on the subject of education, for example, William T. Hamilton asked for Lamar's response to several such pragmatic questions. He inquired as to the cost of land, the prospect for public and private financing, the number of potential students, and the ability of those students to pay tuition.[13] His request seemed more like a business plan than a philosophical treatise on education.

The early political leaders of Texas were approached by many individuals and asked to ponder the subject of education. For his part, Lamar did more than just

---

[11]Ibid., 32.

[12]Ibid., 33.

[13]William T. Hamilton to Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar, 21 November 1838, , in *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*, vol. 2, 297-298.

ponder the subject. During his administration, he signed two bills relating to publicly supported schools and colleges. Specifically, a generous amount of public land was set aside for two colleges. Proceeds from the land and its minerals were to be used to financially support these institutions.[14] However, it was not until 1871 that the state legislature authorized the first public college in Texas. It was called the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and it opened in 1876.[15]

The movement to establish public education in Texas struggled until well after the Civil War. Thomas Lloyd Miller explains, "For many years, the remark which Mark Twain made about the weather applied also to education in Texas, that is, everyone talked about it, but did nothing about it."[16] While this observation may well apply to public education, the fact remains that Texans did do something about higher education. Indeed, antebellum Texas was home to scores of colleges and universities, some dating back to the days of the Republic of Texas. Donald Whisenhunt's *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities* indicates that perhaps nearly all of the colleges that preceded the state's own efforts in higher education were founded by various religious denominations or by religious leaders with strong denominational ties. Leading the denominational effort in Texas higher education were the Methodists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians. Moreover, the Texas government was not a passive observer to the establishment and operation of these institutions. Through the issuance of charters and

---

[14]Robert A. Calvert, Arnoldo De León, and Gregg Cantrell, *The History of Texas* (Wheeling, Il: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2002), 92-93.

[15]Ibid., 225.

[16]Thomas Lloyd Miller, *The Public Lands of Texas, 1519-1970* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972), 107.

the granting of state land, Texas leaders supported private efforts to plant the seeds of higher education in Texas.

The State and Higher Education: Private College and University Charters

Purpose and Context

Where the establishment of private colleges and universities is concerned, American jurisprudence usually defines educational institutions as corporations. According to *Corpus Juris Secundum*, a corporation

> is a body of individuals united as a single separate entity under a common name, and having succession while it exists. It is an artificial being, invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of law, and its status before the law is that of an individual, despite the fact that one corporation may be a subsidiary or affiliate of any other or of others.[17]

Incorporation under the law means that colleges and universities have legal rights and responsibilities. In general these would include:

> The capacity of perpetual existence, the power to sue or be sued in the corporate name, the ability to acquire and transfer property and do other acts in a corporate name, the ability to purchase and hold real estate, the power to actually engage in specified business as set forth in its articles of incorporation and such other characteristics and powers as may be provided by statute.[18]

As regards colleges and universities specifically, American jurisprudence recognizes that these institutions, whether they be public or private in nature, can be, and usually are, regulated by constitutional and statutory provisions. *Corpus Juris Secundum* declares,

> The regulation of educational institutions, such as colleges and universities, is a matter peculiarly affected with public interest involving the welfare, morals, and safety of the citizens and state, and some constitutional provisions confer upon the

---

[17]Lawrence J. Culligan and Milorad Nikolic, eds., *Corpus Juris Secundum: A Contemporary Statement of American Law as Derived from Reported Cases and Legislation*, vol. 18 (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1990), 266.

[18]Ibid.

> state power to control educational institutions, and upon the legislature discretionary power to deal with educational subject only to fundamental restrictions.[19]

Legislative control over colleges and universities applies regardless of whether they are public or private:

> Like the charters of other private corporations, the charter of a private, incorporated university or college is considered to be a contract, and entitled to protection under the provision of the Federal Constitution prohibiting the several states from enacting laws impairing the obligation of contracts. . . . However, private colleges may be required to submit to certain accreditation standards. Moreover, by accepting government appropriations, a private college may make itself subject to various regulations.[20]

Texas jurisprudence likewise recognizes that incorporated private colleges and universities are, to a large degree, subject to state regulation. The Constitution of the Republic of Texas (1836), for example, granted the Congress of the Republic the power "to establish post offices and post roads, to grant charters of incorporation, patents and copy rights, and secure to the authors and inventors the exclusive use thereof for a limited time."[21] Moreover, *Texas Jur* states, "An incorporated private university or college, like any other corporation, has only such powers as are granted in its charter and the governing statutes; however, express power as to any particular act carries with it, by implication, the right to do anything that may be reasonably necessary to effect such power."[22]

---

[19]Bower, Carolyn and Lisa Ascenzo, eds., *Corpus Juris Secundum: A Contemporary Statement of American Law as Derived from Reported Cases and Legislation*, vol. 14A (n.p.: Thomson/West, 2006), 654.

[20]*American Jurisprudence: A Modern Comprehensive Text Statement of American Law, State and Federal, Completely Revised and Rewritten in the Light of Modern Authorities and Developments*, 2d ed., vol. 15A (n.p.: West Group, 2000), 255.

[21]Constitution of the Republic of Texas (1836), art. 2, sec. 3.

[22]Gallagher, Richard, B., ed., *Texas Jur*, 3d ed., vol. 12 (n.p.: Thomson/West, 2004), 517.

The above survey of legal traditions and practices in both the United States and Texas indicates, then, that the state has an appropriate role to play in establishing and regulating colleges and universities, even private ones. Moreover, these traditions and practices assert that the state benefits from granting such incorporation. Specifically, the state recognizes the positive benefits to society bestowed by the activities of colleges and universities. Such institutions are viewed as central to the public interest. Private colleges and universities, on the other hand, also benefit from gaining legal status as corporations. They need the state's blessing to function properly. In short, American law defines the relationship between the state and higher education, to include private schools, as a mutually beneficial one.

This mutually beneficial relationship means, of course, that colleges and universities are part of the body politic. They do not stand separate from it. One example of this is seen in a March 1845 edition of the *Texas National Register*. On its front page the editor published the charter granted by the Republic of Texas to Baylor University. The charter was published word for word in its entirety. Also appearing in the paper was a statute authorizing the construction of a lighthouse on Galveston Island, a statute relating to state revenue, and a statute entitled "An Act To Authorize the Transportation of Goods Coastwise," which dealt with the issue of trade and customs duties. These legislative actions, too, were published word for word. Although no commentary regarding any of these laws was provided in the newspaper, one political issue did, it seems, warrant extensive commentary and discussion. That issue was the annexation of Texas to the United States. Varying arguments over this question were given equal time by the newspaper's editor, W. D. Miller. Writing against annexation,

one contributor noted the threat that statehood would present to the institution of slavery in Texas. The editorial exclaimed,

> The tendencies of party feeling in the United States are decidedly revolutionary. The public mind, for the last ten years, has been in a state of rapidly increasing excitement, which at this moment is phrenzy [*sic*]. The demon spirit of ABOLITIONISM, during that period, has prevailed until it is actually triumphed. It has received no check—it knows no quiet—it admits of no lucid intervals. It has been nursed and invigorated by the alliance of political partizanship [*sic*], until it is no longer content with toleration. It wills to rule, to pervade, to control, to blast.[23]

Also appearing was an editorial expressing a favorable view of annexation. Its author listed the many benefits of annexation: "Perfect protection from foreign interference is one large item; and a good and lasting market for our sugar, cotton and wool."[24]

The debate over annexation is not the subject of this study. However, the publication of Baylor's charter in the *Texas National Register* demonstrated, perhaps in a very subtle way, that colleges and universities in Texas were part of a larger political environment and culture. On the same day that Texans read about Baylor University, they were pondering many other issues of national importance. In other words, just as human beings are born into and become part of a political culture, so, too, are colleges and universities born into and become part of one. A closer examination of the charters issued by the Republic of Texas and the state of Texas will illuminate part of Texas's political culture, at least as it relates to the state's views of higher education. Much of what the state hoped to achieve by supporting private colleges and universities is reflected in the charters it issued.

---

[23]*Texas National Register* (Washington, Texas), 22 March 1845.

[24]Ibid.

College Charters Specifically Considered.

The Constitution of the Republic of Texas declared that "it shall be the duty of congress, as soon as circumstances will permit, to provide by law, a general system of education,"[25] This indicates that the founding generation of Texas was sensitive to, and interested in, education. However, this fact alone does not mean Texans were willing or able to devote taxpayer money to fund such an endeavor. Indeed, their hesitancy was expressed with the qualifying words "as soon as circumstances will permit it." As it turned out, circumstances for the funding of a public education system in Texas would not arise until after the Civil War. Historians Calvert, De León, and Cantrell explain the difficulties faced by public education in Texas in the antebellum period as follows: "The unpredictable weather, the crops, and raids by the Indians all interfered with the routine of learning. Educational reforms such as those Horace Mann popularized in the United States hardly reached Texans."[26]

Public funding for education might well have been absent until after the Civil War, but this should not be taken to mean that the Republic of Texas, or later the state of Texas, sat idly by and did nothing. On the contrary, the college charters issued by the Texas government throughout the Civil War period reflect an active government. That is to say, the state was active in defining numerous aspects of higher education to include college governance, curricula, and even the extent to which religion played a part in the operation of denominational colleges. College charters, then, illuminate the goals of the state as regards higher education.

---

[25]Constitution of the Republic of Texas (1836), General Provisions, sec. 5.

[26]Calvert, De León, and Cantrell, *The History of Texas*, 104.

This study makes no attempt to review the details of every college charter issued by the Republic of Texas or the state of Texas during the Civil War period; however, a sample of such charters uncovers several similarities.[27] First and foremost, college and university charters were considered to be the same as any other article of incorporation that the state might issue. As such, they legally established the various individuals behind the founding of a school as a corporate body. The charter of Andrew Female College, issued in 1853, serves as a very good example:

> Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas, That Andrew J. Wiley, Francis A. McShan, Robert Wynne, J. Carroll Smith, C. G. Keenan, H. Yoakum, Daniel Baker, Williamson Wynne, Anthony C. Parmer, D. J. Ransom, Andrew J. McGown, Pleasant W. Kittrell and Micajah C. Rogers, be, and they are hereby incorporated, and with their successors, as hereinafter provided, shall be known and recognized in law, as the Trustees of Andrew Female College, and under that name shall have power to sue and be sued, to have a seal, and to do all things incident to corporations; provided, their acts as such shall not be inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, or of this State.[28]

Most college charters also made reference to additional powers and responsibilities. Common among these was the power to buy and sell real estate, though colleges were very often restricted to a certain dollar value of property and other assets. Baylor Female College's 1866 charter, for example, stated that the Board of Trustees, as a corporate body, was "authorized to hold lands, buildings, apparatus, library, and endowments; funds to the value of five hundred thousand dollars."[29] Specific reference to tax exemption was also very common; however, the state often limited the amount of

---

[27]The author has made an attempt to choose a sample of college and university charters which are diverse in terms of the year issued and the denominational affiliation of the institutions. Of course, no two charters are identical.

[28]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Andrew Female College*, sec. 1 (1853), in *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*, vol. 3, ed. Hans Peter Neilsen Gammel (Austin: The Gammel Book Company, 1898), 1372; hereafter cited as *The Laws of Texas*.

[29]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Board of Trustees of Baylor Female College, and to Regulate the Mode of their Elections*, sec. 1 (1866), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 5, 1265.

property that could be held in tax exempt status. One of the earliest college charters issued by the state of Texas was granted to Austin College in 1849. Its charter illustrates this point well. When addressing the site of the college, the charter declared "that a site, not exceeding ten acres of land, and the college buildings and library, are hereby declared exempt from taxation, while the property of the college."[30]

In addition to establishing the basic powers and responsibilities of colleges and universities as corporate bodies, charters were often very specific about defining college governance. In many cases, the state even anticipated potential power struggles over control of denominational colleges from within the denominations themselves. The charter issued by the state of Texas in 1854 to Aranama College illustrates this point clearly:

> That the College shall be under the control and supervision of the Western Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church of Texas, embracing the territory between the Colorado river and the Rio Grande, and said control and supervision may be transferred to a Synod of the Presbyterian Church that may hereafter be formed within said territory, or some portion thereof, including the site of the College at Goliad. It is expressly understood and hereby declared that the founders of said college are attached to the division of the Presbyterian Church known at this day as the Old School Presbyterian Church, and that the Western Presbytery of Texas is a branch of the same division and connected with the Old School General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and that said College is to be under the control and supervision of a Presbytery alike connected with the said division, and can only be transferred to a Synod of a like connection.[31]

Such detail is understandable given the often fractious nature of denominationalism at the time. The state, it seems, wanted to avoid any future disputes over control of these colleges and their facilities and property.

---

[30]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Austin College*, sec. 6 (1849), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 3, 675.

[31]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Aranama College*, sec. 3, (1854), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol.4, 30.

Establishing organizational control over colleges and universities was merely one aspect of the state's efforts to define and control college governance. The state, through charters, controlled the manner in which trustees, presidents, and faculty were selected. Here, too, one can see a great bit of care and attention given to this aspect of college governance. The charter granted to Tyler University in 1854 declared,

> The Trustees shall be thrown into parcels of six each, and draw for their numbers from one to three; those drawing number one shall go out of office at the close of the first year; those drawing number two at the close of the second year; provided, in all cases they shall be eligible to re-election by the General Association of Texas, at any annual meeting, at which time it shall be the duty of said General Association to elect six members of said Board of Trustees to fill the annual vacancies; and all Trustees so elected shall continue in office three years from their election; said General Association shall fill all other vacancies that may occur by death or otherwise; provided, that a quorum of the Board of Trustees shall fill vacancies temporarily, when necessary; but vacancies shall be filled permanently only by the said General Association.[32]

Most charters also governed the process for removing board members, presidents, and faculty members. Rutersville College's 1840 charter stipulated "that the Trustees shall have the power of fixing the salaries of all the officers connected with the college; of removing any of them for neglect or misconduct in office—a majority of the whole number concurring in said removal."[33] Trinity University's 1870 charter defined the process of removal in even greater detail. It stated,

> The board of trustees shall have power to remove or expel any of its members for grossly immoral or disreputable conduct, or for continued and wilful [*sic*] neglect of the duties incident to his position; to do this, however, it shall require a two-thirds vote of the entire board, and the reasons for so doing shall be entered in full upon the minutes of the board.[34]

---

[32]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate Tyler University*, sec. 3 (1854), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 4, 129.

[33]Republic of Texas, *An Act to Establish and Incorporate Rutersville College*, sec. 13 (1840), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol.2, 427.

[34]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate Trinity University, Located at Tehuacana Hills, Limestone County, Texas*, sec. 8 (1870), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 6, 679.

Requirements for annual reporting of college activities were incorporated into many, but not all, charters. In such cases, however, the state required colleges to report their activities not to the state legislature or to some other state entity; rather, they were required to report back to the entity which was granted control of the college. This was typically a denominational convention, conference, or congress. For instance, the 1861 charter of Texas Baptist College, which was placed under the control of the Eastern Texas Baptist Convention, required the board of trustees to "annually present to the Convention a written report of the financial condition of said college, the by-laws and regulations adopted by the Trustees, the number of professors and teachers, and the number of pupils in attendance during the year."[35] Similarly, Soule University's 1856 charter required that

> The Board of Trustees shall annually present to the [Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South] a written statement, showing the exact condition of the University as to donation funds, expenditures, by-laws and regulations adopted by the Trustees, the number of Professors and Teachers, and average number of pupils in attendance during the year, and the said Conference may revise the same, and make such alterations as to any items in the statement as may seem proper and expedient, and also transmit to the Board of Trustees such instructions for their observance as the prosperity of the University may demand.[36]

In spite of the fact that these reporting requirements did not involve informing the government of college activities, they do represent a form of state oversight. The state ensured that there would be a rudimentary form of accountability for a college's actions. Allegations of illegality notwithstanding, responding to annual college reports was, in

---

[35]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Texas Baptist College*, sec. 3 (1861), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 5, 428.

[36]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate Soule University*, sec. 3 (1856), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 4, 353-354.

many cases, the job of denominational leaders through their conferences and conventions. In short, the state achieved oversight of higher education without having to create a state-operated oversight agency.

The curriculum represented another area of state involvement in the affairs of denominational colleges. It is here where one finds the clearest expression of the state's view of denominational colleges. As a general rule, the government's response to curriculum issues fell into one of two categories. The first category included those colleges whose charters explicitly prohibited a denominationally oriented curriculum. Most in this category were those whose charters granted control to a board of trustees rather than a denominational conference, convention, or congress. This did not necessarily mean that such schools were nondenominational. On the contrary, most were founded by ministers or other denominational leaders. Examples of this abound. Galveston University, for instance, was "clearly under Presbyterian influence and control."[37] However, its 1841 charter declared "that the trustees of said university, when acting in a corporate capacity, shall be required to confine themselves solely to the advancement of literature, together with the arts and sciences, studiously avoiding all undue connections with any religious or political denominations."[38] The University of San Augustine, which was chartered by the Republic of Texas in June of 1837, had a similar history. Founded as the result of the leadership of a Presbyterian minister named Marcus A. Montrose, the University of San Augustine's mandate was nondenominational. Nonetheless, this school eventually fell under the control of the

---

[37]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 53.

[38]Republic of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Galveston University*, sec. 16, (1841), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 2, 540.

Presbyterian Church.[39] Like Galveston University, its charter made clear that the curriculum was to be nonsectarian and apolitical. It declared, "That this charter and privilege shall extend to the said trustees and their successors in office, as long as they confine the benefit of the same to the advancement of the sciences, and the promotion of useful knowledge to the rising generations, which institution shall be accessible equally alike to all, without regard to opinions of religion or politics."[40]

The second category of state influence over the curriculum is one in which the state attempted to prohibit colleges from discriminating against students on the grounds of religious affiliation. In this model, the state granted full control over the curriculum to the college but limited its actions as they related to the treatment of students. The charter granted to Concrete College, for example, placed the control of college in the hands of a board of trustees. No denominational conference or association was mentioned. However, it was clearly a Baptist school. According to Whisenhunt, "it was not strictly a Baptist-owned institution, but there is no doubt that it was distinctly Baptist-oriented. The Colorado Baptist Association especially endorsed the school."[41] Regarding the curriculum, its 1856 charter stated, "That the said Trustees shall have the power of prescribing the course of studies to be pursued by the students, and of framing and enhancing all such ordinances and by-laws as shall appear to them necessary for the good government of said College."[42] Unlike the examples cited above, there was no explicit

---

[39]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 169-170.

[40]Republic of Texas, *An Act To Incorporate the Trustees of Independence Academy and of the University of San Augustine*, sec. 2 (1837), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 1, 1296.

[41]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 36.

[42]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate Concrete College*, sec. 6 (1856), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 4, 759.

restriction on the religious content of the curriculum. However, Concrete College's charter did prohibit religious discrimination. It stated, "That the Concrete College shall be purely literary and scientific, and that the students of all religious denominations shall enjoy equal advantages."[43]

In this second model of state involvement, it should be added that even colleges which had a specific denominational affiliation were likewise restricted as to the role of religion in their overall operation. Tyler University is a prime example. In this case, the university was allowed "to establish a theological department,"[44] and the professor was required to be "a minister in the Baptist Church, in good standing."[45] However, the charter also declared that "no religious test shall be required of any other Professor or Tutor in said University."[46] Ensuring that no student or faculty member would be subject to religious discrimination indicates, among other things, that the state intended for denominational colleges and universities to serve more than a religious purpose. To be granted an article of incorporation by the state meant that colleges and universities had to serve a public purpose as well.

Perhaps the best overall expression of the state's view of denominational colleges and universities is seen in the legislative history of the Rutersville College charter. The charter was signed into law by Mirabeau B. Lamar on February 5, 1840. It expressed much of the same logic as the examples just cited. The state granted its board of trustees a charter which was, on its face, nonsectarian. According to Whisenhunt, "all members

---

[43]Ibid., 214.

[44]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate Tyler University*, sec. 5 (1854), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 4, 129.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Ibid.

of the Board of Trustees and faculty, however, were Methodists and in 1848 legal transactions tied it closer to the Methodist Church."[47] Specifically, its charter declared, "That the institution hereby incorporated, shall be purely literary and scientific, and the students of all religious denominations shall enjoy equal advantages."[48] Whisenhunt suggests that the college's first attempt to gain a charter from the government was denied on the grounds that the college was too closely connected to a specific denomination. Once the nondenominational provisions were added, the government assented to the charter.[49]

Indeed, a closer look at the legislative history of the Rutersville charter reveals something more than just concerns over denominational affiliation. The primary concern of the state seems to have been ensuring that the college would serve the Republic through a nonsectarian curriculum. In other words, the state wanted the college to be something other than a training ground for ministers and missionaries. On December 31, 1839, the Texas Senate's committee on education reported its findings on the Rutersville College charter. In this report, the committee recommended that the Senate adopt the charter on the grounds of specific benefits to the Republic:

> The Committee further report that since this bill has been submitted to their charge, one of the trustees of this college has suggested to them the propriety of connecting a professorship with said College by the authority of Congress and endorsed by the same. The Committee therefore believing that Congress shall by all laudable means endeavor to develope [*sic*] the resources of the country and foster scientific research, respectfully recommend that a professorship designed to promote the science of Geology, be connected with this institution—Texas presents a wide unexplored field of research to the scientific geologists. The vast

---

[47]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 108-109.

[48]Republic of Texas, *An Act to Establish and Incorporate Rutersville College*, sec. 14 (1840), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 2, 427.

[49]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 108.

> tertiary deposits bordering the coast, the secondary region of the interior and the towering primitive mountains of the northern and north western sections, indicate that the formations of every geological era, from the most modern to the most ancient periods diversify its surface & that almost every variety of minerals is enclosed in its soil. Already have valuable 'salines', deposits of bituminous coal, ores of Iron, copper, lead, silver and other minerals been discovered, and it is confidently believed that if Congress will but sustain and encourage geological research mineral treasures will be developed more valuable than the products of Golconda. In order to advance a project of so much importance and usefulness, the committy [*sic*] respectfully, submit the accompanying, bill containing additional section to the bill submitted to this charge.[50]

Two points of interest are reflected in this report. First, the committee on education was most interested in the benefits which would be gained by the Republic through the support of scientific research, especially in the field of geology. The state's interest was completely nonsectarian and secular. Second, the committee's report indicated that the board of trustees was fully aware of the state's interests. By expressing its willingness to allow the state to sponsor a professorship, the board was trying to increase its chances for incorporation; that is to say, the board was trying to sweeten the deal. It was aware that the government's interests were something other than training ministers and missionaries.

The State and Higher Education: Land Grants to Denominational Colleges

The committee on education did more than simply endorse the adoption of the Rutersville College charter. It expressly recommended that the Republic donate public land to the college to assist in its upkeep. The report stated,

> The provision designating a donation of land to the trustees of the college; they sincerely hope will be sustained by the honorable members of the senate, with their accustomed liberality. The public domain and revenues cannot be appropriated more advantageously than to the support of institutions of learning.

---

[50]Harriet Smither, ed., *Journals of the Fourth Congress of the Republic of Texas, 1839-1840*, vol. 1, *The Senate Journal* (Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., Printers, n.d.), 191-192.

> Even apparent prodigality for this purpose, often accords with the soundest principles of political economy.[51]

The Congress of the Republic made good on this recommendation with the donation of four leagues of land.[52] One league of land was the equivalent of 4,428.4 acres. Land grants, then, offered another way in which the government supported the endeavor of higher education. As with college charters, land grants to higher education reveal certain interests of the state and its view of colleges and universities.

The history of land policy in Texas is unique among the fifty states. In his article "The Public Land System of Texas, 1823-1910," Reuben McKitrick asserts that this unique history is not the result of the vast *size* of Texas but rather the result of *how* Texas entered the Union. Specifically, it is the annexation agreement with the United States that explains how Texas land policy differs from all other states. Because of annexation, "Texas is the only state ever admitted to the Union that subsequently has had complete control over the disposition of the unoccupied public land within its borders."[53] Land policy in other states was founded on land grants from the federal government. This meant that "in other states the legislatures have had control of only such limited quantities of land as have been granted to the states by Congress for particular purposes."[54] Moreover, when disposing of these lands granted by Congress, other state legislatures could only use the proceeds from land sales for those endeavors identified by

---

[51]Ibid., 191.

[52]Republic of Texas, *An Act to Establish and Incorporate Rutersville College*, sec. 18 (1840), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 2, 427.

[53]Reuben McKitrick, "The Public Land System of Texas, 1823-1910," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, 9, no. 1 (February 1918): 7.

[54]Ibid., 8.

Congress. Texas, on the other hand, was free to use its land sales for everything from raising general revenue to encouraging settlement. Some 67,000,000 acres were sold by Texas to the United States in 1850. In addition, the legislature of Texas has disposed of another 140,656,280 acres of land.[55]

Disposition of this land has been done to support a wide variety of public-interest causes. According to historian Thomas Lloyd Miller's study, nearly 10 million acres were granted to Texans who had performed military service; 39,701,944 acres were granted to settlers; 4,651,076 acres were sold for cash; 3,050,000 acres were disposed of as part of the capitol land grant; and 37,155,674 acres were granted for internal improvements. These improvements included land for railroad construction, building irrigation canals and ditches, improving navigation, promoting industry, building ships, and constructing the Central National Road. Land grants for education totaled 52,329,168 acres. Such endeavors included land for public schools, private schools, parochial schools, eleemosynary schools, and a state university.[56]

To fully appreciate land grants to private colleges and universities, it is important to distinguish between land sold for revenue and land granted for non-revenue purposes. In his extensive study of land policy, Aldon Socrates Lang observes, "The amount of land given away by Texas vastly exceeds the total acreage sold, exclusive of the 67,000,000 acres transferred to the United States."[57] According to his research, the Republic of Texas gave away some 41,570,733 acres. By contrast, it sold only 1,280,000 acres of

---

[55]Ibid., 8-9.

[56]Miller, *The Public Lands of Texas*, 138-139.

[57]Aldon Socrates Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas," *Baylor Bulletin*, 35, no. 3 (July 1932): 91.

land scrip.[58] After Texas was admitted to the Union in 1845, the state of Texas acted similarly. It gave away approximately 44,457,370 acres. This brings the grand total of land given away by Texas to 86,457,370 acres, which is slightly more than half the state's area. Land disposed of for the purpose of funding public education amounts to some 52,000,000 acres. Lang considers this a fiscal use because the revenue generated from this land was set aside to support public trust fund endowments specifically designated to support public education.[59]

The above research is presented here only to bring context to the question of where land grants to private colleges fit into land use history and, more importantly, what such grants say about the state's view of said colleges. To address these questions properly, the actual extent of land grants to private colleges must be addressed. With that in mind, both Miller's research and Lang's research indicate that land grants to private colleges were made during the period of the Republic. Neither study references any land grant to these colleges after statehood. Miller accounts for this by noting that the Republic of Texas constitution did not prohibit government aid to church-supported schools. As a result, such grants did occur. Examples given include De Kalb College, San Augustine University, Rutersville College, Herman University, Guadalupe College, Marshall University, and Nacogdoches University. The typical amount granted was four leagues.[60] In total, the Republic of Texas granted private schools approximately 172,319

[58]Ibid., 243.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Miller, *The Public Lands of Texas*, 116.

acres of land. This total would include all types of schools: academies, colleges, institutes, universities, high schools, seminaries, asylums, and medical colleges.[61]

When compared to the amount of land granted to individuals (soldiers, veterans, settlers, and homesteaders) and corporations constructing internal improvements (railroads, the Central National Road, etc.), the 172,319 acres of land granted to private educational institutions seems paltry. When considered from the standpoint of explaining the state's interests and goals, however, this relatively small amount of acreage increases in significance. According to Miller, the earliest efforts made by President Lamar and the Texas congress to support public schools and universities by setting aside public land were important; however, "no immediate results of these acts were obtained."[62] Private schools, colleges, and universities (including those which were explicitly denominational in orientation) moved in to fill the vacuum left by an unrealized public education effort. Most importantly, the government sought to help them do this by offering generous amounts of public land. Land grants to private colleges seem to have been so closely tied to the public interest that Lang asserts, "One might question the logic of classifying land grants to private education as non-fiscal and grants to public education as fiscal in character. Possibly the grants to private schools were fiscal in character in the sense that they saved the State the expense of establishing schools."[63]

The Republic's support for denominational colleges went far beyond simply solving a financial problem. Support for these institutions fit very well within the general

---

[61]Ibid., 117.

[62]Ibid., 110.

[63]Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas," 91.

philosophy of Texas land use policy. According to Miller, the state's primary interest was to create a society of individual landowners. He claims, "Texas was trying to attain the Jeffersonian ideal of every man owning his own home and eating figs from his own tree."[64] Many Texans saw the role of higher education in Jeffersonian terms as well. In this sense, Texans saw land use policy and education policy as being cut from the same cloth. For instance, when the Senate committee on education endorsed the land grant of four leagues to Rutersville College it was, in one sense, adopting Jefferson's vision for education; namely, that a strong republic required an educated population.

In his first message to the Texas Congress in December, 1838, President Lamar reflected this Jeffersonian view as well. He declared to the Congress, "It is admitted by all, that [a] cultivated mind is the guardian genius of Democracy, and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man."[65] It was noted earlier in this chapter that Lamar received many appeals from individuals interested in planting an educational system in Texas. Based on his address to the Congress, it appears that the appeals from Alexander Jones and Nathaniel W. Holly, both of which were made from the standpoint of republican ideals, resonated with him most strongly. Denominational colleges served this republican philosophy well. For this reason, the 172,319 acres of land granted to private schools, which included several denominational colleges and universities, is not paltry at all.

---

[64]Miller, *The Public Lands of Texas*, 243.

[65]Mirabeau B. Lamar, quoted in Miller, *The Public Lands of Texas*, 109.

Churches and their Colleges

The first two sections of this chapter focused on how the government of Texas viewed denominational colleges and universities. The discussion now turns to how churches viewed these same institutions. Of particular interest is the extent to which the state and churches shared similar goals for education in the state of Texas. Although many churches were involved in planting the seeds of higher education in Texas, the focus here, as with the rest of this study, is on the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians.

Texas Baptists and Higher Education.

Baptists left an early mark on the history of education in Texas. Though they founded scores of colleges and universities, Baylor University clearly stood in the spotlight. In his book *Texas Baptists: A Sesquicentennial History,* Harry Leon McBeth observes, "By far the largest undertaking of Texas Baptists in this early period was the founding of Baylor University."[66] According to McBeth, no other institution of higher learning achieved such a beloved status among Texas Baptists. He asserts, "Baylor was the first great achievement of Texas Baptists, and they loved and supported the school with a zeal which would brook no rivals."[67] Given the fact that Texas Baptists felt such a connection between Baylor and their own sense of mission in Texas, this university should serve as a good laboratory for illuminating Baptist attitudes about higher

---

[66]Harry Leon McBeth, *Texas Baptists: A Sesquicentennial History* (Dallas: Baptistway Press, 1998), 36.

[67]Ibid., 56-57.

education in general. Through the prism of Baylor University, one should be able to see the views, attitudes, and goals Texas Baptists had for their educational endeavors.

The Baptist State Convention of Texas was organized in September 1848. Educating Texas's youth was among its goals. The Convention's constitution declared, "The object of the convention shall be Missionary and Educational, the promotion of harmony of feeling and concert of action in our denomination, and the organization of a system of operative measures to promote the interest generally, of the Redeemer's Kingdom, within the state."[68] What is noteworthy is the grammatical structure of this sentence. The words "Missionary" and "Educational" are linked grammatically before being separated by a comma. They are listed grammatically as one goal out of three. On the one hand, one could argue that missionary work and educational work are completely distinct from one another. On the other hand, the grammar of that statement certainly places them close together. These two goals seem to be mutually dependent on one another.

The proceedings of the Baptists State Convention of Texas in the late 1840s and early 1850s are useful in determining whether the assumption about a mutual dependence between missionary work and education is accurate. However, the proceedings are only useful after the relationship between Baylor University and the Convention in these early years is uncovered. According to McBeth, Baylor was "founded by Baptists and for Baptists, but it was never narrowly sectarian."[69] To support this assertion he notes that

---

[68]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Organization and Proceedings of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Antioch Church, Anderson, Grimes County, September, 8-12, 1848* (Huntsville: Banner Print, n.d.), Appendix A.

[69]McBeth, *Texas Baptists*, 37.

Baylor's charter contained neither a requirement that all members of the board of trustees be members of a Baptist church nor any provision granting ownership of the university to any convention, Baptist or otherwise.[70] Ownership or any other direct connection between Baylor and the Convention was simply not possible "since the university founded in 1845 preceded the Baptist State Convention (formed 1848) and its successor the Baptist General Convention of Texas (1886)."[71] In spite of Baylor's legal status, Texas Baptists viewed Baylor as a Baptist institution. Indeed, even at the first meeting of the Baptist State Convention in 1848 there is evidence of this. For instance, the committee appointed by the Convention to consider the benefits of establishing a Baptist religious publication in Texas noted the following: "We believe that [a religious paper] will promote, to a considerable extent, the interest of our Baylor Institute."[72] To be sure, the primary goal of this religious paper was not to benefit Baylor but rather to advance "the interest of our denomination in Texas."[73] However, by prominently and affectionately highlighting Baylor as "our Baylor Institute," the committee saw Baylor serving the interests of Baptists and their denomination. It seems, therefore, that where a legal connection between Baylor and the Baptists State Convention of Texas was lacking in 1848, the psychological connection was quite strong and definitive.

In 1849 the Convention began making plans to seek an amendment to Baylor's charter to give the Convention the power to fill all vacancies on the University's board of trustees. At the convention, it was resolved that

---

[70]Ibid.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Organization and Proceedings of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, September, 8-12, 1848*, Appendix B.

[73]Ibid.

> J. W. D. Creath, A. G. Haynes, and J. L. Farquhar, be appointed a committee to confer with the Texas Baptist Convention relative to the propriety of obtaining from the Legislature an alteration in the charter of Baylor University, giving the power to fill vacancies in the Board of Trustees, into the hands of the convention; and that said committee report to this body as early as practicable.[74]

The committee so assigned did, in fact, present its recommendation for a change in Baylor's charter, and the recommendation was adopted.[75] The following year, the Convention's legal connection to, and its control over, Baylor were confirmed when J. M. Maxcy, chairman of the committee on Baylor University, reported to the Convention that the Texas legislature had approved the change in the University's charter.[76] Just two short years after its organization, the Baptist State Convention established both a psychological and a legal connection with Baylor. Therefore, the Convention's views about Baylor's purpose and mission should illuminate how Baptists felt about the relationship between missionary work and education.

Historian Frederick Eby's research on the founding of Baylor concludes that the dual missions of spreading the Gospel and spreading education were two sides of the same coin as far as early nineteenth-century evangelicals were concerned. He argues, "From early days Texas had an irresistible attraction for the Protestants of the United States. They looked upon it as the gateway to the evangelization of Latin-America."[77] Eugene W. Baker agrees. In his study of William M. Tryon, one of Baylor's founding

---

[74]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Proceedings of the First Anniversary of the Baptist State Convention of Texas*, May 11-14, 1849 (Huntsville: Texas Banner, 1849), 3.

[75]Ibid., 6.

[76]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Proceedings of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas: Held with the Huntsville Baptist Church, From the 10th to the 14th Day of May, 1850* (Huntsville: Texas Presbyterian, 1850), 7.

[77]Frederick Eby, "Education and Educators," in *Centennial Story of Texas Baptists*, ed. L. R. Elliott (Dallas: Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1936), 129.

fathers, he writes, "Just as Tryon was convinced that Texas was the most promising field of labor for Baptist ministers, he also felt certain that Baylor University offered the greatest hope for the denomination's future in the state."[78] Baylor's primary mission, as understood by the Convention, was to advance the cause of missionary work. At the 1850 meeting, the committee on domestic missions reported an urgent call for the Convention to "employ as many missionaries as she is now and may be, from time to time, able to pay."[79] A large reason for this call was that missionary work was believed to be "the most important of all [the Convention's] works."[80] Indeed, much work apparently needed to be done to address the needs of "our scattered brethren" and the "entire destitution of many counties within our State."[81] Regarding Baylor, the committee saw a mutually beneficial relationship between missionary work and the success of the University. On the one hand, the committee implored the Convention to employ missionaries because such an act would be in "the paramount interest of our infant Institution, (the Baylor University)."[82] Although the committee did not say so directly, it apparently saw missionary work as central to attracting students to Baylor, allowing it to prosper. Missionaries, then, were to be the fundamental recruiters for the school. On the other hand, the success of Baylor would lead to further advancement of missionary work. The committee described Baylor as "the great object of our future

---

[78]Eugene W. Baker, *A Noble Example: A Pen Picture of William M. Tryon, Pioneer Texas Baptist Preacher and Co-Founder of Baylor University* (Waco: Baylor University, 1985), 55.

[79]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Proceedings, 1850*, 5.

[80]Ibid.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Ibid.

hopes."[83] Evidence of this mutually beneficial relationship was already being reported to the Convention. In its report, the committee on education proudly declared that Baylor had "two young men of promise studying with a view to the ministry."[84]

Similar reports concerning the need for ministers continued into the 1850s. The 1851 Convention heard a report from the committee on home missions which declared, "The destitution within our own State is great, and the call for the Bread of Life, or more laborers, is loud and frequent."[85] Likewise, in 1852 the committee on home missions reported to the Convention that the religious needs of many Texans were not being met due to "the increase of our churches, over that of the number of efficient ministers."[86] An urgent appeal for more ministers was offered. The committee's report asserted, "We need, at the present moment, at least one hundred holy, godly ministers—mighty in the scriptures, and mighty to combat the various forms of infidelity, and the soul withering, and Zion blighting isms that are abroad in this our thriving State."[87]

At the same time it was calling for ministers, the Convention was also highlighting Baylor University's role in helping to supply those ministers. The University was seen by the Convention as a way to address this urgent need. In 1852, the special committee on education recommended that the Convention reject a request by the Baptist church in Tyler to help fund the establishment of a female institute. The

---

[83]Ibid.

[84]Ibid.

[85]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Fourth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Independence in June, 1851* (Washington, TX: Texas Ranger Office, 1851), 11.

[86]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Fifth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas, Held at Marshall, in June, 1852* (Washington, TX: Lone Star Office, n.d.), 12.

[87]Ibid.

recommendation was made on the grounds that said institute would be a literary institute and on the grounds that the Convention had already given its support to Baylor. The resolution read,

> That we highly approve the liberal educational spirit manifested in those resolutions, and do heartily wish their authors abundant success in their truly noble and praiseworthy enterprise, but as we deem it incompatible with the constitutional province and design of this convention, to solicit and raise funds for the establishment of any literary institution: our educational efforts extending only to the aid of ministers of the Gospel; and as we have under our patronage the Baylor University designed especially for this purpose, we cannot consistently promise aid to any other institution, nor extend to such a fostering or controlling influence.[88]

Baylor's board of trustees was also aware that their duty was to produce ministers. In their reports to the Convention, therefore, the board often highlighted the number of students studying for the ministry. Unfortunately, these numbers may not have been anything to brag about. In its 1854 report to the Convention, for example, the board reported that in the male and female departments combined there comprised between 180 and 190 students in attendance. Out of all these students, the board reported only three who were preachers preparing for a career in the ministry fulltime.[89] Perhaps to illustrate to the Convention that they were aware of this paltry number and were working on the problem, the board immediately reminded everyone that "tuition is free to all the children of ministers of the gospel."[90]

The urgent need to train ministers was driven by more than the desire to address the spiritual needs of Texans. It was also driven by the desire to advance the Baptist

---

[88]Ibid., 7

[89]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Seventh Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Palestine, Anderson County, in June, 1854* (Anderson, TX: Central Texian Office., 1854), 13.

[90]Ibid.

denomination in Texas. In its 1853 report to the Convention, the committee on domestic missions highlighted the importance of missionary work for Baptists as a denomination. The committee feared that if Baptists did not work hard to establish a strong presence in Texas, Baptists would lose influence over the spiritual orientation of the state to some other denomination. "But if we slumber or are recreant to our high obligation to God and his Church," the committee declared, "other and less pure opinions must prevail, and the sceptre [*sic*] of influence must pass into other hands; and is there a Baptist heart in this Convention, or in this wide land, that feels no deep emotion on a subject so momentous?"[91] For Texas Baptists the stakes were high. If they failed to gain a dominant influence, heresy might win the day. Again, education was seen as the most important tool at their disposal to win this all-important competition. In its 1855 report to the Convention, the committee on education noted,

> We, as a denomination, have the truth—we are the only denomination that has the whole truth, so far as the ordinances of church organization are concerned: hence, we have the religious world against us. Now, to silence this opposition—to give to the world the pure word and a pure gospel—we must have learning. Hence we regard the Baptist denomination as under solemn obligations to give to the world, and all coming generations, to present to the world a pious laity and a holy ministry, armed with all the graces of the spirit, and at the same time furnished with all that science and learning can do towards aiding him in his great work. Hence we would recommend to all our churches, that they foster, with pious solicitude and generous sacrifice, our own beloved University; that they sustain our paper, and that they furnish themselves and their families, well selected libraries; that they, by every lawful means, encourage a taste for reading, and that they seek to form habits of thought among the children—the rising generation.[92]

---

[91]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Huntsville, in June, 1853* (Galveston: Civilian Office, 1853), 16.

[92]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Eighth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of the State of Texas, Held at Independence, Washington County, in November, 1855* (Anderson, TX: Texas Baptist Office, 1855), 16.

Denominational concerns were also a driving force behind the support of women's education. In its 1853 report, the committee on education affirmed,

> The Baylor Female College, or the female department, should not be overlooked by us nor should its merits be forgotten. . . .We congratulate our brethren that they have now an institution under the direction of their own denomination, in which their daughters may not only receive all the solid and thorough advantages desired, but every accomplishment which they can reasonably require. And, above all, that their daughters may be reared and trained under the subduing, refining, and elevating influences of the cross. For the pure and holy influences of the religion of Jesus surround and pervade both departments.[93]

In choosing to emphasize "their own denomination," the committee sought to highlight that Baylor University, to include its female department, served not only God and the state of Texas but also Baptists. This discovery gives support to Frederick Rudolph's contention that religious zeal, including the need to defeat other religious denominations, was one plausible motive behind the founding of denominational colleges and universities.[94] It also calls into question the validity of McBeth's assertion cited earlier that Baylor was "never narrowly sectarian."[95]

The most important observation that needs to be made is not the extent to which Baylor was or was not a narrowly sectarian institution. Rather, what is important is that Texas Baptists viewed their colleges, especially Baylor University, differently than did the state of Texas. The government of Texas was interested in supporting private colleges and universities, including denominational ones, for two primary reasons. First, such support fed into the widely accepted notions of Jeffersonian democracy, namely, that colleges and universities were necessary for a healthy republic. Second, the Texas

---

[93]Baptist State Convention of Texas, *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Session, 1853*, 18.

[94]See Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 70-72.

[95]McBeth, *Texas Baptists*, 37.

government was also very practical. By supporting private efforts to found schools, especially through granting charters of incorporation and public land, the government would meet the public's demand for such education without having to raise taxes. Moreover, the government expected the diffusion of advanced knowledge to improve the social vitality and economic strength of the entire state.

Baptists, on the other hand, were motivated primarily by religious and denominational concerns. They saw higher education as a central pillar in the promotion of God's Kingdom in Texas. Baylor University's primary purpose was to produce ministers. In addition, Baptists believed that supporting higher education was a way for their denomination to gain substantive influence over Texas society, especially at the expense of all other religious denominations. In short, although the state of Texas and Texas Baptists both promoted the establishment of private, church-supported colleges and universities, their interests and goals were markedly different.

Texas Presbyterians and Higher Education.

Like the Baptists, Texas Presbyterians left an early footprint on the history of higher education in Texas. Galveston University, University of San Augustine, Nacogdoches University, and Austin College represent their earliest educational accomplishments. And, like the Baptists, religious interests in founding colleges and universities were also foremost in the minds of Texas Presbyterians. Securing an educated ministry and advancing the influence of the Presbyterian denomination were essential to their educational mission.

Supporting education has deep roots in the history and culture of Presbyterianism. Texas Presbyterians were no exception. "Texas Presbyterians have been patrons of

learning," argues William Stuart Red, "advocating an open Bible, religious liberty, and the separation of Church and State. With that Calvinistic love of learning, they regarded ignorance as a misfortune and the lack of grace a tragedy."[96] An educated ministry was particularly important to the Presbyterians. Their religious traditions insisted upon it. George H. Paschal, Jr., and Judith A. Benner note that it was especially important for ministerial candidates to be versed in both Greek and Latin. Consequently, these authors believe that Presbyterianism's interests were both helped and hampered. On the one hand, an educated ministry meant that most Presbyterian ministers were well respected in most communities. On the other hand, the demand for an educated ministry hampered Presbyterian efforts on the frontier.[97] According to Paschal and Benner, "backwoods farmers preferred both their religion and liquor raw."[98] A ministry fluent in Greek and Latin often "burdened their sermons with classical allusions."[99] In other words, Presbyterian ministers, unlike their Baptist and Methodist counterparts, found it difficult to speak the language of frontier America's potential converts. Paschal and Benner describe a growing dispute over educational requirements that contributed to an early church schism. Demand for ministers along the early nineteenth-century frontier led the Cumberland Presbytery in Tennessee to grant licenses and ordinations to ministers who did not meet the church's educational requirements. Conservatives rejected this

---

[96]William Stuart Red, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in Texas* (n.p.: Steck Company, 1936), 215.

[97]George H. Paschal, Jr., and Judith A. Benner, *One Hundred Years of Challenge and Change: A History of the Synod of Texas of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1968), 2-3.

[98]Ibid., 3.

[99]Ibid.

development, and the dispute eventually led to the creation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Soon after the split, this church began using many of the techniques pioneered by the Methodists such as circuit-riding ministers.[100]

Some four decades after the establishment of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Texas Presbyterians were reminded that frontier realities often required the church to compromise its principle of an established, educated ministry. In November of 1846, the editor of the *Texas Presbyterian* printed an article by a leading member of the church. It had been previously published in *Buck's Theological Dictionary*. In the article, the unnamed author recounted the dispute in Tennessee and Kentucky over the education of ministers. Of this controversy he observed,

> 'Come over and help us,' was the cry from all quarters. What was to be done? Thousands called for the bread of life, but there were none to break it to them. After much deliberation, and even hesitation, it was agreed that in view of the great ministerial destitation [*sic*], it would be right and proper to set young men apart to the ministry, who did not enjoy a classical education. Some three or four, whose piety and talents seemed to justify the step, were encouraged to prepare written discourses and present them to Transsylvania [*sic*] Presbytery, in which the revival occurred. These individuals were licensed in October, 1808, after warm opposition from some member of the Presbytery.[101]

The article was quick to point out that these men were not uneducated. Indeed, it was noted that "previous to licensing them, they were examined on literature and theology."[102]

Loosening the church's requirements regarding the education of ministers did not lessen the Presbyterian interest in education. The ordination of improperly educated

---

[100]Ibid.

[101]*Texas Presbyterian* (Victoria, Texas), 3 November 1846.

[102]Ibid.

ministers was a matter of necessity. Education, to include that of ministers, remained part of the Presbyterian mission. Moreover, it was a mission heartily embraced by Texas Presbyterians. At its 1846 meeting, the Texas Synod of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church declared that Texas Presbyterians supported an educated ministry. The Synod's committee on education reported,

> The Texas and Colorado Presbyteries have taken preparatory steps to carry out the General Assembly's plan of schools. Also, that there is an Academy at Clarksville, under the patronage of Red River Presbytery. We further report, that throughout our bounds there is a deep and, we think, an abiding interest in favor of a deeply pious and highly cultivated ministry; and also in favor of a general diffusion of knowledge and religion among the people.[103]

By the late 1840s, Texas Presbyterians had read several accounts in their religious newspaper, the *Texas Presbyterian*, of the successes around the United States related to the education of ministers. In the August 14, 1847, edition, for instance, the editor chose to publish the minutes of the seventeenth General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The minutes included a report from the committee on education. The committee reported that of the 120 students enrolled at Cumberland University in Lebanon, Tennessee, 80 were "professors of religion."[104] Moreover, "Rev. R. Donnell and the president deliver weekly, lectures on Theology and Ecclesiastical history, to a class of 28 young brethren who are preparing for the ministry."[105] Beverly College in Ohio was reported to have two students out of 35 who were studying theology.[106] As

---

[103]Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Texas Synod, Committee on Education, in *Texas Presbyterian* (Victoria, TX), 9 January 1847.

[104]Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Seventeenth General Assembly, Committee on Education, in *Texas Presbyterian* (Victoria, TX), 14 August 1847.

[105]Ibid.

[106]Ibid.

with the Baptists, it appears that the vast majority of students at Presbyterian schools were not studying for the ministry. Nonetheless, church leaders highlighted those few examples which seemed to indicate that their colleges and universities were fulfilling that mission.

Presbyterian support for higher education in Texas was driven by more than just the need for an educated ministry. Ensuring the widespread presence and influence of religion in Texas society was also important. Texas society, many Presbyterian leaders believed, needed more than just scientific and literary education; it most urgently needed moral education. One such leader quoted in the *Texas Presbyterian* asserted,

> A place of education, whether in Europe or America, renders at the present day a higher and more seasonable service to society than by anything that ends in mere scientific or literary culture. The understanding in every department of speculative or practical knowledge has advanced of late years with a vigoar [*sic*] and success beyond what the world has witnessed at any other period; but I cannot suppress a painful impression, that this intellectual improvement has not exerted, and is not exerting, its natural influence in purifying the moral character of the age. I cannot subdue the feeling, that our modern Christendom, with all its professions and in all its communions, is sinking into a practical heathenism, which needs a great work….It may be feared that a defeat of this kind, if truly stated and sufficiently general to mark the character of an age, will prove too strong for any corrective influences but those of public calamity, and what are called, in our expressive national phrase, 'the times that try men's souls.'—But I have long thought that if, in a period of prosperity and by gentle influences, any thing can be effected toward the same end, the work must be begun in our seminaries of liberal education, and that they have a duty to perform, in this respect, which cannot be too strongly urged or too deeply felt.[107]

The message conveyed was that higher education was a central pillar in the fight against the perceived godless tendencies of the age. The failure of Texas Presbyterians to support colleges and universities might well lead to the end of Christianity's influence over society's moral compass. Evidence proving a university's ability to influence the

[107] *Texas Presbyterian* (Victoria, TX), 6 February 1847.

morality of society was often reported. In 1847, for instance, a letter from the *Watchman and Observer* was published in the *Texas Presbyterian.* The letter was a brief description of a revival that had been held at Oglethorpe University in Georgia. The letter read, "The work has gone on until there is scarcely a student left in college, whose mind is not more or less deeply convicted and a considerable number are rejoicing in hope."[108] As with the Baptists, Texas Presbyterians saw higher education as a way to strengthen the faith of students, who would in turn go out into society to promote the Gospel.

It was not enough, however, for students to carry the message of proper Christian morality and uprightness. Important also was that the message be particularly Presbyterian in tone. Austin College is a prime example. According to historian William Stuart Red, the founders of the college not only intended it to be influenced by Presbyterians but also controlled by Presbyterians. The fact that they insisted on a charter that allowed the Presbytery of Brazos to fill vacancies on the board of trustees was cited as evidence.[109] But the founders had to compromise with the state when it came to strict sectarianism. As Red describes it, "In order to secure a charter, it was necessary to conform to precedents set during the Republic of Texas as expressed in section five of the Austin charter."[110] Red is incorrect when he references section five. He most likely meant to reference section seven, which prohibited the use of religious tests when hiring the college president and its faculty. It also prohibited the college from

---

[108]*Texas Presbyterian* (Victoria, TX), 13 February 1847.

[109]Red, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in Texas*, 236.

[110]Ibid.

using punitive measures against students because of their religious beliefs.[111] According to Red, "This provision harkens back to Britain, where Dissenters did not enjoy the same privileges at the universities as the members of the Established Church."[112] In other words, whether the founders of Austin College supported the no religious test clause or not, the state insisted that it be included in the charter.

Presbyterian leaders were not completely disappointed with the charter. Highlighting section thirteen, which granted the board of trustees the power to establish a professorship in theology, the Reverend William Baker noted,

> Yes, let it be for ever remembered by the Church in Texas—let it be distinctly impressed upon the minds of the Trustees and members of the Faculty—the one idea of the founders, that for which they wept, and prayed, and toiled, and gave of their means, was that it might be an institution wherein there might be raised up for Texas, generation after generation, a native ministry.[113]

In short, preserving both the theological character and organizational control of Austin College was paramount to early Presbyterian leaders. The college's charter, then, satisfied both the church and the state.

Texas Methodists and Their Colleges

Some scholars have suggested that the early Methodists were not particularly enthusiastic about education. In his study of Methodism's views of and contributions to education, Sylvanus Milne Duvall argues that early English Methodism was largely hostile to the rational and scientific approach to education. This was true in spite of the

---

[111]State of Texas, *An Act to Incorporate the Austin College*, in *The Laws of Texas*, sec 7 (1849), vol. 3, 675.

[112]Red, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in Texas*, 236.

[113]William Baker, *Life of Daniel Baker*, quoted in ibid., 237.

fact that such an approach was increasingly supported by the broader English society[114]. Consequently, the early Methodists "can be credited with no significant contribution either to science and learning or to Christian thought."[115] He argues that such hostility to science and learning was based on John Wesley's belief in the inherent wickedness of worldly things. Left to their own devices, human beings could not be expected to rely on their own abilities or their rational thought in the quest for a true Christian life. God's grace was their only hope.[116] This world-denying theology led many early Methodists to believe that "they could obtain supernatural solutions to perplexing problems by opening their Bibles and casting lots."[117]

More recent scholarship raises doubts about Duvall's assertions. Daniel L. Marsh, for instance, argues that the idea that early Methodists were uninterested or even hostile to educational efforts is false. "The unvarnished truth," writes Marsh, "is that The Methodist Church has exercised a greater educational influence than any other ecclesiastical institution in the past two hundred years."[118] Galye Carlton Felton suggests that John Wesley believed that learning was central to the advance of Christianity. She writes, "Wesley was deeply convinced that the making of Christians was a process which

---

[114]Sylvanus Milne Duvall, *The Methodist Episcopal Church and Education Up To 1869* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928), 1-5.

[115]Ibid., 5.

[116]Ibid., 6-7.

[117]Ibid., 7.

[118]Daniel L. Marsh, "Methodism and Early Methodist Theological Education," *Methodist History* 1, no. 3 (October 1962): 6.

required devoted and diligent teaching."[119] Duvall's assertions, it seems, have not stood the test of time.

In fairness to Duvall, however, he does recognize that the Wesleyan movement's early reservations about science and learning did not last long. He identifies several factors that led to the development of Methodist education in the United States. One of the most important developments was the American Revolution, which severed many of the ties between English and American Methodists. Consequently, argues Duvall, the Americans had to rely on themselves rather than on the English for guidance. It also meant that American Methodists controlled their own future. They were free to develop their own identity as a denomination, which also included developing their own ideas about education.[120] A second important factor in the development of Methodist education in the United States was the growing interest in education among Americans generally. Americans, he asserts, demanded educational opportunities. "However little need for it they [Methodist missionaries and ministers] may have felt," writes Duvall, "the people to whom they went with their message, and from whom they won their converts, and among whom they had to live, were becoming increasingly interested in education and in the founding of schools and colleges."[121]

In his comprehensive study of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South's educational efforts, Clarence Moore Dannelly argues that although Methodist education in America can be traced back to the early 1700s, its support for education began in

---

[119]Galyle Carlton Felton, "John Wesley and the Teaching Ministry: Ramifications for Education in the Church Today," *Religious Education* 92 (Winter 1997): 92.

[120]Duvall, *The Methodist Episcopal Church and Education Up To 1869*, 14-15.

[121]Ibid., 21.

earnest after 1820. General Conferences throughout the 1820s passed resolutions which called for the denomination to support educational institutions.[122] By the 1850s, the southern branch of American Methodism was fully engaged in an educational program. According to Dannelly, "Institutions of learning were pressing their claims for denominational approval and patronage. Annual Conferences were concerned that educational provisions under their auspices be provided the constituency of the Church. The denomination was without doubt definitely engaged in an expanding educational program."[123]

Historian Daniel Marsh confirms that the 1820s was a time in which Methodists increasingly pressed their educational efforts forward. Indeed, his research indicates that it was Martin Ruter who proposed a resolution at the General Conference in 1820 which called on Methodists to build educational institutions wherever they planted the faith.[124] Ruter's resolution "sparked the movement that was to make The Methodist Church the pioneer educational advance in every part of the nation."[125] Ruter's influence on the development of Texas higher education has already been noted. For Marsh, the numbers do not lie. He writes, "During the first hundred years of the existence of The Methodist Church, starting with 1784, it established and conducted 85 literary institutions, 58

---

[122]Clarence Moore Dannelly, "The Development of Collegiate Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1846-1902" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1933), 10-11.

[123]Ibid., 62.

[124]Marsh, "Methodism and Early Methodist Theological Education," 9.

[125]Ibid.

private schools, 61 classical seminaries, 56 colleges and universities, and 6 theological institutions, a total of 266 educational institutions."[126]

Numbers alone do not suggest motive, however. Dannelly, for instance, explicitly suggests four motives. Many of them are similar to those cited above in the discussions of Baptist and Presbyterian educational efforts. First, he argues that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South supported educational efforts because such efforts were viewed as central to the achievement of religious goals. "This concern about education as intimately tied in with the methods and ends to be achieved by religion," writes Dannelly, "was one of the chief reasons which caused the Methodists to found schools."[127] Second, colleges and universities were viewed as one of the best ways to advance the Methodist Church. Indeed, he presents evidence which indicates the fear expressed by Methodist leaders of having Methodist children attending Catholic or other Protestant denominational colleges. As a consequence of their education at these schools, such children, it was thought, might find spiritual fulfillment in other denominations.[128] Third, he contends that Methodist leaders recognized that their colleges and universities should serve more than just narrow denominational concerns. That is, they called on Methodists to support education in order to allow Methodist youth a chance to achieve a high level of literacy and knowledge. Educational opportunities were not to be limited to just those seeking a career in the ministry.[129] Finally, Dannelly's analysis suggests that Methodists

---

[126]Ibid.

[127]Dannelly, "The Development of Collegiate Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1846-1902," 86.

[128]Ibid., 88.

[129]Ibid., 90-91.

viewed their educational efforts as serving the needs of the broader society. The Church did this by building schools "in communities where none had existed previously."[130] He calls this motive "missionary."[131] He means by this term that Methodist leaders often recognized the need for educational opportunities in certain states and locales; consequently, they made conscious efforts to meet those needs. Thus, their "missionary work" sought to provide education for intellect's sake.[132]

Texas Methodists shared educational goals similar to the entire Methodist Church community. Their understanding of the role of denominational colleges and universities was similar to that of their Baptist and Presbyterian contemporaries. Texas Methodists saw their colleges as part of a crucial religious mission. In 1861, for instance, the Rio Grande Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South put forward a resolution which called upon church members to "recognize the hand of God in the prosperity of our educational interests in the Rio Grande Conference."[133] From their perspective, then, God was fully supportive of the grand project of educating youth. Consequently, these institutions were to serve God and His church. In 1866, commenting on the appointment of Dr. M. B. Franklin and his wife to the faculty of Guadalupe Female College, the committee on education of the West Texas Annual Conference reported of this husband and wife team that "their Moral and Christian Character is a

---

[130]Ibid., 91.

[131]Ibid.

[132]Ibid., 92.

[133]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Rio Grande Mission Conference, 1861, *Journal of the Rio Grande Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, in *Official Minutes of the Southwest Texas Annual Conference*, Southwest Texas Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, 1942 session of the Conference (n.p: n.p., n.d.), 117 (19); hereafter cited as *Official Minutes*.

further assurance that while the minds of their pupils will be well developed they will be seeded with sound Christian morals."[134] To emphasize the importance of colleges, the committee concluded its report by advancing the following resolution: "That a sound and carefully attended education of our people is of such high importance that it become our duty to lay our hands on every agency we can to secure the end."[135]

During the 1867 session of the conference, however, the committee on education expressed its distress over the fact that Methodists in Texas were not heeding the call to support Christian education. In its report, the committee exclaimed, "We fear that as a church we have not kept pace with the times in this respect, and that we have not met the demands upon us."[136] In spite of this lament over lackluster support, the committee attempted to maintain a positive tone. It declared with some excitement that it was "gratified to observe among our people an interest upon the subject of Education never before manifested."[137] Most importantly, the committee reminded the conference of the religious significance of the Methodist program of education in Texas. "Let us place a high estimate upon intellectual improvement," the report asserted, "and earnestly strive to render our institutions centres [*sic*] of religious as well as intellectual training."[138]

Texas Methodists did not see religious training as secondary to intellectual training. On the contrary, religious training was believed to be the essence of Methodist

---

[134]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, *Journal of the Rio Grande Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (1866) and the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (1866-1875)*, in *Official Minutes*, 57.

[135]Ibid., 58.

[136]Ibid., 66.

[137]Ibid., 65.

[138]Ibid., 66.

education in Texas. At its eighteenth session in 1876, the West Texas Conference's committee on education emphasized the importance of religious training in Methodist schools. Its report declared, "It must be apparent to all enlightened Christian minds that the cause of Christian education is a cause that now demands the most serious attention of the church of God."[139] The emphasis was on *Christian education*, not merely *education*. In an attempt to distinguish further between this Methodist program for Christian education and the state's program of secular, nondenominational education, the report reminded the conference that "the State pursues a policy that excludes all such religious teachings as would be objectionable to any particular denomination or to the public at large. This policy, which appears necessary in connection with the State schools, is pursued at the sacrifice of that which practical Christians esteem as indispensable elements of a sound education."[140] The state's secular program of education was clearly viewed as insufficient in the minds of Methodist church leaders.

With regard to denominational colleges, the expression of the state's nondenominational policy is, of course, best reflected in college charter provisions discussed earlier in this chapter. For example, Texas Methodists would have been well informed about the state's nondenominational program through the charter of Rutersville College, which was their first college. Its charter provisions reflected, to a great degree,

---

[139]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, Session Eighteen, 1876, *Journal, West Texas Conference*, in *Official Minutes*, 193.

[140]Ibid.

the state's efforts to keep many denominational colleges from becoming too narrowly sectarian.[141]

The 1876 committee report expressed the Methodist belief in the importance of Christian education. It reminded all those present at the Conference that "[Christians] believe that it is far more important to cultivate the heart to the knowledge and love of divine truth and sound moral principle upon which substantial character depends, than to give exclusive attention to abstract sciences and such studies as alone call into exercise the intellectual powers."[142] Higher education was particularly important. By 1876, Rutersville College was no longer the flagship of Methodist education in Texas; rather, Southwestern University had emerged as the church's foremost example of its efforts. Following its report to the West Texas Conference, the committee on education presented a resolution asserting that "we regard the Southwestern University as the most important educational enterprise of our church in Texas and that it demands our most earnest co-operation, support and patronage."[143]

Texas Methodists did not believe that their educational vision was exclusively in the service of their church. On the contrary, they had a definite sense that Christian education stood in service to Texas society as well. They were willing to entertain some of the Jeffersonian republican ideas about education, with a religious slant, of course.

---

[141]See Republic of Texas, *An Act to Establish and Incorporate Rutersville College*, sec. 14 (1840), in *The Laws of Texas*, vol. 2, 427. Section fourteen prohibits the College from discriminating against any student on account of their religious affiliation.

[142]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, Session Eighteen, 1876, *Journal, West Texas Conference*, in *Official Minutes*, 193.

[143]Ibid., 194.

The 1876 West Texas Conference committee on education expressed this relationship between religious education and a healthy republic:

> Christianity, with an open Bible, is the great conservative power that gives stability and vital force to the free institutions of our great republic. In view of these brief suggestions all will see the importance of every branch of the Protestant church, with the open Bible, engaging with increased and persevering energy in the great cause. As a church, without numerical strength in Texas, we are far behind the measure of our duty in our interest and efforts in this important department of Christian labor. We, however, take pleasure in stating that from the papers and documents referred to us, as well as other information received, our church in Texas is doing something in the cause of Christian education and that we have schools which call for our increased patronage and support.[144]

To suggest, however, that Texas Methodists were cut from the same cloth as Thomas Jefferson regarding their educational program would be inaccurate. The report's overwhelming interest was denominational.

Like the Baptists and the Presbyterians, Texas Methodists believed that their colleges and universities served to advance their denomination, not just Christianity or Christian education generally. In 1878 the Texas Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South held its first church meeting after Reconstruction. In spite of the fact that the Civil War was hard on Texas colleges, the Methodists seemed ready to plow ahead with their educational mission. Their motives for supporting colleges and universities had not changed. First, institutions like Southwestern University were viewed as a primary training ground for ministers. The North Texas Conference said of Southwestern University that "the University is signally blessing the State and the church, by sending from her halls of learning intelligent and pious young men and ministers of the Gospel, whose influence for good will be felt in all the associations and

[144]Ibid, 193.

relationships of life."[145] It was also reported to the Conference that North Texas Female College and Dallas Female College were offering education free of charge to the children of ministers.[146] Similarly, the 1878 Texas Annual Conference's report on education noted that at Southwestern University "a religious influence of decided character prevailed. There was no 'revival,' as that term is usually understood, but conversions were frequent, and the religious services conducted for the young men largely attended. Two of the advanced students, yielding to their convictions on the subject, obtained license to preach."[147] The enthusiastic tone surrounding these reports of successful ministerial training is obvious. One might well speculate that such reports offered church leaders great comfort.

The Methodist program of higher education sought to do more than just produce ministers and other pious men. One of its central goals was to advance Methodism itself. These young men were not simply to preach the Gospel; they were to expand Methodism's presence in Texas. Conference records indicate that the various reports on education rarely used the words "Methodist" or "Methodism" as such. Instead, it was more common for these reports to use the words "our people." For instance, the eighth session of the West Texas Conference in 1866 relied on these words to describe Methodists. In the committee report on education, the main topic of interest was the rebuilding of educational institutions following the Civil War. The report stated,

---

[145]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, North Texas Annual Conference, *Minutes*, "Reports Adopted: Education", in *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences, M. E. Church, South Comprising Full Minutes and Statistical Reports*, ed. J. C. Keener (Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Publishers, 1879), 45.

[146]Ibid.

[147]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Texas Annual Conference, *Minutes*, "Education", in *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences*, 79.

> We have taken all the papers referred to us and all the facts known to us under a careful review, and now have to express our high gratification that the four years of civil war that so unsettled the whole fabric of our society and for the time crippled all our church enterprises (and none suffered more than our schools) have left us the hope that our institutions of learning will soon be restored to their original position of honor and usefulness.[148]

The same report continued with an expression of hope for the future: "Yet amid all these upheavals of the plans of society and all the ills and evils that so disturb and distract our people they have addressed themselves to the work of mending their broken fortunes to readjusting the forms of society with a calm cheerfulness and firmness that may challenge admiration."[149] The committee's report closed with the following resolution: "That a sound and carefully attended education of our people is of such high importance that it become our duty to lay our hand on every agency we can to secure the end."[150] In short, the education of Methodist youth should, preferably, take place at Methodist-sponsored institutions.

Continued calls for Texas Methodists to send their children to Methodist institutions were not necessarily driven by the need to make such institutions financially viable, though that may have been partly responsible. Rather, these calls were based on a deep concern for the spiritual guidance of Methodist youth. One of the greatest fears was that young Methodists might attend Catholic schools because of a lack of Methodist ones. The eighteenth West Texas Conference's committee on education stressed this point in its 1876 report. It noted with some distress,

---

[148]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, *Journal of the Rio Grande Mission Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (1866) and the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South (1866-1875)*, in *Official Minutes*, 57.

[149]Ibid.

[150]Ibid., 58.

> It must be apparent to all enlightened Christian minds that the cause of Christian education is a cause that now demands the most serious attention of the church of God. We are now living at a time when the public mind, secular and ecclesiastical, is moving out in this great work in a manner that it never was before—and superstition and infidelity are making the cause of education the means of promoting their respective interests and ends. Our children are being drawn by this means either into the meshes of a secret and insidious skepticism, which under the guise of science, is seeking to undermine the very foundations of the Christian faith; or into institutions whose object is the propagation of a superstition and idolatry under the name of Christianity, which are shocking to the enlightened Christian mind to contemplate, in their dogmas, rites and ceremonies; and especially in their denying to the common people free access to the word of God, the only lamp to the feet and light to the path of the benighted sons and daughters of earth.[151]

Although the Catholic Church was not mentioned by name, it was certainly mentioned by inference. To avoid exposing their children to any improper influence, Methodists were called upon to support Methodist education.

Scholars like Dannelly have suggested that denominational colleges and universities tried to avoid such narrow sectarian characteristics. Of Methodist colleges he writes, "In a very real sense these have been and are denominational in origin and support but not narrowly sectarian in curriculum or influence and never exclusive in patronage."[152] However, what Dannelly fails to recognize is that if Methodist colleges successfully avoided narrow sectarianism it was primarily because the state of Texas, through college charters, prohibited such behavior. It was not necessarily the result of nonsectarian intentions of church leaders.

Methodist leaders, to be sure, had serious religious concerns on their minds as they fought to promote Methodist higher education. However, one of their final

---

[151]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, Session Eighteen, 1876, *Journal, West Texas Conference*, in *Official Minutes*, 193.

[152]Dannely, "The Development of Collegiate Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1846-1902," 24-25.

identifiable motives is one which many parents, regardless of denomination, would have recognized and appreciated. That is to say, Methodist leaders wanted their colleges and universities to be places where young men and women could live away from their parents yet be subjected to a life of order, safety, and discipline. In 1876, for instance, the West Texas Conference's committee on education happily reported that "we learn from a published letter from the Regent that the current session had 70 students enrolled the first day. The institution is out of debt and is under a most admirable system of instruction and discipline."[153] The 1878 Northwest Texas Conference reported that at Waco Female College "the course of instruction is wisely chosen, and the rules and regulations governing the pupils are such as to insure good discipline."[154] The same report declared about Southwestern University that "diligent attention to study, orderly submission to rule, and gentlemanly intercourse with the citizens of the community marked the entire session."[155] In other words, parents could rest assured that their children were receiving not only a proper religious education, but also an orderly, structured, and disciplined lifestyle.

College and university advertisements in the *Texas Christian Advocate*, a prominent Methodist publication at the time and predecessor to the *Texas Wesleyan Banner*, offered parents a comforting vision of campus life. Order and discipline on campus were predominant selling points. An advertisement for Guadalupe Male and Female College read,

---

[153]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Conference, Session Eighteen, *Journal, West Texas Conference*, in *Official Minutes*, 194.

[154]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Northwest Texas Annual Conference, "Reports Adopted: Education," in *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences*, 27.

[155]Ibid., 27-28.

> We commend to the attention of parents and guardians the advertisement of the Guadaloupe [*sic*] Male and Female College at Seguin. The Male College is under the Presidency of Rev. J. M. Wilson, and M. B. Franklin, A.M., M.D., is President of the Female College. The curriculum embraces a liberal course of instruction, while the healthfulness of Seguin, the morality and piety of its community, with the liberal arrangements for boarding in excellent families, render its claims equal to any point we know in the West.[156]

Another advertisement for Guadalupe Male College asserted, "Under the present organization the Trustees most confidently commend these as Seminaries of Learning, to whose care and guidance Parents and Guardians may with safety and advantage entrust the intellectual and moral culture of their sons and daughters and wards."[157] In other words, parents had no reason to fear sending their sons and daughters away to these colleges because great care and attention was given to their spiritual well-being and physical safety.

Summation

This chapter has endeavored to uncover how both church and state viewed the role of denominational colleges and universities during the Civil War era. The evidence has produced many conclusions. First, the state of Texas and Texas evangelicals shared the belief that Texas needed a system of higher education. Most importantly, this system did not need to be purely public. Private, denominationally sponsored institutions were welcomed by both church and state. Both the government and the churches believed that the future of Texas must include higher education. This agreement belied, to some degree, the important differences in interests.

---

[156]*Texas Christian Advocate* (Austin, Texas), 10 January 1867.

[157]Ibid.

In its public acts, the Texas government supported private colleges and universities in Texas. Denominational institutions were most numerous. The state's interests were at least nonsectarian and at most purely secular. By granting articles of incorporation to denominational colleges, the government held fast to a long-standing legal tradition in American law which maintains that colleges and universities, whether they be publicly supported or privately supported, have an inherent public purpose. Likewise, this public purpose meant that even denominational schools were subject to public regulation. Not surprisingly, then, Texas regulated these religious institutions in many ways. Charters defined college governance, required annual reporting (usually to a denominational body), insisted on a largely secular curriculum rather than an exclusively religious one, and prohibited religious discrimination.

Moreover, the Republic of Texas granted public land to many denominational schools. By doing so, the government was treating colleges and universities as it did other public endeavors like internal improvement projects. In other words, denominational education efforts were seen as one part of a much larger project. Bringing Texas up to the level of other parts of the United States economically, culturally, and technologically was the state's goal. Granting lands to denominational educational efforts was seen as the most efficient and inexpensive way to achieve that goal.

Evangelical church leaders, by contrast, had different motives for supporting colleges and universities. First, higher education served a religious, missionary purpose. The training of missionaries and ministers was considered extremely important. Indeed, nineteenth-century evangelical leaders would have agreed with the assertion made by

historian Frederick Eby nearly a century ago that "If one will but study the relation of Christian schools to the progress of missions he must soon be convinced that without Christian education the task would be practically hopeless."[158] Second, these colleges were viewed as an important way to spread denominational influence in Texas. The evidence suggests that church leaders believed their denominational institutions served to advance the interests of their own denomination. Arguments by scholars such as McBeth and Dannelly that claim that denominational colleges were rarely driven by narrow sectarian concerns should be called into question. The state of Texas sought to minimize narrowly sectarian interests in these schools. However, church leaders often expressed narrowly sectarian views on education. Indeed, the bulk of the credit for the nonsectarian nature of denominational schools should go to the state, not the denominations.

It would be wrong to suggest that denominational leaders were solely interested in promoting strict sectarianism at the expense of the public good. On the contrary, many linked sectarianism and the public good. They believed that the success of their denomination in Texas would serve to improve the moral and civic health of society. Despite this fact, Thomas R. Dye, L. Tucker Gibson, Jr., and Clay Robison's recent comparison of the present-day Christian Coalition to evangelical leaders from times past reminds historians that "historically, fundamentalist Protestant churches avoided politics as profane and concentrated evangelical efforts on saving individual souls."[159] There is little evidence to suggest that Texas denominational college leaders saw politics as

---

[158]Frederick Eby, *Christianity and Education* (Dallas: Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1915), 229.

[159]Thomas R. Dye, L. Tucker Gibson, Jr., and Clay Robison, *Politics in America, Texas Edition* (Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005), 292.

something to be shunned; however, they were certainly more enthusiastic about using their institutions to save souls.

In sum, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists in Texas held different views of and expressed different motives for supporting a program of denominationally centered higher education from those espoused by the government. These differences, though significant, rarely became a source of conflict. Each benefited substantially by the existence of such colleges and universities; thus, the differences seemed not to matter. Pangle and Pangle claim that "absent strong religious or economic motives, the need for well-informed citizens did not in itself prove a sufficiently compelling reason to create schools. Jefferson's excellent political arguments for the ward system could not reproduce in Virginia the vigorous civic life that had been set in motion by religious conviction in the townships in New England."[160] The evidence suggests that the same could be said of Texas.

---

[160]Pangle and Pangle, *The Learning of Liberty*, 145.

CHAPTER THREE

Texas Denominational Colleges and the Problem of Slavery

Introduction

The problem of slavery was at the heart of the Civil War. James M. McPherson's book *Ordeal By Fire* argues that none of the political, social, and economic issues of the day can be understood without including slavery as a frame of reference. Especially important to his analysis is the impact on American society of territorial growth, population growth, and economic growth. All of these phenomena pushed Americans into a conflict over slavery.[1] McPherson asserts, "The social and political strains produced by rapid growth provoked repeated crises that threatened to destroy the republic. From the beginning, these strains were associated mainly with slavery."[2]

The interest expressed by historians in Texas's place in the national debate over slavery is on the rise. Credit for starting seminal work in this area goes to Texas historian Randolph B. Campbell. His book *An Empire for Slavery*, published in 1989, reorients the historiography of Texas. He claims that the typical view of Texas as expressed by both historians and American popular culture places the state in the West rather than in the South.[3] Accordingly, "the state thus becomes part of the romantic West, the West of cattle ranches, cowboys, and gunfighters and seemingly less compelling moral issues

---

[1]James M. McPherson, *Ordeal By Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001), 1.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 1.

such as destruction of the Indians."[4] Because Texas's connection to the South and its connection to slavery are rarely discussed, "there is a widespread popular misconception, particularly in Texas, that somehow the institution of Negro slavery was not very important in the Lone Star state."[5] Campbell's goal is to correct this misconception. With that in mind, he states his thesis: "The limited nature of Texas's historical experience with slavery, however, belies the vast importance of the institution to the Lone Star state."[6] In short, Texas's history with slavery, though brief compared to other parts of the United States, places Texas in the stream of Southern history more than Western history.

Whereas Campbell's *An Empire for Slavery* focuses primarily on the legal evolution of slavery in Texas as well as the day-to-day lives of Texas slaves, an earlier work entitled *Planters & Plain Folk*, which he co-authored with Richard G. Lowe, evaluates the economic importance of slavery. It seeks to ascertain whether or not slavery in Texas was profitable. This economic analysis is an attempt to show that Texas belongs historically to the South. They observe that "Texas was vital to antebellum southern agriculture because the state represented the expanding cotton frontier and thus held a key to the future of the slaveholding cotton South."[7] Perhaps their most important conclusion is that slavery in Texas was profitable, especially in the decade preceding the

---

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., 2.

[7]Richard G. Lowe and Randolph B. Campbell, *Planters & Plain Folk: Agriculture in Antebellum Texas* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1987), 3.

Civil War. The authors conclude that "the combination of slavery and agriculture was far from moribund—it was thriving."[8]

Campbell's work is by far the most comprehensive study of slavery in Texas; however, one does not have to look to such fine secondary works to find evidence of slavery's importance there. Antebellum Texans defended slavery with great vigor and passion, and they did so in the public record. The two most important documents in this regard were the Texas Ordinance of Secession and the Texas Declaration of Causes. As far as the public record was concerned, these documents were the best expression of how white Texans felt about slavery. The Declaration of Causes outlined in greater detail the prevailing view of slavery; therefore, it will be cited in this study as supporting evidence. Regarding Texas's annexation to the United States, the declaration asserted, "She [Texas] was received as a commonwealth holding, maintaining and protecting the institution known as negro slavery—the servitude of the African to the white race within her limits—a relation that had existed from the first settlement of her wilderness by the white race, and which her people intended should exist in all future time."[9] More importantly, in their Declaration of Causes Texans explicitly described themselves as Southerners and Texas as a Southern state. The Declaration asserted, "Her institutions and geographical position established the strongest ties between her and other slave-holding States of the confederacy. Those ties have been strengthened by association."[10] On February 23, 1861, Texans went to the polls in a state-wide referendum to vote on secession. The vote

---

[8]Ibid., 179.

[9]State of Texas, Secession Convention 1861, *A Declaration of the Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union*, 2 February 1861, in *Documents of Texas History*, ed. Ernest Wallace (Austin: Steck Company, Publishers, 1963), 194-195. Hereafter cited as Declaration of Causes.

[10]Ibid., 195.

was 46,188 votes in favor and 15,149 votes against.[11] Voting clearly in the affirmative with regard to secession, "Texans took up the southern cause without hesitation."[12] Not even a Founding Father of Anglo Texas and then governor, Unionist Sam Houston, could stop Texas's exit from the United States of America and entrance into the Confederate States of America. For his opposition to this action, Houston was removed from the governor's office.[13]

This chapter is a study of how Texas denominational colleges and universities responded to the antebellum debate over the question of slavery. It will adopt the view advanced by Campbell and Lowe that Texas was, in fact, a Southern state and was profoundly defined by the institution of slavery. The main question to be investigated is the extent to which the debate over slavery impacted denominational colleges and universities, especially as it related to the curriculum. Were Texas denominational colleges touched by the slavery question in the same way as those in other Southern states, or was Texas different in this regard? Did the curriculum and other campus activities promote a particular view of slavery? Wherever appropriate, extra-curricular activities will also be included in the analysis.

---

[11]Robert A. Calvert, Arnoldo De León, and Gregg Cantrell, *The History of Texas* (Wheeling, IL: Harland Davidson, Inc., 2002), 139.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

Southern Distinctiveness

The institution of slavery was so central to the Southern way of life that it became part of Southern cultural identity. According to historians George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, the 1820s were a seminal decade in the development of southern culture. It was at this point that Southerners began to view their way of life as largely distinct from that of the rest of the United States. This distinctiveness, they claim, was based primarily on the recognition that the South's geography and climate set it apart. In turn its climate gave rise to the South's reliance on staple crop agriculture. Reliance on staple crop agriculture gave rise to a reliance on slavery.[14] Slavery, claim Tindall and Shi, became the most definitive element in the makeup of southern distinctiveness. "The resolve of slaveholders to retain control of their socioeconomic order," write the authors, "created a sense of racial unity that bridged class divisions among whites."[15] Moreover, "the South increasingly became a consciously minority region, its population growth lagging behind that of other sections of the country, its 'peculiar institution' of slavery more and more an isolated and odious phenomenon in Western civilization."[16]

The Texas Declaration of Causes indicated that by 1860 Texans, like their brethren across the South, had adopted wholeheartedly the belief in Southern distinctiveness. "The Federal Government," exclaimed the Declaration, "while but partially under the control of these our unnatural and sectional enemies, has for years

[14]George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, 7th ed., vol. 1 (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007), 532.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Ibid., 532-533.

almost entirely failed to protect the lives and property of the people of Texas against the Indian savages on our border, and more recently against the murderous forays of banditti from the neighboring territory of Mexico."[17] The phrase "our unnatural and sectional enemies" was most likely a reference to abolitionist activities in Kansas. In the preceding paragraph of the Declaration, Texans decried the fact that "by the disloyalty of the Northern States and their citizens and the imbecility of the Federal Government, infamous combinations of incendiaries and outlaws have been permitted in those States and the common territory of Kansas to trample upon the federal laws, to war upon the lives and property of Southern citizens in that territory, and finally, by violence and mob law, to usurp the possession of the same as exclusively the property of the Northern States."[18] Further into the Declaration, the Texans described North and South as "entirely distinct nations."[19]

The Home Education Movement: A Distinct Education for a Distinct People

The growing awareness of Southern distinctiveness impacted education directly. Indeed, it may well have been Thomas Jefferson who first voiced the relationship between a Southern identity and education. Writing to General James Breckenridge in 1821 about the conflict over the Missouri Compromise, he noted, "we are now trusting to those who are against us in position and principle, to fashion in their own form the minds and affections of our youth."[20] According to historian Rachel Bryan Stillman, such fears

---

[17]Declaration of Causes, 195.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Thomas Jefferson, quoted in John S. Ezell, "A Southern Education for Southrons," *Journal of Southern History* 17, no. 3 (August 1951): 303.

of undue influence of Northern educational practices and practitioners led Southerners to begin a movement to sever educational ties with the North, a trend associated with the Southern movement to sever most other cultural ties as well.[21] The common name given by scholars to this movement is the Home Education Movement. According to Stillman, by 1860 this movement stood fully behind Jefferson's observation. That is, Southerners had finally come to see and appreciate fully what Jefferson had observed forty years earlier.[22]

Scholars studying Southern education in the antebellum period have identified three specific characteristics of the Home Education Movement. They include a curriculum based on the classics, the demand that educators adopt pro-Southern textbooks in their courses, and the promotion of native education among Southern youth. Since the Home Education Movement will be used in this study as a frame of reference as it relates to Texas denominational colleges, a brief overview of it as well as the relevant scholarship is warranted.

To begin, scholars such as Roger Geiger and Michael Sugrue have suggested that nineteenth-century colleges and universities had identifiable regional characteristics, especially with regard to the curriculum. In his edited work *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*, a collection of historical essays, Geiger claims that "the growing regional assertiveness of the slaveholding South is well known, and it seemed to place an increasingly apparent stamp upon the major colleges of the region."[23] If he is correct, the

---

[21]Rachel Bryan Stillman, "Education in the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865" (Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972), 65.

[22]Ibid.

[23]Roger Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 16.

question is: What was it about southern colleges that made them distinct? What set them apart from their cousins in the Northeast and Midwest?

Michael Sugrue uses South Carolina College as a case study to identify numerous characteristics of Southern colleges. Special attention is given to the curriculum, which he argues was designed to educate future slave owners. According to Sugrue, the need to train future slave owners defined the curriculum in four ways. First, it emphasized classical languages and literature. The goal was "to train the students' minds in a broad, general sense rather than to prepare them for a specialized profession. . . . It was designed to take fourteen- and fifteen-year-old boys and polish them into young eighteen- and nineteen-year-old gentlemen."[24] Second, a moral philosophy course was a standard requirement. It was here where "students studied the arguments in favor of slavery, and they emerged well versed in proslavery apologetics."[25] Third, moral philosophy courses also taught the importance of honor. This concept, argues Sugrue, was not an insignificant afterthought but was often front and center in the curriculum. As Sugrue describes it, "one of the 'peculiarities' of the 'Southern youth' who populated the college was a powerful desire for the maintenance of honor, which amounted to the recognition by others of patrician status in a society whose most prominent feature was inequality."[26] Finally, students were instructed in the "correct" interpretation of the United States Constitution. Sugrue notes that students were taught "that strict construction was the only legitimate kind of constitutional interpretation and that secession was a

---

[24]Michael Sugrue, "'We Desired Our Future Rulers to be Educated Men': South Carolina College, the Defense of Slavery, and the Development of Secessionist Politics," in ibid., 94.

[25]Ibid., 96.

[26]Ibid., 98-99.

constitutionally prescribed remedy to federal usurpation."[27] Though Sugrue does not mention the importance of a strict construction interpretation of the Constitution to the proslavery apologists, it surely must have been. Indeed, the Constitution makes three specific references to slavery: the three-fifths compromise, the slave trade, and the issue of fugitive slaves. All of these provisions were added to the document to appease the concerns of slave owners.[28]

One of the major obstacles to advancing this Southern point of view was the availability of applicable textbooks. Indeed, Southern periodicals published in the 1850s regularly railed against the use of Northern textbooks in Southern colleges. According to Stillman,

> the almost complete abandonment of [textbook publishing] to Northern enterprise had led to the entrenchment of these exports in most Southern schools. . . . The fact that many of these books, even though carefully selected, had sentences or sections considered offensive to sensitive Southerners had made this a complaint that would, during the war, be a main educational issue.[29]

In his study of antebellum Southern views about education in the South, historian John S. Ezell agrees with Stillman's argument. Southern views of Northern textbooks loom large in his analysis. According to Ezell, Jefferson's lament over the loss of Southern youth to Northern schools cited above went largely unnoticed at the time. However, "as the twin wedges of slavery and sectional pride pushed the people farther

---

[27]Ibid., 96.

[28]In addition to Geiger and Sugrue, several other scholarly works have likewise identified the decidedly sectional character of the antebellum Southern curriculum. They include E. Merton Coulter's *College Life in the Old South*; Dan R. Frost's *Thinking Confederates*; and Rachel Bryan Stillman's "Education in the Confederate States of America."

[29]Stillman, "Education in the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865", 67.

and farther apart, adherence to customs more typically southern was demanded."[30] Textbooks were central to maintaining these customs. Much of Ezell's analysis focuses on what Southerners found objectionable about Northern textbooks. In this regard he concludes: "Just how biased were the northern texts? It is difficult, if not impossible, to measure accurately southern sensitiveness on the subject. The hypercritical eye of the South probably read insults where none was intended."[31]

Southern dependence on Northern education went far beyond textbooks. In the antebellum period, Southerners became increasingly concerned over the fact that a sizable number of Southern youths attended Northern colleges and universities.[32] Consequently, the Southern elite advertised the specific advantages to the South and its youth in supporting Southern education. Aside from the benefits of preserving Southern distinctiveness just discussed, the Home Education Movement advertised the benefits to student health and well-being provided by Southern institutions. Southern leaders often wrote reviews of specific Southern colleges and universities, even those that had not yet been established. In one such review of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, a six-page review was provided. The combination of natural beauty and advantageous location was portrayed by the reviewers as part of a larger plan, indeed a divine plan. As with all things related to Southern distinctiveness, even this connection was related to slavery. The review proclaimed, "This Cumberland plateau seems to have been formed by God for the benefit and blessing of the valley of the Mississippi, and the

---

[30]John S. Ezell, "A Southern Education for Southrons," *Journal of Southern History* 17 (August 1951), 304.

[31]Ibid., 314.

[32]Ibid., 303-305.

cotton-growing regions of the Southern States."[33] For the committee on location, which had been assigned the task of selecting a place for the University of the South, all of its considerations were driven by preserving Southern distinctiveness. Accordingly, the choice of location was made "with a holy pride for the elevation of our homes, with a becoming zeal for the moral culture of our people, with a love, passing love of woman, for the land of the sun and the slave."[34] Notice the connection between climate and slavery. In other words, a Southern university was good for the physical welfare of the students but also for the welfare of the institution of slavery.

Texas Denominational Colleges and the Southern Point of View

The discussion now turns to Texas. Where do Texas educators and their institutions fit into this story? To be sure, one could find many things that separate Texas from the rest of the South. However, as was stated in the opening of this chapter, for the purposes of this study Texas will be viewed as primarily a Southern state.

Like their Southern brethren, Texas educators developed curriculums that reflected the needs of Texas society, politics, and culture. Some, such as the need for trained ministers and the need to satisfy the political and economic aspirations of Texas politicians, have been discussed in a previous chapter. Meeting the demands of a slaveholding society was also one of those needs. As with their sister institutions across the South, Texas denominational colleges and universities expressed support for Texas's slaveholding society in a variety of ways: through the actions and words of their college presidents and faculty, through their emphasis on the creation of honorable men, through

[33]Stephen Elliott, et al., "University of the South," *De Bow's Review* 26 (March 1859): 333.

[34]Ibid., 335.

their emphasis on the classics, and through teaching the proslavery argument in moral philosophy classes.

Texas Educators and Slavery: Words and Actions

In their actions and words, many Texas educators directly or indirectly expressed their support for the Southern view of slavery. Rufus C. Burleson is one such example. Born on a plantation in Morgan County, Alabama, in 1823, the young Burleson aspired to a career in law and politics. However, his conversion to Christianity in 1839 led him to abandon these goals and commit himself to becoming a minister. He accomplished this goal in June 1845. In 1848 he was sent to Texas by the Southern Baptist Domestic Mission Board, and by 1851 became president of Baylor University.[35] During his tenure he was also professor of multiple subjects.[36] Given the fact that he was born and raised on a plantation in Alabama and had chosen to perform missionary work in Texas, a slaveholding state, one might easily deduce that his views on slavery likely reflected those of most Southerners. And, indeed, they did. In a June 1862 editorial submitted to the Houston *Tri-Weekly Telegraph*, Burleson addressed the challenges faced by Waco University as a result of the Civil War.[37] However, his editorial was just as much a commentary on the challenges facing the entire South. "In regard to the present crisis," wrote Burleson, "I am rejoiced to know that the heroism of our people rises with our reverses. It could not be otherwise. Our all is at stake. We must be free or perish. . . .

---

[35]Lois Smith Murray, *Baylor at Independence* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1972), 99-102.

[36]Ibid., 365.

[37]Waco University was founded largely as a result of the efforts of Rufus C. Burleson in 1861. He served as the University's president. In 1886, Waco University merged with Baylor University after the latter moved from Independence to Waco. See Donald W. Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historic Profile* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1986), 184.

Indeed it would be far cheaper to die than to live and work for Yankee tyrants."[38] Burleson was trying to do more than report on the impact of the war on Waco University; he was trying to motivate Southern readers to continue the fight against the "Yankee tyrants." His editorial continued,

> But I see no reason to despair—our reverses are not greater than any reasonable man might have expected from the superiority of the foe in numbers and the means of warfare. But, as the London Times has said, 'The South is invincible from the vastness of her territory.' VICTORY IS SURE. Our independence may cost us another seven yeasr [*sic*] war; if so, let it come. It may cost us rivers of blood and millions of treasure; if so, I repeat it, let it come. Liberty to a nation, like honor to a man, or virtue to a woman, is the gem of existence. Without it everything else, even life, is a curse, and not a blessing. Let us, therefore, arise as one man and swear by the Holy and Eternal One that the bones of 75,000 Texians shall whiten our prairies before Abolition despotism shall reign over this lovely land.[39]

Burleson's view that the government of the United States was hell bent on imposing its tyrannical and despotic regime of abolitionism on the South placed him alongside most of his fellow Southerners. *De Bow's Review* would have surely been happy to publish these remarks, and other proslavery apologists would have applauded in agreement.

Another Texas minister and educator, John Witherspoon Pettigrew McKenzie, also exemplified how Texas educators gave expression to the Southern point of view. McKenzie was the founder and president of McKenzie College. McKenzie was born in Burke County, North Carolina. He came to Texas as a missionary, but due to health considerations he had to leave the itinerant ministry and settle. He built his home near

---

[38]Rufus C. Burleson, "Waco University—The Crisis," *Tri-Weekly Telegraph* (Houston), 27 June 1862.

[39]Ibid.

Clarksville, Texas. Farming and teaching became his life's work.[40] McKenzie's educational program soon grew into McKenzie College.

Although McKenzie College shared many of the typical attributes of other Texas denominational colleges of the antebellum period, its financial situation was in some respects unique. Historian William B. Jones argues that with regard to financial matters, the Reverend McKenzie "seemed to have the Midas touch."[41] He suggests that while other institutions struggled to maintain financial viability, McKenzie College seemed to manage quite nicely, a fact that he attributes to McKenzie's strategy of using the plantation to support the college. Jones explains, "The entire farm and slaves were utilized for the College. No cotton was raised at all, not a single bale. The major crops were corn and wheat for bread. Hogs and cattle were raised in sufficient quantities to supply the school's needs for meat."[42]

J. W. P. McKenzie was by all accounts a successful plantation owner. Jones's research indicates that in 1839 McKenzie owned 421 acres of land in Red River County. By 1858 he was reportedly farming 3,641 acres.[43] His ownership of slaves increased along with his ownership of land. Jones's research shows that McKenzie owned two slaves in 1843. By 1861 he owned thirty-six.[44] From these statistics Jones concludes, "At the outbreak of the Civil War, slightly more than a third of Red River County's

---

[40]William B. Jones, *To Survive and Excel: The Story of Southwestern University, 1840-2000* (Georgetown, TX: Southwestern University, 2006), 31-32.

[41]Ibid., 38.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid., 39.

[44]Ibid.

population of 8,535 were slaves. Only about one-quarter of the white families owned slaves, and only a quarter of those owned more than ten. By that criterion, McKenzie was a large slave owner."[45] Jones's assertions are corroborated by Randolph B. Campbell's research. In 1860, for example, there were only 1,827 slave owners in Texas who could claim ownership of between 20 and 49 slaves. They represented 8.4 percent of all slave owners.[46] McKenzie was one of them, which put him in an elite group.

What is important to note is that the success of McKenzie College can, in large measure, be attributed to its connection to slave labor and the plantation system. Given Reverend McKenzie's direct ties to the institution of slavery, it would be hard to imagine him endorsing abolitionism or anything remotely close to it. His personal fortunes as well as those of his college were dependent on slavery. Jones observes that McKenzie's ownership in slaves came to an end only as a result of the Civil War. In 1865 he owned no slaves.[47]

Royal T. Wheeler serves as yet another example of how a prominent Texas educator dealt with the question of slavery. At the time of the Civil War, Wheeler was head of the Law Department at Baylor University as well as a member of the Texas Supreme Court.[48] In his comprehensive study of Baylor during the Civil War, Guy Nelson argues that Baylor expressed support for the Southern cause.[49] Wheeler's

---

[45]Ibid.

[46]Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery*, 193.

[47]Jones, *To Survive and Excel*, 39.

[48]Guy Nelson, Jr., "Baylor University at Independence: The War Years, 1861-65," *Texana* 2 (Summer 1964): 87.

[49]Ibid.

thoughts on the subject are cited by Nelson as evidence. He describes Wheeler as a man opposed to Lincoln and the Republican Party. Slavery was the main source of this opposition. Regarding Lincoln and his party, Wheeler asked, "Does it [Lincoln's party] not proclaim the natural and political equality of the slave and his master; and thus aim a blow at the very existence of our society, no less than our domestic peace and security?"[50] This statement reflected the Southern belief that Lincoln was an abolitionist. Wheeler, it seems, asked this question to his readers rhetorically.

Like many Southerners and many other Texans, Wheeler expressed his belief that Lincoln's election would lead to a despotic government in the United States:

> Is not the result of this election, indeed a most extraordinary, a tremendous decision to the people of the Southern States? Was there ever in the history of free governments such a thing witnessed as a party elevated to power, and administration inaugurated, with an open avowal of hostility to the institution, the constitution, and the laws of the people whose government it assumed to administer?"[51]

Concerning Wheeler's proslavery views, Nelson argues that they were "no doubt echoed in the law classes at Independence."[52] Though Nelson provides no specific supporting evidence to support this statement, it would be hard to imagine that Wheeler would teach anything in his classes that ran counter to his stated sentiments regarding slavery and secession.

---

[50]R.T. Wheeler, quoted in Nelson, "Baylor University at Independence," 87.

[51]Ibid., 88.

[52]Nelson, "Baylor University at Independence." 88. Independence, Texas, was the original site of Baylor University. Baylor is now located in Waco, Texas.

Texas Denominational Colleges and the Southern Curriculum

In Burleson, McKenzie, and Wheeler, one finds both actions and words which easily suggest that these individuals supported slavery. On that score, they all identified with the central tenet of Southern distinctiveness. Although they all were directly connected to their respective institutions, their personal views may not be definitive proof that denominational colleges and universities in Texas were officially and overtly proslavery. The essence of any such institution is its curriculum. Therefore, if Texas denominational colleges did in fact reflect a Southern point of view, it should have been manifested in the curriculum.

The next question to be addressed is: To what extent did Texas denominational colleges promote the Home Education Movement's belief in a Southern curriculum? More specifically, did these colleges endorse a curriculum designed to advance and preserve the slaveholding society in which they operated? It is to this question that the discussion now turns. According to the conclusions of Sugrue and the other scholars cited above, there were specific hallmarks of the Southern curriculum. They included an emphasis on classical languages and literature, moral philosophy courses in which the merits of slavery were defended, classes stressing a strict constructionist view of the United States Constitution, and a college environment that stressed the creation of honorable gentlemen. What follows is an analysis of the curriculum at Texas denominational colleges based on the presence of these hallmarks. However, a discussion of the presence of strict constructionist views of the Constitution will be reserved for the next chapter.

The classics. The Greeks and Romans loomed large in the minds of Texas educators. Even in the area of the physical education curriculum, classical ideas were present. In his 1846 address to the Educational Convention of Texas, Chauncey Richardson asserted, "A sound mind in a sound body is an ancient Latin poet's description of a perfect man. It would be well if our children had a little Roman training in their physical habits."[53] Like J. W. P. McKenzie, Richardson was forced to give up his itinerant ministry for health reasons. He subsequently became a well-known Methodist educator. Before his election to the presidency of Rutersville College in Texas, he had served six years as president of Tuscumbia Female College in Alabama.[54] To be sure, his ideas on education were much sought after. For Richardson, the Greek emphasis on physical training was the foundation of intellectual training. He declared,

> The Greeks, possessed a correct notion of the importance of giving the human frame the fullest and fairest chance of development; hence their gymnastic exercises, Olympic games, and the prizes awarded for the encouragement of manly feats. From childhood to adolescence the physical expansion and free development of the frame should precede the cultivation of the mental powers.[55]

Classroom instruction at Rutersville College certainly reflected Richardson's affinity for the classics. The curriculum of the department of ancient languages and literature included courses of study in Roman antiquities, Latin composition, and written translation of Latin. Roman writers and orators such as Ovid, Horace, Livy, Cicero de Oratore, and Tacitus were also part of the curriculum. Greek philosophers, critics, and orators were, of course, included. Among those listed by name were Plato and Aristotle.

---

[53]Chauncey Richardson, *An Address on Education: Delivered Before the Educational Convention of Texas, The City of Houston, January, 1846* (New York: n. p., 1846), 6.

[54]Jones, *To Survive and Excel*, 11.

[55]Richardson, *An Address on Education*, 6.

Written translation of Greek figured prominently in the curriculum as well.[56] Students were given a small amount of flexibility as to their course of study. The catalog stated, "Any student may take a partial, or an entire course, as may suit his circumstances; and when regularly dismissed, he shall be entitled to a Diploma corresponding to his attainments."[57] However, completion of classical studies was required for a college degree. The catalog further stated, "But no one will be admitted to the collegiate degree of Bachelor of Arts, unless he pass a thorough and satisfactery [*sic*] examination in the entire classical course. Whenever he does this, he will be entitled to his degree, without regard to the time he may have been in the college."[58]

Other notable Methodist institutions likewise stressed a classical curriculum. Soule University under the presidency of William Halsey developed a curriculum in which students studied the Greeks and Romans throughout their four-year education. Those wishing to graduate with a Bachelor of Arts degree were required to successfully complete the curriculum in all departments, except the department of Hebrew languages and biblical science. One of the required departments was the department of Latin and Greek languages.[59]

Not only was McKenzie College directly connected to the plantation system, but its curriculum also reflected the Southern affinity for the classics. In the freshman year, students read works by Cicero, Xenophon, and Virgil. Homer's *Iliad* as well as Greek

---

[56]Rutersville College, *First Annual Catalogue of Rutersville College, Rutersville, Fayette County, Texas* (Austin: Sentinal Print, 1840), 10-11.

[57]Ibid., 9.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Soule University, *Catalogue of Soule University, Chappell Hill, Texas, 1859-60* (Galveston: Texas Christian Advocate Book Press, 1860), 20.

and Latin composition were included. Works by Tacitus, Xenophon, and Homer appear predominantly in the sophomore curriculum, and Cicero and Thucydides make an appearance in the junior year course of study. The senior year curriculum included Tacitus, Herodotus, and Livy.[60]

Moral philosophy courses. Scholars working in the field of American educational history have long recognized the important role moral philosophy courses played in the antebellum denominational college, both North and South. The review of literature included in the first chapter of this dissertation, for example, cited the works of Robert Huehner and Albea Godbold. Usually taught in the senior year, the importance of these courses cannot be overstated. As Huehner suggests, the moral philosophy course was "the point in the curriculum that tied church and college together, for here a religious code that could be applied to social situations was imparted to the students."[61] Godbold's research suggests that in Southern institutions the defense of slavery was often a central topic.[62]

The experience of Texas denominational colleges and universities regarding moral philosophy courses confirms, for the most part, the conclusions reached by both Huehner and Godbold. That is to say, moral philosophy courses often touched on the question of slavery. Perhaps the best description of the moral philosophy course given by

---

[60]McKenzie College, *Annual Catalogue of the Students and Faculty of M'Kenzie College, Near Clarksville, Texas, for the Session of 1860-61* (Nashville: The Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1861), 7.

[61]David Robert Huehner, "Reform and the Pre-Civil War American College" (Ph. D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972), 63.

[62]Albea Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944), 89-90.

a Texas educator was provided by Chauncey Richardson. In his address to the Educational Convention of Texas he said, "Moral education embraces that course of instruction and discipline which has for its object the inculcation of correct sentiments of right and wrong, together with the motives for the adoption of the one and rejection of the other."[63] For Richardson, a student's education was incomplete without instruction in moral philosophy. Instruction in science and mathematics alone was insufficient. He asserted, "A right development of the moral nature is more essential than all the ratiocinations of the understanding; for mere knowledge is worth nothing, without the desire and ability to apply it to useful purposes."[64] Some educators, argued Richardson, defined a proper education as including only the natural sciences such as geology, chemistry, and mathematics; however, such subjects "are not, of themselves, sufficient to make the man or the citizen."[65]

For Richardson, the necessity for moral instruction in the college curriculum was rooted in its emphasis on matters religious. He argued, "Indeed, religion should be the soul of everything, the basis of all education, from the cradle to the grave. Religion is to a correct system of education what God is to the material universe."[66] Scientific knowledge alone is not sufficient to address the needs of humanity. In his words, "There are not sanctions so efficient as the command of God, and the prospects of a future world; no motives so spirit-stirring as the love of God and the Saviour [*sic*], in subduing the passions and controlling the appetites of the mass of men. The tree of knowledge is not

---

[63]Richardson, *An Address on Education*, 8.

[64]Ibid., 9.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Ibid., 8.

the tree of life. Knowledge is power, but it is neither wisdom nor virtue."[67] Although Richardson made no mention of slavery or any other specific topic to be included in moral philosophy courses, historians have long concluded that Southerners used religion, especially the Bible, to justify slavery.[68]

The proof that slavery was discussed in moral philosophy courses at Texas denominational colleges is found in the assigned textbooks. With regard to these textbooks, this study makes two arguments. First, textbooks were a close reflection of what was actually taught in the classroom. Second, choice of textbooks reflected an institutional point of view, not just an individual instructor's point of view. From these textbooks an accurate picture of a college's views on slavery develops.

Support for these arguments is grounded in the concept of academic freedom. In 1918, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, "A word is not a crystal, transparent and unchanged, it is the skin of a living thought and may vary greatly in color and content according to the circumstances and the time in which it is used."[69] Holmes's observation is applicable to the words "academic freedom." As a legal, cultural, and academic concept, the meaning of academic freedom has evolved in both meaning and practice since the nineteenth century.

Modern understanding of the meaning of academic freedom is derived from law and practice. According to William A. Kaplin and Barbara A. Lee, academic freedom is

---

[67]Ibid., 9.

[68]See the review of literature in chapter one of this dissertation for a discussion of the scholarly research surrounding proslavery religion in the South. The views of Thornton Stringfellow are specifically highlighted in Eric L. McKitrick, *Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963).

[69]*Towne v. Eisner*, 245 U. S. 418, 425.

closely tied to the First Amendment rights of freedom of speech, press, and association. However, the protection of these rights depends on the type of institution and the type of infringement alleged. Generally, the law only protects the First Amendment rights of faculty from infringement by the government. Such protection applies whether a faculty member teaches at a public or private institution. It does not generally protect faculty at private institutions when the infringement alleged is from an internal source (deans, chancellors, presidents, provosts, etc.).[70] "Absent a finding of state action," write Kaplin and Lee, "an internal restraint in a private institution does not implicate government, and the First Amendment therefore does not apply. The protection accorded to faculty expression and association in private institutions is thus usually a matter of contract law."[71] Legal interpretations such as these have originated quite recently. *West's Encyclopedia of American Law* asserts that "Academic freedom was first introduced as a judicial *term of art* (a term with a specific legal meaning) by Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas [in 1952]."[72] In other words, as a legally recognized concept, academic freedom's origins are very recent. Finally, academic freedom, like all rights, is not absolute. Kern Alexander and Erwin S. Solomon note, "No court has, to date, squarely held that academic freedom is a distinct right which elevates the teacher's rights over and above those constitutional rights guaranteed to any public servant or citizen."[73]

---

[70]William A. Kaplin and Barbara A. Lee, *The Law of Higher Education: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*, 4th ed., vol. 1 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 605.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Jeffrey Lehman and Shirelle Phelps, eds., *West's Encyclopedia of American Law* (Detroit: Thomson/Gale, 2005), 45.

[73]Kern Alexander and Erwin S. Solomon, *College and University Law* (Charlottesville: Michie Company, 1972), 344.

Limitations can be placed on public employees, including faculty at public schools, when there is a compelling state interest to do so.[74]

Regarding practice and custom, academic freedom is derived from college and university tenure policies and from institutional accreditation. Tenure is usually created by employment contracts and written policies and procedures; however, it may also be derived from traditional practice.[75] Its primary purpose is "the preservation of academic freedom effected through the provision of job security."[76] Accreditation standards also require recognition by the institution of academic freedom. The process of accrediting higher educational institutions in the United States is a private matter, not a government one. In Texas the most common accreditation comes from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Founded in 1895, SACS describes itself as a "voluntary association of educational institutions."[77] Its stated philosophy asserts, "The task of accreditation is related to the traditional public philosophy of the United States—that a free people can and ought to govern themselves and that they best do so through a representative, flexible and responsive system."[78] This means that colleges and universities, through their participation in SACS, accredit themselves. The government is not the source of accreditation. To be accredited by SACS, a participating institution

---

[74]Ibid.

[75]Carolyn Bower and Lisa Ascenzo, eds., *Corpus Juris Secundum: A Contemporary Statement of American Law as Derived from Reported Cases and Legislation*, vol. 14A (n.p.: Thomson/West, 2006), 674.

[76]Ibid., 673.

[77]Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges, *Criteria for Accreditation, 1998* (Decatur, GA: Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 2000), 2.

[78]Ibid.

must recognize and promote academic freedom. Whereas the law may not completely guarantee academic freedom to faculty at private religious colleges, SACS accreditation standards do. One accreditation standard asserts,

> Institutions may endorse particular religious or philosophical beliefs, or specific social principles as they relate to the institutional statement of purpose. Such beliefs and principles may influence the curriculum and the selection of students, faculty and staff. Nevertheless, institutions of higher education exist to further the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.
>
> An institution must adopt and distribute to all faculty members a statement of the principles of academic freedom as established by the governing board, ensuring freedom in teaching, research and publication.[79]

The nineteenth-century understanding of academic freedom, especially as understood by denominational institutions, was different from the modern view. Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger suggest that in the latter decades of the eighteenth century, academic freedom at American colleges and universities was advancing at a steady pace. However, with the rise of scores of denominational colleges in the first half of the nineteenth century, academic freedom declined significantly[80]. They argue, "From the outset the severely denominational institutions neither aspired to nor pretended to foster academic freedom; and very commonly—although not universally—their teachers lived and worked placidly within this framework."[81] The early nineteenth century witnessed a broad reaction to the Enlightenment. In the United States this was expressed by the Second Great Awakening. Hofstadter and Metzger connect the rise of the denominational college to this reaction. Moreover, they connect the lack of academic

---

[79]Ibid., 48.

[80] Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 209-210.

[81]Ibid., 210.

freedom present at these colleges to anti-Enlightenment thought in general.[82] They assert that "the intellectual and religious reaction fostered a host of little institutions in which doctrinal and sectarian considerations were rated above educational accomplishment."[83] Neil Hamilton's research concurs with these findings. His conclusions suggest that nineteenth-century denominational educators held a tight grip on all matters relating to the curriculum and religious orthodoxy. He writes, "The ideological zealotry created a significant prohibited zone from which many professors would steer clear."[84]

Among the most important educational leaders in the nineteenth century were denominational college presidents. Their devotion to their respective institutions cannot be overestimated. Texas provides many examples. E. Bruce Thompson writes, for example, that William Carey Crane was "the lifeblood of Baylor University at Independence."[85] Typical of most denominational college presidents of his day, Crane performed almost every task necessary to keep his institution running smoothly. In addition to administrative duties, he personally maintained the grounds and buildings. Most importantly he taught the bulk of the curriculum.[86] Jack W. Humphries's assessment of the importance of Daniel Baker to Austin College has a similar tone. Baker not only helped to found the college, but he also served for a time as its president.

---

[82]Ibid., 209-210.

[83]Ibid., 210.

[84]Neil Hamilton, *Zealotry and Academic Freedom: A Legal and Historical Perspective* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 11.

[85]E. Bruce Thompson, "William Carey Crane and Texas Education," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 58 (January 1955): 413.

[86]Ibid., 412.

Humphries writes that Baker's "enthusiasm for educational mission work in Texas was exceeded only by his indomitable Christian faith and tireless energy."[87]

Denominational college presidents in the nineteenth century not only ran their institutions from top to bottom, they also maintained a tight grip over the academic and social life on campus. Laurence R. Veysey argues, "An overriding spirit of paternalism infused the American college of the mid-nineteenth century. Although (perhaps because) the president continued to teach in the classroom, he exercised an 'almost patriarchal authority.' Indeed, many of these men were remembered largely for their sternly authoritarian dispositions."[88] Classroom behavior was particularly strict. Calvin Dickinson's research on Baylor University lists nine rules applied to the classroom. One of these prohibited the reading of material other than textbooks or other sources relevant to a student's studies.[89] Ironically, one of the few places where academic freedom thrived in the nineteenth-century denominational college was in the activities of student literary societies. Rose Mary Magrill, whose research focuses on Chapel Hill College in Texas, asserts, "In the decades before the Civil War, when college programs were highly structured and no provisions existed in the curriculum for individual interests, the literary society became an important part of the student's intellectual and social life."[90]

---

[87]Jack W. Humphries, "Notes and Documents: The Law Department at Old Austin College," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 83 (April 1980): 373.

[88]Laurence R. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 32-33.

[89]Calvin Dickinson, "Collegiate Life in Nineteenth Century Texas: A Case Study," *Texana* 7, no. 4 (1969): 316.

[90]Rose Mary Magrill, "Higher Education on the Frontier: Chapel Hill College in Daingerfield, Texas," *East Texas Historical Journal* 43 (Spring 2005): 60.

In short, the scholarly consensus about the status of academic freedom in the nineteenth-century denominational college is that such freedom was reserved for the college president. Faculty members and students were given little latitude. Many denominational colleges in Texas even published the assigned textbooks for each class in their annual catalogs. This indicates that textbook selection was not merely a faculty decision, but an institutional one as well. Given the control that college presidents had over their campuses, it is unlikely that textbooks that ran afoul of their views could have been listed in the official curriculum. Therefore, these texts do, indeed, represent an institutional viewpoint.

Regarding moral philosophy courses, some Texas colleges used textbooks that explicitly addressed the issue of slavery. An example is found at McKenzie College, where the senior year moral science course used R. H. Rivers's text *Elements of Moral Philosophy*.[91] The text's cover page listed the Reverend Rivers as the president of Wesleyan University in Florence, Alabama.[92] Regarding slavery, it contained an entire chapter on the subject. The detail with which Rivers endorsed the proslavery argument would have made Thornton Stringfellow and other proslavery advocates proud.

Rivers's chapter on slavery systematically divided the proslavery argument into several parts. Due to the length and detail of his analysis, only the highlights of the

---

[91]McKenzie College, *Annual Catalogue, 1860-61*, 7. College catalogs of the period listed the authors and titles of textbooks used in the curriculum. They did not typically list specific editions or dates of publication. Many books, of course, went through several editions. Consequently, it is difficult to say with exact accuracy which editions of these texts were used at any given time. Nonetheless, it is assumed for the purposes of this study that an author's views and conclusions did not change dramatically from one edition to the next. Therefore, it is believed that regardless of which specific edition was used, the textbooks cited in this chapter are a solid reflection of what students would have been asked to read.

[92]R. H. Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, ed. Thomas O. Summers (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1860), n.p.

argument are presented here. Part one asked whether or not slavery was a sin. His answer reflected generally what proslavery ministers argued from the pulpit. According to Rivers, slavery was not a sin for the simple fact that it was ordained by God. He observed, "But suppose that slavery was established by Divine legislation: if that does not make it right, does it not prove that it is right? We maintain that God's law is always right, and that whatever God established is right, not because he established it, but we maintain that God established it *because he saw that it is right.*"[93] Numerous Old Testament passages were cited by Rivers to prove this point. Among them was Genesis 9:25-27: "'Cursed be Canaan: a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.' And he said, 'Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.'"[94] According to Rivers, this passage meant that "the children of Ham are doomed to serve the children of Shem and of Japheth, by the decree of Him whose ways are not as man's ways."[95] He conceded that the Bible mandates in Exodus 21:2 that slaves were to be set free after six years of servitude; however, he quickly pointed out that this decree only applied to *Hebrew* slaves. Citing Leviticus 25:35-46, Rivers noted that this decree did not apply to the children of Ham.[96] According to his analysis of this passage, "God commanded the Hebrews that all their perpetual slaves should be of the

---

[93]Ibid., 330.

[94]Gen. 9:25-27 quoted in ibid., 331. In the Revised Standard Version, which is, of course, a more recent translation of the Old and New Testaments, the word "servant" is replaced by the word "slave." This new translation notwithstanding, Rivers clearly understood these two terms as synonymous with one another.

[95]Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 331.

[96]Ibid., 331-334.

heathen that were round about them. These heathen were the descendants of Ham, the very people upon whom slavery was inflicted."[97] Moreover, "these people were to be owned; they were to be bought as property: they were to become 'chattels personal, to all intents, purposes, and constructions whatsoever.'"[98] Although he does not state it explicitly, Rivers's logic suggests that he saw Africans as Ham's descendants. Their most significant characteristic was, of course, that they were deemed by Anglos as heathens.

In his book *Masters & Slaves in the House of the Lord*, historian John B. Boles argues that the heathenism of Africans, which is to say their non-Christian character, was used by the English in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to justify enslaving them. Morally speaking, the English believed that a Christian could own another human being provided that he or she was not Christian.[99] Rivers's analysis demonstrates that nineteenth-century Southerners were still relying to some degree on the heathenism of blacks to justify slavery.

On the other hand, given the fact that by the mid-nineteenth century many slaves were Christian, his reference to heathenism also included race. His text provides some evidence to support this assumption. When addressing the question of why God ordained slavery, Rivers simply declared that "the 'strangers' were heathen, they were an inferior race, and those whom they were required to serve were enlightened, having a correct knowledge of the true God; and the very doom of slavery, though a physical curse, was to

---

[97]Ibid., 334.

[98]Ibid.

[99]John B. Boles, ed., *Masters & Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740-1870* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988), 2-3.

be a spiritual, a moral benefit."[100] Rivers does not cite any particular passage from the Bible to support this claim. Such an oversight demonstrates one of two things. Either Rivers thought that such a citation was unnecessary or it does not exist. If the latter was true, it would mean that Rivers was simply assuming that God held the same beliefs about race as Southerners; namely, that whites were superior to blacks. Indeed, this passage, though only a single sentence out of his entire work, demonstrates how deeply ingrained the question of race was imbedded in the Anglo mind and the prevailing Southern point of view. Apparently, God himself had no need to state what Southerners believed was the obvious.

Rivers also utilized the New Testament to show the divine foundation of slavery. Paul's Epistle to Philemon figured large in his analysis. The subject of the Epistle is a man named Onesimus. Rivers described him as a fugitive slave. The author's interpretation of this passage was somewhat lengthy, but it demonstrates how, in the Southern mind, slavery was a God-given right. He noted,

> Paul meets a fugitive slave, and is the instrument of his conversion to the Christian religion. He then causes him to return to his master Philemon, whom he calls by the most endearing epithets. He sends him back, not as a guest to receive hospitality, but as a slave, who, now that he had become a Christian, would be no 'longer unprofitable, but profitable.'[101]

Paul's Epistle has another story to tell, however. Rivers used it to demonstrate that Northerners had a biblical duty to return fugitive slaves, not just a legal one. He wrote, "Paul, being aged, and needing a servant, would have kept Onesimus could he have done so in justice to his master. But so scrupulous was that aged apostle of the

---

[100]Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 336.

[101]Ibid., 338-339. Rivers ignores the fact that Onesimus was sent back as "a beloved brother," not a slave. See Philem 15, Revised Standard Version.

rights of a slaveholder, that he would do nothing without the consent of the master."[102] Slaveholders had long insisted on legal protections against fugitive slaves running to non-slave states for their freedom. They won an apparent political victory on this point at the constitutional convention in 1787 with the inclusion of the fugitive slave provision in the final draft of the Constitution.[103] In short, Rivers elevated what most Southerners saw as a legal obligation of Northerners to return fugitive slaves to the realm of universal truth. Their duty was not just to man's law; it was to God's law as well.

Jesus Christ himself was used by Rivers to justify slavery. He argued bluntly that "Christ recognizes the institution, and expresses no disapprobation of it."[104] For emphasis, Rivers quoted an author by the name of Hopkins. No other information is provided by Rivers as to his identity or the source of the quote. Presumably Hopkins was an authority in the area of Biblical interpretation of slavery. Quoting Hopkins, Rivers asserted,

> We know how he inveighed against the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, the infidelity of the Sadducees, the venality and corruption which surrounded him. But the case of the slaveholder was never mentioned, nor could any reader of the Gospels find authority for the notion that he regarded slavery as a sin against God, and a crime against humanity.[105]

For Rivers, then, it was Jesus' silence on slavery that was most telling. This argument suggested that failure to condemn something must mean acceptance of it. In case the reader did not make this connection, Rivers asked rhetorically, "Is it not passing strange, then, that in an empire in which Gibbon says there were not less than sixty millions of

---

[102]Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 339.

[103]See U. S. Constitution, art. 4, sec. 2.

[104]Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 340.

[105]Ibid., 340-341.

slaves, Jesus, the boldest of teachers, the greatest of reformers, the purest of philanthropists, our Lord and Saviour, the friend of man, should utter not one word against so great, so crying a sin?"[106]

Finally, Rivers pointed to one last important bit of evidence, namely, the specific apostolic references to the relationship between master and slave. According to his analysis, these references call upon slaves to obey their masters and masters to treat their slaves justly.[107] In keeping with his usual style of argumentation, Rivers then asked the reader rhetorically: "We ask, Do these apostolic directions agree with the philosophy of modern abolitionists? Can they be reconciled with the idea that the relation of master and servant always involve sin? We answer emphatically, No."[108] Notice that Rivers used the first person, plural pronoun "we" instead of the first person, singular "I." Apparently, not only did his argument belong to himself but to the reader as well. Grammatically, this technique is the equivalent of preaching to the choir. The author was not so much attempting to convince readers of an argument as he was simply clarifying their own thinking and sentiments.

The second section of Rivers's chapter on slavery presented the argument for slavery based not on the Bible but on reason. Most of his argument was based on his belief that Africans were an inferior race. This led him to conclude that slavery was necessary to govern them and that they were better off for it. With regard to the issue of self governance, Rivers declared, for example, "And as they are confessedly the inferior

---

[106]Ibid., 341.

[107]Ibid., 344.

[108]Ibid.

race, who can never enjoy essential liberty or reciprocity of social condition with the whites, the government adapted to them must be inferior and subordinate to that of the whites amongst whom they dwell. It must be subordinate; for in the nature of things it must be an independent or a subordinate one."[109]

Having established slavery as a logical consequence of the inferiority of the African race, Rivers discussed in detail the benefits bestowed upon slaves by that institution. He wrote, "We do not say that slavery would be a blessing to the enlightened Anglo-Saxon; nor can the argument with any propriety be retorted upon us. But we do say that slavery has been, and still is, a blessing to the negro."[110] According to the author, these blessings included the fact that blacks in the American South lived better than those in their homeland of Africa; that they also lived better than their free black brethren in the North; that they lived better and were happier than the free, white wage laborers in the North; and that slavery granted them the opportunity to be Christianized.[111] Once again Rivers used the personal pronoun "we" in his argument. One can easily imagine that this line of argumentation was well received by his readers. They would certainly have felt part of "we." Acceptance by Southerners of the argument that slavery was somehow a benevolent institution was widespread. White Texans certainly thought it was. The Texas Declaration of Causes, for example, described slavery as "beneficent and patriarchal" and as "mutually beneficial to both bond and free."[112]

---

[109]Ibid., 350.

[110]Ibid., 351.

[111]Ibid., 351-355.

[112]Declaration of Causes, 195, 196.

Rivers also addressed the claim made by many that slavery had a negative impact on the slave owner. As he did throughout the chapter, the author allowed the reader to lay partial claim to the argument: "We argue that slavery exerts no evil effects upon the master, and therefore is not necessarily sinful."[113] As evidence, Rivers outlined six specific virtues which he believed defined Christian slave owners: humility, charity, justice, benevolence, deep piety, and missionary zeal.[114] In the description of these virtues, the Christianity and Christian-like behavior of slave owners were prominently emphasized. When referring to the virtue of benevolence, for example, the author boldly proclaimed, "Active benevolence, displaying itself in works of charity, in rendering assistance to the poor, visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, relieving the sick, erecting churches, building up colleges, and sending abroad the Bible, is exemplified nowhere more than among the slaveholders who are so violently slandered."[115] His belief in the piety of slave owners also reflected the view that slave owners exemplified what it meant to be Christian. For him this meant a person gave "love to God and man."[116] Evidence of such enormous piety among slave owners was "manifested in veneration for the Almighty, in godly fear, in holy love, in a sacred regard for the Sabbath, and in constant prayer."[117] Slave owners were described as great missionaries for Christ. He exclaimed, for example, "I have known the slaveholder surrender the pleasures and ease and luxuries of home, and give himself to the laborious

---

[113]Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 356.

[114]Ibid., 356-357.

[115]Ibid., 357.

[116]Ibid.

[117]Ibid.

and self-denying work of a Christian missionary."[118] In short, far from harming slave owners, the institution of slavery made them exemplary Christians.

To the modern ear, such hyperbole is easily dismissed. Many scholars identify it as a common technique used by Southern leaders, especially ministers and other proslavery apologists. In his research on religion and the Confederate army, historian Reid Mitchell concludes, "This southern strategy of making sweeping religious claims was not limited to discussions of the Confederate army. During the late nineteenth century, southern churches became accustomed to equally grandiose bragging. . . . When one encounters these grandiose southern claims, one is reminded of the arguments of proslavery ideologues. The Christian has been long taught that he shall be hated by the world; the South has long been willing to accept hatred as proof of its Christianity."[119]

Rivers's proslavery textbook has been described in detail in this chapter because it stands out as one of the most overt proslavery texts used by a Texas denominational college. Moreover, it demonstrates the detail with which the proslavery argument was developed and presented. However, other Texas denominational colleges used textbooks that were not as obvious in their proslavery sentiments. Some Texas colleges and universities even used moral philosophy textbooks that the Home Education Movement railed against, such as Francis Wayland's *The Elements of Moral Science.* Baylor University was one such institution. Its catalogs throughout the 1850s listed this text

---

[118]Ibid.

[119]Reid Mitchell, "Christian Soldiers?: Perfecting the Confederacy," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, ed. Randall M. Miller, Harry S. Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 301.

consistently as the textual foundation of its moral science courses.[120] The faculty at Soule University did not commit itself to any particular moral philosophy or moral science textbook. Its 1859-60 catalog, for instance, listed the professors' lectures as the foundations for the courses. No specific textbook or author is mentioned.[121]

Wayland's *The Elements of Moral Science* did not receive very good reviews from the Southern press. Commentators and reviewers were mostly troubled by its stance on the question of slavery. The Southern Commercial Convention of 1855 went so far as to pass a resolution that historian John S. Ezell suggests may, in part, have been motivated by Wayland's text. According to Ezell, "the convention readopted its resolutions of 1854 and, perhaps mindful of Francis Wayland's influence, recommended that the Louisiana legislature annually apply $1,000 to encourage publication of texts more suitable for the youth of its state."[122]

Francis Wayland was Brown University's fourth president, a position he held from 1827-1855. According to Wayland's biographer, Theodore R. Crane, the interest of modern scholars in Wayland is based on his program of educational reform rather than his views on slavery.[123] Scholars generally do not categorize him as being a firebrand abolitionist; however, there is clear evidence that he was opposed to slavery. That is to say, in spite of his antislavery views, scholars would most likely not use his name in the same sentence as John Brown, Frederick Douglass, or William Lloyd Garrison. Eugene

---

[120]The following Baylor University annual catalogs listed Wayland's text as required reading in the moral science curriculum: 1851-52, 1852-53, 1853-54, 1854-55, 1856; and 1857.

[121]Soule University, *Catalogue, 1859-60*, 15.

[122]Ezell, "A Southern Education for Southrons," 314.

[123]Theodore R. Crane, *Francis Wayland: Political Economist as Educator* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1962), 3.

D. Genovese, for instance, describes Wayland as being "moderately antislavery."[124] In truth, antebellum Texans would most likely have taken exception to Genovese's argument that Wayland was only moderate in his antislavery views. In the Southern mind, someone was either completely for slavery or completely against it.

Wayland's *Elements of Moral Science* would certainly have convinced antebellum Texans of his abolitionist tendencies. In it he expresses his belief that slavery was morally wrong. His argument was rooted in the concept of individual liberty, which he defines as follows: "I have said, that every man has an equal right to use whatever means of happiness God has bestowed upon him, in such a manner as he pleases, provided he do [*sic*] not use it, as to molest his neighbor."[125] The question was, of course, did slavery constitute a violation of one's liberty. Wayland answered emphatically: yes. Indeed, slavery was, for him, perhaps the grossest violation of liberty. He wrote, "The most common form of this violation, is, in the case of domestic slavery."[126]

How, according to Wayland, did slavery violate a person's liberty? Applying the same tactic as his Southern counterpart Rivers, Wayland argued against slavery using both reason and revelation. His argument based on reason, which he called the law of nature, stated,

> Domestic slavery proceeds upon the belief, that A, by the payment of money to B, may obtain a right to use C as his property. It supposes that one man has no right to use his limbs, his intellect, and his other powers, for the promotion of his own happiness; but only in such manner as will promote the happiness of another.

---

[124]Eugene D. Genovese, "Religion in the Collapse of the American Union," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 78.

[125]Francis Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science* (Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1853), 101-110.

[126]Ibid., 103.

> And it supposes a man to have this right, not over a single individual only, but over as many as he can obtain by purchase.[127]

In Wayland's logical scheme there was no reference to nature separating people into superior and inferior classes based on race, as was often found in the argument of Southern proslavery apologists. When Wayland declared that all men were created equal, he meant *all men*, black or white. Texans would certainly have rejected Wayland's logic. In their Declaration of Causes, the idea that literally *all* men were created equal was specifically rejected. Such a notion of equality was "a doctrine at war with nature, in opposition to the experience of mankind, and in violation of the plainest revelations of the Divine Law."[128] In short, most Southerners easily dismissed Wayland's logical argument on the grounds that it started, so far as they believed, with a false assumption—that whites and blacks were inherently equal.

If Wayland's use of natural law and reason was not sufficient to sway Southern college students to the side of abolitionism, his biblical argument would certainly not have done the job either. There were four parts to Wayland's religious argument against slavery. First, he relied on the *spirit* rather than the *letter* of the Bible's message. In his words,

> The precept of the Christian religion is, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. The meaning of this precept, we have before shown. Now this must be absolutely prohibitory of slavery, unless it can be shown, that any man is not my neighbor. Every one must admit, that, were this precept universally obeyed, slavery could not exist, for a moment, in fact, though it might exist, for a while, in form.[129]

---

[127]Ibid.

[128]Declaration of Causes, 195.

[129]Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science*, 104.

In other words, if everyone simply adhered to the so-called Golden Rule, slavery could not possibly survive. Love for one's fellow human beings would cause the natural extinction of slavery.

The second element to Wayland's biblical attack on slavery addressed the question of race. The question was: Does the Bible recognize racial differences between human beings? Wayland used the rhetorical question to make his argument. He stated, "Every one sees, that slavery of white men is at variance with the precepts of religion. We all thus judge, respecting the slavery formerly existing in the Barbary States. But does difference of color make any change in moral right, and moral obligation?"[130] Although he did not directly answer his own question, the answer was meant to be obvious. Interestingly, he relied on the same grammatical technique as Rivers; namely, the first person, plural pronoun "we." Like Rivers, Wayland was trying to give his readers ownership of the argument and, as such, they became participants in it. His argument was also an attempt to do for the Bible what Justice John Marshall Harlan tried to do for the U. S. Constitution. In *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), Harlan delivered his passionate dissent from the majority, declaring, "Our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens."[131] This was essentially what Wayland was saying about the Bible, namely, that God is colorblind.

Wayland's third point of attack on the proslavery argument focused on the Old Testament. His argument was simply to discount the references in the Old Testament as being the product of the corrupt age in which its books were written. With the advent of

---

[130]Ibid.

[131]*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U. S. 537, 559.

the Gospel, this old age of corruption is washed away. Specifically, he wrote, "If it be said that the Old Testament recognized slavery, we answer, this was an era of comparative moral darkness, to which, under the clearer light of the Gospel, we need not go for illumination. It also allowed of divorce, which the New Testament forbids."[132] In other words, there were many practices that were part of Old Testament society, but these things were no longer tolerable in the age of the Gospel.

The final piece of Wayland's biblical argument against slavery focused on the New Testament. In this line of argumentation, he confronted directly the proslavery notion that the New Testament endorses slavery simply because slavery is not explicitly condemned. This, according to Wayland, was bad logic. Just because slavery was not condemned does not indicate that it should be condoned. He argues, "If it be said, that the New Testament does not forbid it [slavery], we answer, the first precept of the New Testament is such, that, if it were obeyed, slavery could not exist. It is unjust to say that it does not *forbid* it, because it does not take that particular mode of *extirpating* it which we might select."[133] In other words, there was no implied consent for slavery in the New Testament.

If McKenzie College's use of Rivers's textbook demonstrates the presence of a pro-slavery curriculum within Texas denominational educational institutions, what, if anything, does Baylor's use of Wayland's overtly anti-slavery text demonstrate? When the views about slavery expressed by prominent Baylor professors such as Burleson and Wheeler are considered, this question becomes even more perplexing.

---

[132]Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science*, 104.

[133]Ibid.

There are at least four plausible explanations for this apparent dissonance. The first explanation for Baylor's choice of Wayland's textbook is that he was a well-known Baptist leader and educator. After all, McKenzie College's choice of Rivers's textbook might well have had something to do with the fact that Rivers was a Methodist minister whose book was published by the Southern Methodist Publishing House and who was also president of Wesleyan University in Florence, Alabama. The choice made in favor of Wayland's textbook might simply have been the result of the incestuous nature of education. The world of academics was then, and remains today, a very small world. It is not uncommon today, for example, for professors to assign their own books or those of a close colleague as required reading. Indeed, one of the founding fathers of Baylor University, the Reverend James Huckins, was a student under Francis Wayland at Brown University.[134] Moreover, one of Baylor's wartime presidents, William Carey Crane, counted Wayland as one of his many professional colleagues.[135]

A second possible explanation is Wayland's reputation in the field of moral science. In spite of the fact that he published textbooks in several different fields, the study of morality seemed to be very dear to his heart.[136] In the preface of his 1853 edition to *The Elements of Moral Science*, for instance, Wayland explained the goal of moral science to those who taught it. He declared, "It deserves also to be remarked, that

---

[134] Frederick Eby, "Education and Educators," in *Centennial Story of Texas Baptists*, ed. L. R. Elliott (Dallas: Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1936), 129-130.

[135]E. Bruce Thompson, "William Carey Crane and Texas Education," 406.

[136]Other textbooks by Wayland include *The Elements of Intellectual Philosophy* (1854) and *The Elements of Political Economy* (1837).

the end of the study of Moral Science is, to make men better. If in this respect it fail, it is at best useless. This should be continually borne in mind, by the instructor.[137] According to Crane, Wayland's reputation in the field of moral science came to define him, both in the minds of his contemporaries and in terms of his life's work. In spite of his work in other fields his contemporaries considered him "first of all a Christian moralist."[138]

The third plausible explanation for Baylor's use of Wayland's textbook is that the discussion on slavery only encompassed three pages out of 212. By contrast, Rivers devoted an entire 50-page chapter on slavery in his *Elements of Moral Philosophy*. A Southern professor using Wayland's textbook could have easily skipped over such a brief reference to slavery and still have had plenty of "acceptable" material to work with.

A final observation that might explain Baylor's use of Wayland's textbook is the most straightforward. Conrad James Engelder's observation is most instructive. He argues that both Northern and Southern ministers were cautious about their handling of the scriptural pronouncements about slavery. In his words, "Was it possible that the Bible, which was admittedly God's Sacred Word, could have erred so flagrantly? Neither side wished to charge Scriptures with errors, as the overwhelming majority of the clergy and laity accepted Holy Writ as God's infallible revelation to mankind."[139] According to Engelder, such a devastating identity crisis was averted rather simply: both

---

[137]Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science*, v-vi.

[138]Crane, *Francis Wayland*, 3.

[139]Conrad James Engelder, "The Churches and Slavery: A Study of the Attitudes Toward Slavery of the Majority Protestant Denominations" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1964), 16.

sides simply declared the other wrong.[140] No doubt, Baylor's professors and students could very well have done the same with regard to Wayland's text.

The creation of honorable men. The scholarship surrounding the nineteenth-century Southern college is consistent in its conclusion that the concept of honor loomed large in the minds of both faculty and students. Michael Sugrue's view of this has already been cited once in this chapter. According to Sugrue, a belief in honor was a central component of the worldview of the plantation class. Consequently, plantation owners expected colleges to train their sons in the ways of honor. The manner in which the rules of honor were taught took two forms—formal instruction in moral philosophy courses and extracurricular violence.[141] The role played by moral philosophy courses has already been covered sufficiently in this chapter. As to the role of violence, Sugrue suggests that the college served as training ground for future political leaders. On campus, as in the political arena of Southern politics, violence was seen as the honorable way for gentlemen to settle their differences. Examples of such violence offered in his analysis include dueling and caning. The actions of Preston Brooks, who had attended South Carolina College, are cited to illustrate this point.[142] Other scholars like Albea Godbold and E. Merton Coulter concur with Sugrue that the concept of honor defined a central characteristic of the plantation class's worldview. However, they are much more insistent that Southern college presidents wholeheartedly attempted to quash any

---

[140]Ibid.

[141]Sugrue, "'We Desired Our Future Rulers to be Educated Men,'" 96-98.

[142]Ibid., 99.

extracurricular violence on their campuses.[143] Robert F. Pace's research supports the contention that students often resorted to violence in defense of honor on Southern college campuses; however, he also argues that many positive actions resulted from the students' commitment to honor. He writes, "On the other side of the argument, however, is the fact that the code of honor was what made these students set and achieve academic goals."[144] The level of violence on the antebellum college campus is not necessarily relevant to this analysis. What is important to recognize is that these scholars all agree on one fundamental point: honor was considered an important virtue, and college life was thought to facilitate training in it.

In early August of 1900, the *Texas Christian Advocate* devoted nearly an entire edition to McKenzie College. Much of what appeared consisted of reminiscences of the college's president, J. W. P. McKenzie. They provide an interesting window into campus life at a pioneering Texas denominational college, especially as it relates to the importance of honor. One alumnus, M. H. Neely, recalled that students at McKenzie nicknamed their college president "Old Master," which was meant strictly as a term of endearment.[145] A common theme among these reminiscences was the Biblical story of the prodigal son. Used as a metaphor of their own experiences at McKenzie, these former students saw themselves as playing the role of the wayward son. Old Master was the father figure. One such alumnus was the Reverend E. A. Bailey. While recalling his story, the good Reverend declared, "I left South Carolina, my native State, in the spring

---

[143]E. Merton Coulter, *College Life in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951), 68; and Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South*, 172-175.

[144]Robert F. Pace, *Halls of Honor: College Men in the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 11.

[145]*Texas Christian Advocate* (Dallas), 2 August 1900.

of 1858, a veritable prodigal."[146] Bailey credited Reverend McKenzie with turning him into a proper young man. He wrote,

> He seemed to have special adaptation by grace and cult to guide youth to noble manhood. He took in boy nature by intuition, and knew when and how to appeal to the best in it. His wise methods of pruning and educating were simply marvelous. I never have seen his equal in 'taming' and 'breaking in' wild and spoiled boys, for which he made a reputation more than State wide and which afforded him amplest opportunity to display his remarkable skill in this difficult work; for many a sad father, as his only hope, took his prodigal to McKenzie Institute. And to the honor of Old Master, the father was rarely disappointed.[147]

B. F. Fuller's account of his college experience at McKenzie College expressed nearly identical sentiments. He recalled, "His school soon became known as the place to tame wild young men. His power to govern was unsurpassed. In those days of wild Western life, when parents utterly failed to govern their sons in their reckless tendencies, the common expression was, 'Send him to McKenzie. If he can't save him, he can't be saved.'"[148]

The value one should place in the recollections of alumni is, of course, debatable. It seems only natural that old men would look back fondly on the impetuous nature of youth. Perhaps Reverend John H. McLean reflected the need the South had for college-educated Southern gentlemen best when he said of J. W. P. McKenzie: "He was a Southern Christian gentleman of the old school—a type of manhood that will never be surpassed—and Methodist to the core in doctrine, polity and practice."[149] Note that

---

[146]Ibid.

[147]Ibid.

[148]Ibid.

[149]Ibid.

McLean stressed the fact that the Old Master was Southern, Christian, and a gentleman. To be sure, Southerners equated gentlemen with the concept of honor.

The catalogs of many Texas denominational colleges reflected the importance of honor as well as the recognition that students were often inclined to violence in defense of it. In its 1860-61 annual catalog, for example, the McKenzie College administration admitted that its student body reflected a contradiction; that is, that students were both gentlemen and prone to misbehavior. It read,

> Other institutions, it is true, whose students regard it as a privilege to revel *ad libitum*, can boast of never having cases of discipline; but whilst McKenzie Institute is most fortunately located, and we conscientiously believe no other school of the country can boast of so orderly, well-disposed, and gentlemanly classes of students, the Principal has to regret serious difficulties in the administration of law.[150]

Summarizing its goal regarding the molding of young men, the McKenzie College administration observed that "the effort is to make gentlemen first, and then scholars if possible."[151] One of the difficulties in maintaining order involved the presence of weapons on campus. The college was aware of the propensity of students to resort to violence in defense of honor. The last law in its code of laws stated, "A student, on entrance, will be furnished with a copy of the laws of the College; and, after reading them, he will be required to deliver up to the President all fire-arms, or weapons of any kind, in his possession, to be returned at the close of the College year."[152] Soule University's catalog expressed a similar state of affairs. In order to be admitted, prospective students were required to take the following pledge, which read in part: "I

---

[150]McKenzie College, *Annual Catalogue, 1860-61*, 13.

[151]Ibid., 14.

[152]Ibid., 19.

hereby pledge myself, upon my honor as a gentleman, strictly to conform to all the laws, rules and regulations of the Soule University, during my connection with it as a Student; . . .and I hereby certify that I have delivered to the President all of my concealed weapons."[153] With regard to the reliance on violence to settle questions of honor, many Texas students shared the same worldview with their fellow students across the South.

Texas Denominational College Literary Societies and the Question of Slavery

The formal curriculum by no means defined the typical antebellum denominational college entirely. Extra-curricular activities, especially participation in student literary societies, were defining elements of campus life. Scholars are divided, however, on the question of whether or not school officials welcomed or cursed the presence of these societies on campus. Frederick Rudolph suggests that "the societies existed with the approval of college authorities, who generally provided the space necessary for society activities and even arranged the hours of the regular course of study to accommodate those activities."[154] In Rudolph's analysis, literary societies were welcomed as complementary components to the formal curriculum. Students were able to do in literary societies that which they were not allowed to do in normal classroom instruction, namely, express themselves. He writes, "The literary societies were testing grounds for those purposes of the college that could not be examined in the regular course of study—character, leadership, imagination, self-reliance—and therefore were surely construed by college authorities as fulfilling in action what the senior course in

[153]Soule University, *Catalogue, 1859-60*, 12.

[154]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), 97.

moral philosophy could provide only in theory and guidance."[155] By contrast, Coulter's research suggests that these societies may not have been altogether welcomed by presidents and faculty. He asserts, "The professors were also a little jealous of the part the societies were playing in the life and affections of the students—there was danger that the side shows were becoming more attractive than the big tent."[156]

From the point of view of the students, literary societies were not merely light-hearted diversions from the rigors of college life. On the contrary, "the business of the societies was carried on with great seriousness; when members entered the dignified halls of these organizations they were expected to forget that one of their chief delights in college was to break rules."[157] This was certainly the case in Texas. The constitution, by-laws, and regulations of McKenzie College's Philologian Society and Dialectic Society show that adherence to rules loomed large in the life of these two organizations. In article III of the Philologian Society constitution, for example, a student was eligible to attain membership only after reading the constitution, by-laws, and regulations.[158] Officers of the society, especially the president, were required to "rigidly adhere to the requisitions of the Constitution, By-Laws, and Regulations."[159] Indeed, detailed procedures were established to adjudicate rule breakers. Students could be fined or expelled. By-law fifteen declared, "The President shall assess a discretionary fine,

---

[155]Ibid., 97-98.

[156]Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 126.

[157]Ibid., 129.

[158]Philologian Society of McKenzie College, *Revision of the Constitution, By-Laws, and Regulation of the Philologian Society of McKenzie College Adopted April 7th, 1860* (Nashville: A. A. Stitt, 1860), 4.

[159]Ibid.

between five and twenty-five cents inclusive, for any violation or neglect of duty under the Constitution, By-Laws, or Regulations, for inexcusable absence, failure in performances, or for any known improprieties, whether enumerated or not."[160] On May 12, 1860, for example, the Baylor University Philomathesian Literary Society fined one of its members twenty-five cents for leaving the room without permission.[161]

Some offences were deemed far more serious. By-law seventeen of the McKenzie College Philologian Society outlined offenses which subjected a member to suspension or expulsion. A member could be suspended or expelled "for habitual absence, non-payment of indebtedness within required time, ungovernable temper during exercises, and illegal disclosures."[162] Very few offenses were more serious than violating the veil of secrecy that surrounded literary societies. According to Coulter, secrecy was one of their most cherished characteristics. He writes,

> The great patron of the societies, their aegis, greater even than Demosthenes, was the goddess Secrecy. What could be more desirable, more interesting, more intriguing than to know something that others did not know—to constantly remind them that there were things that they did not know! The secrets themselves might be inconsequential; the fact that they were secrets was all-important.[163]

Like the Philologian Society, McKenzie College's Dialectic Society took the need for secrecy very seriously. By-law twenty-six insisted that "the disclosure of the name of a

---

[160]Ibid., 10.

[161]Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University, Philomathesian Minute-Book from October 14th 1859 to February 18th 1868, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

[162]Philologian Society of McKenzie College, *Revision of the Constitution, By-Laws, and Regulation of the Philologian Society of McKenzie College*, 11.

[163]Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 105-106.

rejected petitioner for membership, or the willful divulgence of any private matters, shall be an expellable offence."[164]

One primary purpose of student literary societies was to hone the skills of debate and oratory. Regarding the issue of slavery, Coulter suggests that "the great slavery debate, which began vigorously in the 'thirties and did not end until the Civil War intervened, was carried on in the halls of Phi Kappas and Demosthenians scarcely less than in the halls of Congress."[165] This was the case at Baylor University. On October 29, 1859, for instance, the Philomathesian Literary Society debated the following question: "Does Mechanical invention improve the laboring Class?"[166] By "laboring class" they most likely included slaves. Verbatim notes of the debate do not exist; therefore, it is difficult to know what was said. It should be noted that the minutes did not record final votes; rather, society records listed "disputants." A certain number of disputants were listed as having argued in the affirmative, and a certain number of disputants were listed as having argued in the negative. In most cases, there was the same number of disputants on each side of the argument. Even on controversial issues, the Philomathesian Society at Baylor attempted to present balance in the debate. They also debated the question of equality. On March 31, 1860, the following issue was debated: "Resolved that the clause in the declaration of Independence which says that all men are created free and equal

---

[164]Dialectic Society of M'Kenzie College, *The Constitution and By-Laws of the Dialectic Society of M'Kenzie College; Together with a Catalogue of the Honorary and Regular Members for 1859-1860* (Nashville: A. A. Stitt, 1860), 10.

[165]Coulter, *College Life in the Old South*, 122.

[166]Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University, Minute Book. Incorrect and inconsistent use of proper capitalization reflects the hand-written minutes.

with certain unalienable rights is not strictly true."[167] Race was evidently at the heart of many issues debated at their meetings. At the November 3, 1861, meeting, debate on the following statement took place: "That the whites were justifiable in driving the Indians from America."[168] Records of this debate show that there were six disputants arguing in the affirmative and five in the negative.[169] Whether these numbers constituted a vote of some kind is not clear. The question of abolitionism did not escape attention either. On May 12, 1860, the Society debated the following statement: "Resolved that Abolitionists be permitted to promulgate their principles South."[170] This was not the first time that Baylor's literary societies pondered the issues of abolitionism. In July 1854, Robert Hay Taliaferro was invited to speak before a joint meeting of the Erosophian Society and the Philomathesian Society. The topic of his address was not abolitionism; however, he made his sentiments known:

> Southerners had refused to read the dull, dreamy books of theorizing abolitionists; or if, perchance, they met an abolition lecture in their newspaper, it was either unread, or read with scornful indifference. Even up North abolitionism had fallen below par, and the community was loathing the evil fruit produced by slanderous publications. Why, then, was 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' read by North and South—by Europe and America? All of its sentiments had been proclaimed, year after year, by abolitionists till the ear had grown dull of hearing such cold-blooded libels. Why then should this book of glaring falsehoods, of baseless caricatures, of disunion tendencies, make resistless headway against the strongest opposition, rekindled the fires of fanaticism, arouse civil discord, shake the pillars of government and compel, during the present session even learned legislators to recall its enthusiasm amidst the Nebraska controversy? By what means did it produce these alarming effects? Mrs. Stone [*sic*] accomplished this by *embodying*

---

[167]Ibid.

[168]Ibid.

[169]Ibid.

[170]Ibid.

> *abolitionism in living characters, by personating its sentiments, and by vitalizing its arguments with intense activity*.[171]

Taliaferro was well known in Baptist as well as political circles. His public accomplishments included work as a minister, an author, and a chaplain. He helped to organize Austin's First Baptist Church, and he served as a chaplain to the military and to the Texas Constitutional Convention in 1875. In 1848 he published his *Evidences of Christianity*.[172] Taliaferro's biography might well explain why he was invited to speak at Baylor. However, his comments on abolitionism also indicate that students had many opportunities to consider divisive political arguments.

Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes's argument is instructive in the case of the Philomathesian debates at Baylor, namely, that "the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it is done."[173] To be sure, none of the questions posed by the students touched directly on the question of the legality or morality of slavery. However, when understood in the context of the times, questions relating to the so-called laboring class, race, equality, and abolitionism strike very close to the heart of that issue.

Texas Denominational Colleges and Native Education

Calls for parents to send their children to Southern colleges and universities occurred in Texas just as they had in other Southern states. This fact once again demonstrates a fundamental tenet of this chapter; namely, that Randolph Campbell is

---

[171]R. H. Taliaferro, *An Oration Delivered at Baylor University Before the Erosophian and Philomathesian Societies* (Austin: "State Gazette" Job Office, 1854), 4-5. The author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was Harriet Beecher Stowe, not Stone.

[172]Tyler, Ron et al. eds., *The New Handbook of Texas*, vol. 6 (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996), 196.

[173]*Schenck v. United States*, 249 U.S. 47, 52 (1919).

correct in his assertion that Texas is best described as a Southern, not a Western state. A good example of this call for native education in Texas was found at Baylor University. In the context of the antebellum South, native education means an effort by educators and other community leaders to persuade Texans to give their support and patronage to Southern (and especially Texas) colleges and universities. Several of its catalogs in the 1850s explicitly highlighted the necessity for, and benefits of, a Texas education. Baylor's 1856, 1857, 1858, and 1859 catalogs expressed similar sentiments. The 1856 catalog declared,

> The Trustees see, with regret, the tendency with some Texians to patronize Northern or distant Colleges, instead of sustaining Institutions founded in their own State. It is evident however, that a young man educated in Texas, will have peculiar advantages, not only in forming many valuable acquaintances from every portion of the State during his Collegiate course, but in learning fully the habits, character and wants of the people with whom he is to live and act.[174]

If scholars like Stillman and Ezell are correct about the Home Education Movement, this statement by Baylor University was intended to be more than a mere advertising ploy; it was an expression of how leading Texas educators, like their fellow Southern brethren, felt about sending the youth of the South to Northern institutions. Notice in particular the phrase "character and wants of the people with whom he is to live and act." Southerners did not have to reference slavery specifically for everyone to know what they meant. To be sure, part of what was meant by this phrase was that Texas's youth would live and work in a slaveholding society. The South was, as they understood it, distinctive from the North. For Southern youth to be corrupted by Northern ideas—especially abolitionist ideas—was intolerable. In addition, the term "regret" was used to describe the current

[174]Baylor University, *Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas 1856* (Galveston: Civilian Book & Job Office, 1856), 18.

state of educational affairs in Texas. Baylor trustees and other Baptists regretted the fact that students often chose other schools. This meant a loss of tuition money, to be sure. However, Baylor's trustees, like many of their Southern cohorts, particularly regretted seeing Texas students leave the South.

In 1857, similar sentiments were expressed by the Baylor board of trustees; however, the language grew in intensity. The catalog that year noted, "It is a source of regret to see Texians patronizing Northern or distant colleges, where our youth will imbibe sentiments, habits and tastes antagonistic or alien to ours; when by giving Texas schools and colleges their patronage they would grow up and reflect glory and luster on our young and growing State."[175] That which Northern colleges and universities had to teach was described as "antagonistic or alien." This phrase expressed two ideas. First, the South was distinct from the North. Second, the North was hostile.

One final change in Baylor's message about a Texas education appeared in its 1858 catalog. It was a direct appeal to patriotism. The trustees reminded Texas parents of the following:

> And not only will our citizens be doing what is due from them to our Institutions of learning and to our political welfare, but a young man, educated in Texas will have peculiar advantages, inasmuch as he will form valuable acquaintances from all parts of the State while at college, and also learn fully the genius, the character and the wants of the people with whom he is to live.[176]

In other words, the political well-being of Texas was at stake. One way parents could help to preserve and protect Texas was to send them to a native college or university.

---

[175]Baylor University, *Fifth Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas, 1857* (Galveston: Civilian Book and Job Office, 1857), 19.

[176]Baylor University, *Seventh Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors, and Students, of Baylor University, Male Department, Independence, Texas, November 26, 1858* (Anderson: Texas Baptist Book and Job Office, 1858), 17.

Again, this may have been simply an advertising ploy; however, that explanation alone does not fully explain such phrases as "doing what is due." Given the political situation of the late 1850s, one must infer a deeper meaning. The Baylor board of trustees believed that attendance at a Texas university was an act of good citizenship. Students and parents owed it to their region—the South and Texas—to stay close to home.

Summation

The goal of this chapter was to examine the question of whether or not the debate over slavery made its way into the life of the antebellum Texas denominational college and university. With that in mind, it can be concluded that Texas denominational colleges and universities demonstrated many of the characteristics and propensities of other Southern institutions of the time. The proslavery argument was made directly and indirectly. It was made in some cases directly through the use of proslavery moral philosophy textbooks. It was made indirectly through the actions and words of college presidents and faculty, through the importance placed by students and faculty on the virtue of honor, through calls to parents to keep their sons and daughters in Texas rather than sending them to Northern schools, and through extracurricular activities such as student literary societies.

In his book *From Slavery to Freedom*, historian John Hope Franklin describes Southern colleges in the following terms: "This war of words [over slavery] became so bitter, and the atmosphere in the South so tense, that free inquiry and free speech disappeared there. People with points of view at variance with the accepted pro-slavery creed were run out of the South. The colleges became a hotbed of secession, and every

agency in the community was employed to defend slavery."[177] Unlike Franklin, the conclusions of this chapter make no attempt to judge the intensity of the debate over slavery at Texas colleges and universities. However, the evidence suggests that Texas institutions tolerated multiple viewpoints on campus. Franklin's assertion that free speech was quashed does not apply to these colleges and universities. Diversity of moral philosophy textbooks and student literary society debates indicate that multiple viewpoints were, at the very least, tolerated. This fact notwithstanding, there is little evidence to suggest that at these institutions there was a wide acceptance of abolitionism. The proslavery position dominated most campuses. Some campuses, however, defended the institution more vigorously than others.

In answer to the questions offered at the beginning of the chapter, then, the following can be concluded with certainty. First, Texas colleges and universities were, indeed, impacted by the debate over slavery. Second, they were not passive participants in the debate. On the contrary, the formal and informal curriculum directly addressed the issue. Finally, their position on this question reflected the proslavery argument. These conclusions confirm Adolphe E. Meyer's observation that "an understanding of the history of education evidently requires an understanding of the society which gave it being."[178] As it relates to the slavery question, the conformity between Texas society and its denominational colleges confirms this statement.

---

[177]John Hope Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), 263.

[178]Adolphe E. Meyer, *An Educational History of the American People* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957), xi.

CHAPTER FOUR

Texas Denominational Colleges and the Problem of Secession and Civil War

Introduction

The preceding chapter illustrated the importance of slavery to Southern cultural identity. A belief in Southern distinctiveness, especially with regard to a biracial society based on slavery, was the centerpiece of this identity. Increasing national tensions over slavery led Southerners to defend the institution on moral, religious, economic, and social grounds. The focus of that chapter was on the role played by Texas denominational colleges and universities in that defense. It was concluded that these educational institutions exhibited all of the identifiable characteristics of the so-called Southern curriculum. The importance of the classics, the defense of slavery in moral philosophy courses, and the importance of indoctrinating students in the tenets of honor were all described in detail. One important characteristic was left out of the discussion, namely, the political defense of slavery.

This chapter focuses primarily on this final component of the Southern curriculum. Two questions are asked. The primary question is: In what ways did Texas denominational colleges and universities express support for or opposition to secession. Special attention is placed on the formal curriculum. However, the views of college administrators and the extracurricular activities of students are also included. The second question relates to the result of the secession movement, the Civil War. The question here is: In what ways did Texas denominational colleges and universities promote Confederate nationalism.

An entire chapter devoted to the political ideas taught by Texas denominational colleges and universities is warranted for the simple fact that when Southern states actually seceded from the Union beginning in December 1860, they justified their actions in political terms. The first state to secede was South Carolina. Its Secession Convention convened on December 17, 1860, in the Baptist Church in Columbia.[1] In his opening address, the president of the Convention stated the matter in explicitly political, if not revolutionary, terms. He said, "It is no less than our fixed determination to throw off a Government to which we have been accustomed, and to provide new safeguards for our future security."[2]

By creating the Confederate States of America, Southerners put their political ideas into action. The Confederacy was the greatest expression of their belief in Southern distinctiveness. It was, for them, a distinct government for a distinct nation. On April 8, 1861, the South Carolina Secession Convention ratified an ordinance designed to connect the destiny of its state with that of the Confederate States of America. It read,

> *We, the People of South Carolina, now met and sitting in Convention, do hereby ordain*: That the Provisional Constitution for the Confederate States of America, framed and agreed to by our deputies, at the City of Montgomery, in the State of Alabama, on the _____ day of February last, be, and it is hereby, accepted and ratified; and that the Government organized in pursuance thereof is hereby approved and made valid, according to the terms of limitation expressed in said Constitution.[3]

Reference to the physical and financial impact of the Civil War on denominational colleges in Texas is included where applicable; however, the primary

---

[1]State of South Carolina, Convention of the People of South Carolina, *Journal of the Convention of the People of South Carolina, Held in 1860, 1861 and 1862, Together with the Ordinances, Reports, Resolutions, Etc.* (Columbia: R. W. Gibbes, Printer to the Convention, 1862), 3.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., 774. The original source places blanks in front of the word "day."

focus is on Confederate nationalism and the role played by Texas denominational colleges and universities in promoting it. The importance of nationalism in human affairs is explained very well by Leon P. Baradat. He argues that it "calls on people to identify with the interests of their national group and to support the creation of a state—a nation-state—to support those interests."[4] Moreover, nationalism encourages and sometimes demands that people become direct participants in the endeavors of the state. Historically this has often led people down destructive or constructive paths.[5]

Texas Denominational Colleges and the Question of Secession

Slavery was the defining element of Southerners' belief in their distinctiveness from the rest of the United States. So central was slavery, in fact, that historian James Marten concludes, "By 1860, southerners and Texans had for a generation enforced loyalty to the South. Men who challenged slavery—whether they hailed from the North or the South—were silenced, exiled, or, in extreme cases, killed."[6] With the advent of the secession crisis, many Texans increasingly saw defense of secession as synonymous with defense of slavery. Martin observes that "men who opposed secession could be labeled abolitionists and were subject to the same sorts of sanctions and violence as any other traitor to southern communities."[7] One of the best case studies of vigilantism in Texas is Richard B. McCaslin's *Tainted Breeze*. Its focus is on the so-called Great Hanging at

---

[4]Leon P. Baradat, *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 9th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006), 42.

[5]Ibid., 43.

[6]James Marten, *Texas Divided: Loyalty and Dissent in the Lone Star Sate, 1856-1874* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990), 16.

[7]Ibid., 17.

Gainesville, Texas, in 1862. In October some 200 individuals suspected of Unionism were arrested and put on trial for treason and inspiring rebellion. In Gainesville alone, vigilantes hanged some forty-two of these individuals. Similar events occurred in the neighboring counties of Grayson, Wise, and Denton.[8] McCaslin echoes Marten's conclusion that in the eyes of loyal Confederates, Unionism was synonymous with abolitionism; it was also considered treasonous. "Few of the victims [of vigilante justice in Gainesville] had plotted to usurp Confederate authority, and most were innocent of the abolitionist sentiments of which they were accused," he writes, "but their pleas made little difference."[9]

Billy Don Ledbetter's work argues that the perceived connection between Unionism and abolitionism existed only in the minds of the secessionists. He claims, "Texans, even those who placed the Union before slavery in the secession crisis, believed that God intended the Negro to be a subordinate race to the white."[10] Regarding the issue of slavery specifically, Ledbetter argues that "the majority of Texans who opposed immediate secession were ardent advocates of slavery, but they believed that the institution was safe in the Union."[11] It must be remembered, therefore, that the conclusion reached in the last chapter that Texas denominational colleges exhibited all the major characteristics of a proslavery position should not be taken to mean that these

---

[8]Richard B. McCaslin, *Tainted Breeze: The Great Hanging at Gainesville, Texas, 1862* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994), 1.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Billy Don Ledbetter, "Slavery, Fear, and Disunion in the Lone Star State: Texans' Attitudes Toward Secession and the Union, 1846-1861" (Ph.D. diss., North Texas State University, 1972), 16.

[11]Ibid., 233.

colleges were also inherently secessionist in their outlook. They may or may not have been. It is to this question that the discussion now turns.

College Boards, Secession, and Confederate Nationalism

Many scholars have investigated the impact of secession and civil war on Texas denominational colleges and universities. Their assessments are mixed. Guy Nelson's investigation of Baylor University during the Civil War concludes that there was "a staunch Confederate spirit at the University."[12] Nelson's research on Baylor's adoption of Confederate nationalism is perhaps the most complete work done to date. His overall conclusion is made without hesitation: "Baylor joined in the determination to maintain the institution of slavery and the sovereignty of the several states. In every way, Baylor entered into the spirit of the Confederacy."[13] Lois Smith Murray argues that the members of the Baylor Board of Trustees were well aware of the political situation which surrounded them at the time of secession. Her analysis indicates that there was more caution and less fervor for secession and war at Baylor. The board, she writes, "felt the urgency of proceeding with as much normality as possible."[14] However, she does acknowledge the fact that 151 male students and several faculty members left Baylor in 1861 to join the Confederate army.[15] Alan J. Lefever's biographical research on Benajah Harvey Carroll, who served as Baylor's president from 1886 to 1907, highlights the fact that not all of those students were necessarily staunch Confederates. In 1861 the young

---

[12]Guy Nelson, Jr., "Baylor University at Independence: The War Years: 1861-65," *Texana* 2 (Summer 1964): 87.

[13]Ibid., 89.

[14]Lois Smith Murray, *Baylor at Independence* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 1972), 197.

[15]Ibid., 208.

Carroll was one of the 151 students who left Baylor to join the armed service. He joined the Texas Rangers.[16] Describing Carroll's political views at the time, Lefever writes, "B. H. Carroll strongly believed in the Union and, according to his brother, would have preferred fighting for the Union; but he joined a regiment of Rangers, along with some of his brothers, to protect the Texas frontier."[17] In other words, the fact that most eligible Baylor students joined the Confederate army does not, in and of itself, indicate their true political views. Advocacy of Confederate nationalism at Baylor was much more complex than Nelson's research indicates.

In the main, however, most scholars who have researched the history of Baylor and its leaders during the secession crisis affirm Nelson's conclusion. The spirit of Confederate nationalism was, indeed, quite high. Margaret R. Vaughan's research on William Carey Crane, who became president of Baylor in 1864, suggests that he, like many Southerners in the mid-1840s, was committed to the Union. She writes, "He was a Whig. He opposed secession, and he believed that the South's strength and influence were best protected within the Federal Union established by the Constitution."[18] Following Lincoln's election, and most likely because of it, Crane became a loyal Confederate.[19] Baylor University's namesake, Judge R. E. B. Baylor, publicly expressed his Confederate nationalism. Judge Baylor's biographer, Eugene W. Baker, notes that at the 1862 meeting of the Union Baptist Association, Baylor was part of a committee

---

[16] Alan J. Lefever, *Fighting the Good Fight: The Life and Work of Benajah Harvey Carroll* (Austin, TX: Eakin Press, 1994), 12-13.

[17]Ibid., 13.

[18]Margaret R. Vaughan, "William Carey Crane and the Sectional Conflict," (M.A. thesis, Baylor University, 1968), 10-11.

[19]Ibid., 12.

designated to study how churches and their members should properly respond to the North's war against the South. Regarding the work of the committee, Baker argues that "the report of Baylor's committee attempted to awake the patriotic spirit that was resting in the hearts of most of the Baptists across Texas."[20] In his biography of Baylor University co-founder James Huckins, Baker recounts a similar story. Huckins was in Charleston, South Carolina to witness Confederate forces fire upon Fort Sumter. One month later he was sent to the Southern Baptist Convention in Savannah as a delegate.[21] At this convention the committee on the state of the country "recommended the adoption of resolutions vindicating the actions of the South in withdrawing from the Union and tendered the support of the denomination to the cause of the Confederacy."[22] Historian Fredrick Dobney argues that after Fort Sumter, Texas Baptists gave strong support for Confederate nationalism. He writes, "A revealing case study provided by an examination of the Southern Baptists in Texas during the Civil War indicates that that denomination became virtually an extension of the Confederate government in the fields of propaganda and morale."[23] Given the close ties between Baylor University and Texas Baptists, both legally and psychologically, it is very likely that Guy Nelson's argument that a strong Confederate nationalism was felt on campus, especially after secession, is correct.

---

[20]Eugene W. Baker, *In His Traces: The Life and Times of R. E. B. Baylor* (Waco: Baylor University, 1996), 241-242.

[21] Eugene W. Baker, *Nothing Better Than This: The Biography of James Huckins, First Baptist Missionary to Texas* (Waco: Baylor University, 1985), 128-129.

[22]Ibid., 129.

[23]Fredrick J. Dobney, "From Denominationalism to Nationalism in the Civil War: A Case Study," *Texana* 9, no. 4 (1971): 367.

Methodist institutions were also touched by the politics of secession and Civil War. Rutersville College is one example. In the history of Texas higher education, Rutersville has the distinction of being one of the pioneering institutions. Historian Ernest Wallace calls it "the first 'college' worthy of the designation [in Texas]."[24] Although research surrounding Rutersville is limited, Wallace contends that at its inception it was well positioned to become the preeminent higher educational institution in Texas. In addition to receiving one of the earliest charters from the Congress of the Republic, it was also granted four leagues of land. Moreover, at its head was the well-known Methodist educational leader Chauncey Richardson.[25] In spite of this promising start, trouble soon enveloped Rutersville. Scholars cite several challenges faced by the college, including the war with Mexico, conflict with Native Americans, and competition from other denominational colleges.[26] Donald Whisenhunt mentions Baylor University specifically as a major source of competition.[27] His research also indicates that in 1856, Rutersville, as such, was no longer operating. Rather, its educational efforts were continued through a merger with two other institutions: the Texas Monumental Institute and the Texas Military Institute. The result was the Texas Monumental and Military Institute.[28] However, there is evidence which suggests that Whisenhunt's account of Rutersville's fate is not completely accurate. As late as February 25, 1861, the board of

---

[24]Ernest Wallace, ed., *Documents of Texas History* (Austin: Steck Company, Publishers, 1963), 138.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Wallace, *Documents of Texas History*, 138; Donald W. Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historical Profile* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1986), 109.

[27]Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities*, 109.

[28]Ibid.

trustees minutes for this school referred to the board as the "Board of Trustees of the Rutersville College & Texas Military Institute."[29] Since Rutersville College was still listed by name in the historical record at least up to 1861, this study will consider it a Methodist institution, its true legal relationship with the Texas Military Institute notwithstanding.

The question of secession and war was evident at the Texas Military Institute. The response to these events by students and college leaders indicates that the school was firmly in favor of secession and also resolutely supportive of Confederate nationalism. At its April 29, 1861, board meeting, the superintendent reported the following:

> The superintendent reports to the Board of Trustees That the news of the day—The call for troops to defend the country have become so exciting as to render study among the cadets almost impossible. The whole corps applied in a petition to the superintendent to disband the school so that they might go to their homes to enlist in the service. The demand for such service as they are capable of rendering, with the exception of a few of the youngest, is such that I desire it proper that their prayer should be responded to; and after advising with the President of the Board & as many members as practicable, I have this day disbanded the Corps. . . assembling them to duty of valor in defense of our rights so ruthlessly assailed.[30]

As was the case at Baylor, students in large numbers appealed to college officials to be released from their educational responsibilities to join the Confederate army. The superintendent's call on the cadets "to duty of valor in defense of our rights so ruthlessly assailed" was very indicative of the language used by so many secessionists. Louis T. Wigfall would most certainly have applauded it.[31] The timing of this report was also

---

[29]Rutersville College, Minutes of Board of Trustees, 1853-1867, Rutersville College Records, 1835-1885, Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin.

[30]Ibid. Minutes are hand written. Quotation follows capitalization and punctuation as closely as can be determined from them.

[31]Eric H. Walther identifies Wigfall as a so-called fire-eater. He was a native of South Carolina and later a United States senator from Texas. Relying on the definition provided by noted historian Ulrich

indicative of strong support for secession and a strong sense of Confederate nationalism. That is to say, it was submitted *after* Texas had formally seceded. Secession and the Confederacy had become fact; they were no longer the subject of theoretical speculation.

In spite of the enthusiasm expressed by the students for secession and war, as indicated by their excitement for joining the Confederate army, parents were often less enthusiastic. In September, 1861, for instance, one parent of a Soule University student wrote to his son:

> I am truly glad you are at School in Chappell Hill, for if you were here the boys would let you see no rest until you would consent to go to the war, not that I would want to stifle the feeling of patriotism in my son; so far from it I am proud of that high and correct appreciation of the blessings of liberty & free government you have that makes you willing to hazard life itself in their defense.[32]

The parent seemed relieved to have his son in college where he was safe from the ravages of war. At the same time, he was proud of his son's willingness to support the Southern cause.

It is important to remember that not all Texans were secessionists. James Marten is one historian who seeks to dispel that idea. "If few Texans actually advocated the eradication of slavery," he writes, "many opposed the more extreme strategies for preserving it."[33] It is, in fact, from scholars working in the field of Texas history like Marten where much of the understanding about the opponents of secession is derived. Many of these opponents found a home at denominational colleges and universities.

B. Phillips, Walther defines a fire-eater as anyone who consistently promoted Southern secession from the Union during the antebellum period. See Eric H. Walther, *The Fire-Eaters* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 2, 178-179.

[32]Anonymous letter to a student in Soule University, 26 September 1861, Special Collections, A. Frank Smith Jr., Library Center, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas. This document is hand written. Quotation follows capitalization and punctuation as closely as can be determined from it.

[33]Marten, *Texas Divided*, 4.

Austin College in Huntsville is one example of how the political divisions over secession made their way into denominational college life. Like Baylor and Rutersville, this Presbyterian institution saw many of its students leave their studies behind for military service. In his recent history of Austin College, Light Townsend Cummins suggests that of those students who fought in the Civil War, nearly all of them fought for the Confederacy.[34] One of Austin's noted faculty members was also a staunch secessionist before the war and a well-known Southern apologist for the Southern cause after the war. His name was Benjamin Franklin Grady. He enlisted in the Confederate army in his native state of North Carolina in 1862. He achieved fame after the war through his writings, which included *The Case of the South Against the North* and *The South's Burden: The Curse of Sectionalism in the United States*.[35] According to Cummins, Grady's books offered an unapologetic Southern interpretation of the war, even going so far as to blame the North for the conflict.[36] Another notable secessionist associated with Austin College was Texas Supreme Court justice Royal T. Wheeler. Austin's 1855-1856 catalog lists him as professor of law.[37] As noted in the last chapter, Wheeler was also connected to the Baylor law department. Nelson writes of Wheeler that he "condemned the election of Lincoln and put forth a vigorous call for secession."[38]

---

[34]Light Townsend Cummins, *Austin College: A Sesquicentennial History, 1849-1999* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1999), 62.

[35]Ibid., 60-61.

[36]Ibid., 61.

[37]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academical Year 1855-6* (Houston: Fairbairn & McClellan, 1856), n.p.

[38]Nelson, "Baylor at Independence," 87.

Opposition to secession was also evident at Austin College. According to Cummins, Presbyterian minister William M. Baker, who was the son of Austin College founder Daniel Baker, was very much opposed to secession. Indeed, his anti-secessionist views along with his support of Abraham Lincoln forced him to leave his church and move to New England.[39] Former Austin College student Leonidas J. Storey is also mentioned by Cummins for his opposition to secession; however, he notes that Storey eventually came to support the Confederacy after secession became official.[40]

The most famous opponent of secession associated with Austin College was, of course, Sam Houston.[41] Houston was a charter member of the board of trustees. He served on the board from 1849 to 1863. Not only did Houston live near the College, but he was also in attendance when the cornerstone of its first permanent building was laid.[42] Historian George Landolt suggests that Houston's presence on the board may have muted Confederate enthusiasm on campus. He writes,

> Soon after Texas voted to secede from the Union and join the Confederacy, the call for volunteers to support the South was answered by most of the upper classmen at Austin College. At first there was a feeling of the faculty and the members of the Board of Trustees that Texas should stay out of the conflict. However, after Sam Houston was deposed from the governorship, all opposition disappeared and even Houston gave his son, Sam, permission to join the Confederate Army.[43]

---

[39]Cummins, *Austin College*, 61.

[40]Ibid.

[41]One of the most complete studies documenting Sam Houston's Unionism is written by Lorayne Miller Doegey. In it she attempts to emphasize this particular aspect of Houston's public life. See, for example, Lorane Miller Doegey, "Sam Houston: Southern Spokesman for the Cause of Union" (Ph.D. diss., Southern Illinois University, 1968), 2.

[42]George L. Landolt, *Search for the Summit: Austin College Through XII Decades, 1849-1970* (Austin: Von Boeckman-Jones Co., 1970), 41-42.

[43]Ibid., 235-236.

Although overtly secessionist and pro-Confederate language is absent from the Austin College board meetings, the evidence indicates that the board regularly expressed support for Confederate nationalism throughout the war years. Such nationalism is evident in both what was said and what was not said. In the president's annual report to the board, which was submitted at the June 28, 1861, meeting, the president of Austin College commented at length about the challenges, especially financial, faced by the College as a result of the Civil War.[44] Cummins notes the financial concerns voiced in this report in great detail.[45] Indeed, almost every institutional history written about Texas denominational colleges during the Civil War period makes similar observations about the financial crisis that befell these institutions during that time. These observations are not, as such, important to this study. More important is the language used in the board's records to describe the political state of affairs. Such language is easily missed, as it is often very subtle. In the case of President Bailey, for instance, he submitted his report just over four months to the day that the Texas Ordinance of Secession was approved by Texans at the ballot box. Calling upon the board to meet the challenges wrought by war, he reminded them, "It is the fate of all Institutions like this—especially in a new country—to pass through the various dangers & changes from infancy to the strength of mature life, & it often requires the same spirit of perseverance in its conservators as we exercise in our own personal interests—never to despair."[46] His sentiments indicate that

---

[44]Rufus W. Bailey, Annual Report of the President, June 28, 1861, in Records of the Board of Trustees of Austin College, April 5, 1850 to May 29, 1912, College Archives and Special Collections, Abell Library Center, Austin College, Sherman, Texas. This document is hand written. Quotation follows capitalization and punctuation as closely as can be determined from it.

[45]Cummins, *Austin College*, 58-59.

[46]Bailey, Annual Report of the President, June 28, 1861, 140.

he was accepting of the Confederacy. His use of the phrase "new country" was obviously a reference to the Confederacy, and he gave no indication that he lamented its creation. Moreover, he reminded the board that the challenges faced by Austin College were shared by other institutions. All of them—Austin College and all other colleges—were part of the same struggle.

President Bailey's report to the board on September 3, 1862, was on the one hand somber and on the other hand hopeful. The preceding year had not been a good one for Austin College. Its operations were suspended by the board, the faculty and president resigned, and the use of the college building was given to a private school.[47] The school was run by Benjamin Franklin Grady and had no official connection to Austin College. It did achieve some level of success.[48] Its impact on Austin College was not as positive, however. In his report to the board, Bailey noted that "they [the board] have permitted the College Building to be used as authorized by a resolution of the Board for the accommodation of a school in which it has suffered more than might reasonably have been expected."[49] In spite of all these challenges, Bailey remained determined. He appealed to the board to do what was necessary to "sustain this cherished Institution for the Church and the Country."[50] Referring to Austin College's role in society, the president asserted, "A school is now needed to meet the wants of the community—and

---

[47]Rufus W. Bailey, Annual Report, September 3, 1862, in Records of the Board of Trustees of Austin College, 147-148.

[48]Cummins, *Austin College*, 60.

[49]Bailey, Annual Report, September 3, 1862, 148.

[50]Ibid., 149.

The Country."[51] These statements connected college and country, the Confederate States of America. He was conscious of the impact of the Civil War on Austin College—its students, its finances, and its physical plant—but at no time did he express regret, anger, or despair over the fact that the United States of America was being torn apart by war. At the least, it appears that Austin College officials passively accepted secession, war, and Confederate nationalism. At most, they were wholeheartedly supportive of them.

One of the recurring themes of the current study is that denominational colleges and universities in Texas, like all schools, exist as part of the communities in which they operate. As such, it was very difficult for these institutions to run counter to community values. The level of the Austin College board's commitment to Confederate nationalism, though hard to estimate, is seen briefly at the end of the Civil War. In its June 29, 1865, meeting, President Samuel McKinney mourned the passing of the Confederacy. In his report to the board, he wrote, "I am pleased to meet you again convened as you are to look after and foster the interests of this College. However vain the many cherished hopes we entertained respecting our country, this institution still lives the object of so many prayers, and earnest efforts of so noble hearts and wise heads to cultivate the minds of the youth of the country."[52] Although McKinney could very well have been referring to the United States of America, this is unlikely. Given the support for Confederate nationalism during the war years mentioned above, it seems more likely that the "cherished hopes" he was referring to related to the Confederate States of America. The meeting, took place just over two months after Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox.

---

[51]Ibid.

[52]Samuel McKinney, Annual Address of the President, June 29, 1865, in Records of the Board of Trustees of Austin College, 163.

The defeat of the Confederacy was very fresh in the board's collective mind, as it surely was in McKinney's. More illuminating than the timing of McKinney's comments is what he did not write in his report. There is no praise for the restoration of the United States of America. There is no condemnation of the Confederacy for the trauma it wrought on Austin College during the war years. There is only regret that the Confederacy failed.

McKinney's comments have another story to tell. Even though he did not offer praise or celebration for the restoration of the United States of America, McKinney did not specifically condemn it. For McKinney, the end of the war, whatever it meant for the United States and for the Confederacy, was less important than a return to the business at hand, namely, education. He wrote enthusiastically, "A new Epoch opens in the history of the College. A large number of young men have recently returned from camp, and are anxious to avail themselves of the advantages here afforded. The question of deepest interest is: how shall we realize most efficiently the possible expectations?"[53] The response by denominational colleges to Reconstruction is the subject of the next chapter. However, the apparent enthusiasm for continuing Austin College's mission indicates two things. First, it demonstrates that denominational colleges in Texas adapted themselves very well to all political realities. In this case, the political reality was that the Confederacy was dead, and the United States of America had prevailed. There was no time for much regret. Second, it demonstrates that while political affairs were important to these colleges, they never lost sight of their true calling—education.

[53]Ibid., 164.

Secession, States Rights, and the Curriculum

The beliefs about secession, Civil War, and Confederate nationalism expressed by college boards, presidents, and even parents, though instructive, are not the only way to gauge support for these things. Most institutional histories focus on the impact of the secession crisis of 1860-61 on colleges and universities. Loss of students to the armed forces and financial struggles are often cited as the main challenges during the war. However, these histories often fail to take into account the role played by the antebellum college curriculum in molding the views on secession. That is to say, they fail to recognize that higher education was a participant in the debate over secession, not simply a victim of it. It is the curriculum that defines an institution over the long term, not just in a single moment in time. What colleges and universities teach represents their heart and soul. It defines them more conclusively than anything else. The focus of the last chapter was on the textbooks used in moral philosophy courses. In this chapter, the focus is on the textbooks used in courses typically entitled "Constitution of the United States" or something similar. Such courses were the nineteenth-century equivalent of "American Government" or "Political Science" taught in most Texas colleges and universities today.[54] It is here where students were taught the underlying principles of American government as well as the basic theory of American federalism.

[54]For the sake of clarity, it is important to repeat here the statement made in the last chapter about college textbooks: College catalogs of the period listed authors and titles of textbooks used in the curriculum. They did not typically list specific editions or dates of publication. Many books, of course, went through several editions. Consequently, it is difficult to say with exact accuracy which edition of these texts was used at any given time. Nonetheless, it is assumed for the purposes of this study that an author's views and conclusions did not change dramatically from one edition to the next. Therefore, it is believed that regardless of which specific edition was used, the textbooks cited in this chapter are a solid reflection of what students would have been asked to read.

The antebellum period was a time in American history in which political parties, presidents, legal scholars, Supreme Court judges, and others attempted to define the nature of American federalism. From the adoption of the U.S. Constitution to the secession of South Carolina in late 1860, this debate was conducted as a war of words. A review of Texas denominational college and university catalogs from the 1840s and 1850s indicates that at many schools the senior year program of study included one class focusing on the U.S. Constitution. Instruction in the history and meaning of the Constitution drew students into this debate in a very direct way.

Joseph Story is particularly important because many students in Texas read his textbooks as part of their coursework. In his own day, he was recognized by nearly everyone as a highly accomplished legal scholar. His reputation has not diminished in the years since his death in 1845. Historian Bernard Schwartz writes that Story was "the most learned scholar ever to sit on the Supreme Court."[55] Mortimer D. Schwartz and John C. Hogan likewise recognize Story's status as a legal scholar, highlighting specifically his commentaries on law. According to their research, his published works number in excess of thirty.[56]

Both Baylor University and Soule University used works by Story in the antebellum years. The curriculums at both schools included a course entitled "Constitution of the United States," and both schools listed Story's text as required

---

[55]Bernard Schwartz, *A History of the Supreme Court* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 59.

[56]Mortimer D. Schwartz and John C. Hogan, eds., *Joseph Story: A Collection of Writings by and About an Eminent American Jurist* (New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1959), 7, 221-224.

reading.[57] Neither catalog listed the exact title or edition; therefore, it is not possible to say with any certainty which of Story's many books on the Constitution was actually used. However, many of his published works were written specifically for use in schools. For the purpose of this study, therefore, Story's *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States: Containing a Brief Commentary on Every Clause, Explaining the True Nature, Reasons, and Objects thereof; Designed for the Use of School Libraries and General Readers* (1852) will be used. In addition, analysis of this work will be limited to those portions particularly relevant to the antebellum debate over secession, states' rights, and the meaning of American federalism.

Taken as a whole, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States* was a work that would have likely pleased Texas Unionists, Whigs, and various other dissenters from the secessionist movement.[58] It was what one might expect from Story, given his judicial nationalism.[59] His analysis of the Constitution began with a brief history of its antecedents. In this historical survey, one finds his obvious preference for a strong central government and his disdain for the divisiveness of sectionalism, which he blamed on the states. First, he recognized that both the Continental Congress and the subsequent Articles of Confederation were products of state governments. He observed,

---

[57]Records show that Baylor used Story's text in its "Constitution of the United States" course from at least 1851 to 1857. After the establishment of its law department, Baylor dropped this course from its undergraduate curriculum. The first reference to this new department is in the *Seventh Annual Catalogue* published in November, 1858. See, for example, Baylor University, *Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas, 1856* (Galveston: Civilian Book & Job Office, 1856), 10.; see also Soule University, *Catalogue of Soule University; Chappell Hill, Texas, 1859-60* (Galveston: Texas Christian Advocate Book Press, 1860), 15.

[58]Walter L. Buenger's research describes the diverse groups in Texas that were hesitant about, and in some cases opposed to, secession. He identifies Texas Whigs as one of these groups. See Walter L. Buenger, *Secession and the Union in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984), 23-24.

[59]For a discussion of Story's judicial nationalism see Timothy S. Huebner, *The Taney Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003), 42-46.

> The Continental Congress, thus organized by a voluntary association of the States, and continued by the successive appointments of the State legislatures, constituted, in fact, the National Government, and conducted the national affairs until near the close of the Revolution, when, as we shall presently see, the Articles of Confederation were adopted by all the States."[60]

Secessionists and Unionists certainly agreeded on this point. In a confederation, states are responsible for creating the national government. Story's assessment of the Articles of Confederation was, on the other hand, quite critical. He laid much of the blame for the Confederation's failure on the fact that states had the right to secede. He wrote, "But it was obvious to reflecting minds, upon the slightest consideration, that the union thus formed, was but a temporary nature, dependent upon the consent of all the Colonies, now become States, and capable of being dissolved, at any time, by the secession of any one of them."[61] The implication was that a confederal structure of government lacked permanence and was, therefore, somehow deficient. After a lengthy discussion of the defects of the Articles of Confederation, Story concluded, "There were many other defects in the Confederation, of a subordinate character and importance. But these were sufficient to establish its utter unfitness, as a frame of government, for a free, enterprising, and industrious people."[62] Secessionists were likely not pleased to have their sons reading such arguments. Unionists, on the other hand, applauded this logic.

For Story, the Constitution of the United States solved the problems presented by the Articles of Confederation. Therefore, he gave it the highest praise possible. Here, too, Unionists were satisfied. Describing the ratification of the Constitution, he wrote,

---

[60]Joseph Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States: Containing a Brief Commentary on Every Clause, Explaining the True Nature, Reasons, and Objects thereof; Designed for the Use of School Libraries and General Readers* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1852), 27.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Ibid., 32.

"Thus was achieved another, and still more glorious, triumph, in the cause of liberty, even than that, by which we were separated from the parent country."[63] In other words, the ratification of the Constitution surpassed in importance even America's independence from Great Britain. His accolades for the Constitution were not limited to the document itself. The framers also received high praise. Specifically praiseworthy was their ability to rise above sectionalism and put the interests of the whole nation first. He asserted, "They felt, that they had a higher duty to perform, than to flatter the prejudices of the people, or to subserve selfish, or sectional, or local interests."[64] Story's nationalism clearly showed. It is doubtful that secessionists found any comfort in such disparaging remarks about placing one's section above the nation.

Even if secessionists found a way to accept Story's observations about the historical origins of the U.S. Constitution, his view of its meaning certainly offended their sensibilities. First, he explicitly rejected a central pillar of the secessionist argument. According to historian Dwight Lowell Dumond, secessionists believed that the Constitution was created by the states and was intended by them to be a confederacy.[65] "We shall treat it," wrote Story, "not as a mere compact, or league, or confederacy, existing at the mere will of any one or more of the States, during their good pleasure; but, (as it purports on its face to be,) as a Constitution of Government, framed and adopted by the people of the United States, and obligatory upon all the States, until it is altered, amended, or abolished by the people, in the manner pointed out in the instrument

---

[63]Ibid., 35.

[64]Ibid., 35-36.

[65]Dwight Lowell Dumond, *The Secession Movement, 1860-1861* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1931), 120-121.

itself."[66] According to Story, one needed only to read the preamble of the Constitution to find the true nature of the government it created. Phrases found there like "we the people," "in order to form a more perfect union," and "to establish justice" meant for him that the United States Constitution was created by people, and their intent was to create one nation, not a nation made up of different sections of the country acting on their own behalf. More importantly, Story believed that these objects of the national government were necessary in order to protect and promote the interests, well-being, and liberties of both states and individuals.[67]

Protection of individual rights was important to Unionists and secessionists alike. Story's judicial philosophy relied on a uniform federal system of law as a way to protect these rights. According to Timothy S. Huebner, uniformity in the law was, in fact, a hallmark of his judicial nationalism.[68] It also reflected the beliefs of Unionists like Sam Houston. In a message to the Texas Legislature delivered in December 1859, Houston claimed that secessionists were wrong to argue that the federal government was negligent in its duty to protect the rights of states, especially their right to legalize slavery. Referring to John Brown's unsuccessful raid on Harper's Ferry as an example, he noted,

> In my opinion, the circumstances attending the act, have furnished abundant proofs of the utility of our present system of government, in the fact that the Federal powers have given an evidence of their regard for the constitutional rights of the States, and stood ready to defend them. . . . The fanatical outrage was rebuked and the offenders punished.[69]

---

[66]Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States*, 36.

[67]Ibid., 37-40.

[68]Huebner, *The Taney Court*, 45-47.

[69]Sam Houston, *Message of Gov. Sam Houston, on the South Carolina Resolutions* (Austin: John Marshall & Co., State Printers, 1860), 6.

In a similar vein, Story argued, "Without justice being fully, freely, and impartially administered, neither our persons, nor our rights, nor our property, can be protected. Call the form of government whatever you may, if justice cannot be equally obtained by all the citizens, high and low, rich and poor, it is a mere despotism."[70] Unlike the secessionists, who believed that the states were the ultimate protectors of one's individual liberties, Story believed that the federal government was actually more capable of playing this role. He was expressly suspicious of a state's ability to protect individual rights all the time. He claimed, "It may be presumed, that the States will provide adequate means to redress the grievances, and secure the rights of their own citizens. But, it is far from being certain, that they will at all times, or even ordinarily, take the like measures to redress the grievances, and secure the rights of foreigners, and citizens of other States."[71]

One of the individual rights that interested both secessionists and Unionists in Texas was that of slave ownership. In Story's analysis of the three references to slavery in the Constitution, one can immediately see that he disliked the institution; however, he recognized the necessity of these provisions. They were, in his eyes, useful in maintaining the Union. Regarding the Three-Fifths Compromise, he wrote,

> The slave-holding States have, at the present time, in Congress, twenty-five Representatives more than they would have upon the basis of an enumeration of free persons only. The apportionment, however, viewed as a matter of compromise, is entitled to great praise, for its moderation, its aim at practical utility, and its tendency to satisfy the people of every State in the Union, that the Constitution ought to be dear to all, by the privileges, which it confers, as well as the blessings, which it secures.[72]

---

[70]Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States*, 40.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid., 57-58.

In other words, slave states not only had their right to slavery secured by the Constitution, they actually received more political power than they deserved as a result. Story's praise for this provision was based on his pragmatism, not on any sense of supporting slavery. His was a grudging acceptance of political reality. He described the compromise as "a necessary price paid for the Union."[73]

Story's discussion of the prohibitions placed on the federal government by the Constitution included observations about the transatlantic slave trade. Article I, section 9 prohibited Congress from abolishing this trade until the year 1808, which was approximately twenty years after the ratification of the document. Story's disdain for slavery was evident. Compromise on this issue was, he believed, a necessary evil:

> But it was indispensable to yield something to the prejudices, the wishes, and the supposed interests of the South. And it ought to be considered as a great point gained, in favor of humanity, that a period of twenty years should enable Congress to terminate, in America, (as Congress in fact have [*sic*] terminated the African slave trade,) a traffic, which has so long and so loudly upbraided the morals and justice of modern nations.[74]

The tone expressed was one of exasperation with the South. That is to say, his comments suggested that the nation was forced to tolerate the South's interest in slavery out of necessity. Southerners, Unionists and secessionists alike, agreed with Story's analysis; however, they did not appreciate his tone. Historians Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty have noted that in the late 1850s, many Southern radicals were advocating a return to the African slave trade as a way to defend against Northern opposition to

[73]Ibid., 58.

[74]Ibid., 143.

slavery.[75] Rabid proslavery secessionist likely found Story's line of thinking offensive whereas moderates in the South were likely less offended. Nonetheless, in a state like Texas where defense of slavery was strong, Story's tone was overtly abolitionist.

The last reference to slavery in the Constitution relates to the issue of fugitive slaves. Article IV, section 2 of the Constitution protected Southern slave owners from the prospect that the North would become a haven for runaway slaves, at least in theory. Northern indifference and sometimes hostility toward this provision was a source of frustration in the South. The Texas Declaration of Causes specifically mentioned the failure of Northern states to comply with the Fugitive Slave Law as one justification for secession.[76] This issue, more than the other two, was a major point of contention between North and South in the 1850s. Even if students and faculty could overlook Story's previous statements about the Constitution's view of slavery, they would have paid special attention to his statements on this issue.

True to form, Story's analysis of the fugitive slave provision indicated on the one hand his frustration with the fact that the South was given every consideration regarding the existence of slavery. On the other hand, his pragmatism led him to believe that without such compromises the Union would not have been created. Of the fugitive slave clause, he wrote,

> This clause was introduced into the Constitution solely for the benefit of the slave-holding States, to enable them to reclaim their fugitive slaves, who should escape into other States, where slavery is not tolerated. It is well known, that, at the common law, a slave escaping into a State, where slavery is not allowed,

---

[75]Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, *The American Nation*, 11th ed., vol. 1, *A History of the United States to 1877* (New York: Longman, 2003), 384.

[76]State of Texas, Secession Convention, 1861, *A Declaration of Causes Which Impel the State of Texas to Secede from the Federal Union*, 2 February 1861, in *Documents of Texas History*, 195.

> would immediately become free, and could not be reclaimed. Before the Constitution was adopted, the Southern States felt the want of some protecting provision against such an occurrence to be a grievous injury to them. And we here see, that the Eastern and Middle States have sacrificed their own opinions and feelings, in order to take away every source of jealousy, on a subject so delicate to Southern interests; a circumstance, sufficient of itself, to repel the delusive notion, that the South has not, at all times, had its full share in the blessings resulting from the Union.[77]

Unionists like Sam Houston would have agreed with such an analysis, though he may not have appreciated its condescending tone. Secessionists would have disagreed. For them, this provision consisted of empty words and unfulfilled promises.

Unity among the states in the federal Union was so important to Story that it was not possible for him to contemplate secession. In his view, individual states and the nation as a whole benefited from a strong Union. He argued that "the Union of the States is in the highest degree desirable, nay, that it is almost indispensable to the political existence of the States, is a proposition, which admits of the most complete moral demonstration, so far as human experience and general reasoning can establish it."[78] He did not suggest, however, that the Union was a perfect system. Indeed, Story admitted that the American federal system gave rise to the possibility that the federal government and the state governments might often come into conflict with each other. On this point, his judicial nationalism was evident. He declared, "For, however true it may be, that in a direct conflict between the constitutional authority of the Union and that of a State, the former must be deemed paramount and superior in its obligatory force."[79] Given the fact

---

[77]Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States*, 243.

[78]Ibid., 38.

[79]Ibid., 107.

that nullification and secession represent, in one fashion or another, a rejection of national supremacy, Story's argument must not have sat well with secessionists.

One of the recurring themes of this study is that denominational colleges and universities, like all educational institutions, are part of the society in which they operate. Consequently, it is assumed that their values will reflect those of that society. How, then, does one explain the use of Story's textbook at both Baylor University and Soule University in the 1850s? Baylor's use of this text is especially perplexing, given what was observed about Baylor in the last chapter on slavery and what was noted in this chapter about its acceptance of Confederate nationalism.

There are four plausible explanations for this dissonance. First, if scholars like Nelson are correct about Baylor's staunch support for the Confederacy, its curriculum did not reflect this support. It may well be that the curriculum was overtaken by political change. The speed with which political changes were afoot was obvious. Although the debates surrounding slavery, secession, and states' rights had been evident in Texas society and politics since annexation in 1845, scholars generally agree that the event which sparked secession was Abraham Lincoln's election to the presidency.[80] According to James McPherson, the speed with which the Lower South moved to secede after the results of the 1860 election were announced surpassed even the actions taken by the American and French revolutionaries in the late eighteenth century. He notes, "By way of comparison, the second Continental Congress took fourteen months to adopt the Declaration of Independence, and a full year elapsed between the first call for a

[80]See, for example, Buenger, *Secession and the Union in Texas*, 119; Marten, *Texas Divided*, 10; Michael F. Holt, *The Political Crisis of the 1850s* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), 252-253; and David Pickering and Judy Falls, *Brush Men & Vigilantes: Civil War Dissent in Texas* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2000), 13.

convention in 1786 and the drafting of the U.S. Constitution; the National Assembly of France met for two years before promulgating the new constitution of 1791."[81] By contrast, the states of the Lower South met and established a provisional Confederate government by early February 1861, just three months after the 1860 election.[82] Baylor's and Soule's use of Story's text indicates that the curriculum did not change as quickly as did political sentiment.

The second plausible explanation for Baylor University's and Soule University's use of Story's textbook is that these institutions were much more divided over secession than previously thought. Rather than supporting the political views of Texas secessionists, the textbook supported the views of Texas Whigs, especially with regard to the nature of government and the understanding of the Constitution. In his classic study of Southern Whigs, Arthur Charles Cole traces the Whig Party's origins to the Federalist Party. To illustrate this point, he compares Whig Party policies to those of the quintessential Federalist, Alexander Hamilton. He writes, "Behind the measures eventually brought forward by Whig leaders, there was a fundamental interpretation of governmental powers and relations similar, in all essentials, to the principles which governed Hamilton and his associates in formulating the Federalist policies."[83] In his analysis, Southern Whigs were a substantial political force. For instance, he argues that in spite of Southerners' attraction to states' rights parties in general, "the Whig party in the South constituted at all times a most powerful minority of the voting strength of that

---

[81]McPherson, *Ordeal By Fire*, 139-140.

[82]Ibid., 139.

[83]Arthur Charles Cole, *The Whig Party in the South* (n.p.: n.p., 1912; reprint, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1962), 1 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

section, capable of being converted by unusual exertions and under favoring circumstances into at least a temporary majority."[84]

According to historians Robert A. Calvert, Arnoldo De León, and Gregg Cantrell, during the tumultuous decade of the 1850s, the Whigs in Texas experienced a political revival of sorts, especially in East and North Texas. They found support in places dominated by planters, merchants, and professionals.[85] The authors summarize the Whig philosophy in a single sentence. They write, "Economic expansion, internal improvements, banking to enhance a business climate, loyalty to the Union, an emphasis on nationhood, and a call to heed core American and Protestant values served as the rallying points for Texas Whigs."[86]

Another defining element of Southern Whig philosophy was its traditional conservatism. In this sense, Whigs stood in stark contrast to their Democrat rivals. Writing in reference to the increasing intensity of the slavery debate in the late 1840s and early 1850s, Cole describes Southern Whigs as a stabilizing influence in society. "While the Whigs repelled all insinuations that they were untrue to southern rights or even less zealous in their defense than the Democrats," writes Cole, "they had thus far kept free from connection with the extreme remedies that had been suggested."[87] The extreme remedies to which he is referring included secession from the Union. According to Cole,

---

[84]Ibid., 1-2.

[85]Robert A. Calvert, Arnoldo De León, and Gregg Cantrell, *The History of Texas* (Wheeling: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2002), 134.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Cole, *The Whig Party in the South*, 136.

Southern Whigs were inclined to forsake community interests for national interests.[88] A more recent study of Southern Whigs by Larry Keith Menna demonstrates that this interpretation has not changed much since Cole's 1912 work. For Menna, the most important tool of Whig conservatism was the law. Whigs believed that the rule of law served as a restraining influence on the otherwise capricious nature of Southern society and politics.[89]

Scholars have documented Joseph Story's Whig tendencies. Upon hearing that proslavery Democrat Roger B. Taney had been confirmed to the Court by the Senate, Daniel Webster wrote, "Judge Story thinks the Supreme Court is *gone*, and I think so too."[90] Webster was well known for his affiliation with the Whigs. Daniel Walker Howe calls Webster "the greatest of Whig orators and second only to Clay in stature within the party."[91] Story was also prone to making his Whig sympathies known to others. In a letter to Francis Lieber in December 1840, Story wrote, "I rejoice in the recent triumph of the Whigs. It is a proud triumph of principles against men under most fearful odds."[92] Therefore, it stands to reason that Story's commentary on the Constitution would please Texas Whigs.

---

[88]Ibid.

[89]Larry Keith Menna, "Embattled Conservatism: The Ideology of the Southern Whigs" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1991), 23-28.

[90]Daniel Webster, quoted in Robert G. McCloskey, *The American Supreme Court* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 53.

[91]Daniel Walker Howe, ed., *The American Whigs: An Anthology* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1973), 53.

[92]Joseph Story to Francis Lieber, 21 December 1840, in Schwartz and Hogan, *Joseph Story*, 158.

Educators often helped to promote the Whig worldview. Menna, claims that in addition to the rule of law, schools and other social institutions were a key component in the Whig program of restraining the masses, which, it seemed, had been unleashed by Jacksonian Democracy.[93] Howe's work gives equal time to this aspect of Southern Whiggism, whereas most scholars tend to focus only on the political and economic components. Included in his anthology are writings from Nicholas Biddle, Lyman Beecher, Horace Mann, and Rufus Choate. This is, to be sure, a diverse group. Regarding the educational program of this group and its relationship to Whig political thought, Howe argues,

> While Jacksonian rhetoric emphasized 'equality' (usually restricted in practice to equality of opportunity for white males), the Whigs stressed 'morality.'. . . Whig morality was corporate as well as individual; the community, like its members, was expected to set an example of virtue. As a result the Whigs' cultural attitudes were highly prescriptive: Whigs looked to the family, the church, the school, voluntary associations, and the state to impose their values on others.[94]

The evangelical denominations, which in most cases had a legal connection to their colleges and universities, held similar views. They, too, saw their institutions of higher learning as important to the proper ordering of society and its norms.[95]

The third explanation for Baylor's and Soule's use of Story's textbook is found in the Southern Whig approach to the slavery question, though on this score his text might have caused some problems for proslavery Southerners. On the one hand, all of Story's references to slavery and the Constitution adhered to a strict constructionist interpretation. While the tone of his analysis clearly indicated a dislike for the peculiar

---

[93]Menna, "Embattled Conservatism," 24.

[94]Howe, *The American Whigs*, 5.

[95]See chapter two of this dissertation.

institution, he grudgingly acknowledged that slavery was constitutionally protected. For Story, then, slavery did not run counter to the Constitution; the delegates at the Constitutional Convention chose to compromise over slavery rather than fight over it. On the other hand, Story's strict construction of the Constitution led him to the conclusion that Congress had ultimate jurisdiction over federal territories. Article IV grants Congress the sole power to add new states to the Union when those new states are created from federal territory. In his 1852 text, Story exalted the wisdom of this provision: "Thus far, indeed, the power has been most propitious to the general welfare of the Union, and has realized the patriotic anticipation, that the parents would exult in the glory and prosperity of their children."[96] Of course, this statement was written prior to the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, Bleeding Kansas, and the *Dred Scott* case of 1857. All of these events propelled the controversy over slavery in the Western territories into the public discourse. Moreover, they all occurred subsequent to Story's death in September 1845. His writings remained in print throughout the 1850s and some went through several editions. According to Schwartz and Hogan's bibliography of Story's works, the last edition of his *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States* was published in 1884.[97]

The Southern Whig view of slavery was a nuanced version of Story's belief in Congressional authority over territories. According to Menna, the Whigs recognized that territories were under the exclusive control of Congress. This control included any decision regarding slavery. However, they believed that if the decision over slavery were

---

[96]Story, *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States*, 138.

[97]Schwartz and Hogan, *Joseph Story*, 223-224.

postponed until a territory began drafting its state constitution, then the legality of slavery could be determined by said territory and not the federal government. Why was this so? In order for a territory to complete the process of becoming a state, it had to assume the powers of a state. One such power was the power of determining the legality of slavery.[98] One cannot be certain whether Story would have accepted this logic; nonetheless, if Menna's analysis is correct, Southern Whigs found a way to defend slavery without totally abandoning his legal philosophy. Baylor's and Soule's use of Story's text did not run counter to Whig political thought. On the contrary, it fit quit well within that worldview.

The final explanation for Baylor's and Soule's use of Story's text does not have much to do with the politics of antebellum Texas; rather, it has to do with Story's reputation as a legal scholar. Legal historian Elizabeth Kelley Bauer claims that his commentaries on the Constitution impacted how American law was taught and how it was practiced. "It was really not until Joseph Story became Dane Professor of Law at Harvard University," writes Bauer, "that the new system of legal education set out to become the chief means of educating lawyers that it is now."[99] Describing his commentaries and their impact on American law, she argues that they "did more than any other single factor to establish a distinctively American system of jurisprudence, based upon the English common law."[100] Many legal scholars like Story also wrote textbooks on law. Bauer suggests that they, too, played a direct role in changing the way students

---

[98]Menna, "Embattled Conservatism," 322-323.

[99]Elizabeth Kelley Bauer, *Commentaries on the Constitution, 1790-1860* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), 23.

[100]Ibid.

learned the law and the way lawyers and judges practiced it. American courts, unlike their British counterparts, allowed for textbooks to be cited in court rulings. This fact was driven by practical considerations unique to the United States. As Americans expanded westward, lawyers and judges often lacked two things: proper training in the law and sufficient legal publications. Commentaries and textbooks alike helped to solve this problem.[101] Joseph Story's textbook, then, may well have been used by Baylor and Soule for similar reasons. His commentaries and textbooks were considered to be somewhat of a gold standard in American law. Moreover, if students were going to enter the legal profession, his writings were expected to be standard tools used by the courts.

Baylor's and Soule's use of Story's textbook makes sense when placed in the political, cultural, and educational context of the 1850s. Up to the moment when the turmoil of secession hit Texas, the curriculums of these schools indicated a strong Whig influence. At the same time, Story's position on slavery and the Constitution would not have offended the secessionists either. However, Story's were not the only textbooks and commentaries used at Texas denominational colleges and universities. There were others.

McKenzie College, the famous Methodist institution discussed at length in the last chapter, taught students about government in its moral philosophy course. It relied on R. H. Rivers's *Elements of Moral Philosophy*.[102] This textbook included one chapter entitled "Political Ethics," which was less a commentary on the United States Constitution and more a discourse on the nature and principles of government. Its

---

[101]Ibid., 23-24.

[102]McKenzie College, *Annual Catalogue of the Students and Faculty of M'Kenzie College, Near Clarksville, Texas for the Session of 1860-61* (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1861), 7.

content supported the beliefs of the secessionists. Rivers believed that the best type of republican government was that in which states created a national government with specific delegated powers and in which all other powers were reserved to the states.[103] "Such a government," wrote Rivers, "is believed to conform to the principles of morality, and to have advantages above every other form, when the people are enlightened and virtuous."[104] This state-centered view of government fit very well within secessionist political thought.

Austin College's curriculum demonstrates even more how the political complexities of Texas in the 1850s made their way into denominational colleges. Like Baylor University and Soule University, Austin's curriculum for much of the 1850s included the study of the Constitution. The textbook used was by William Rawle, which in this case was most likely his *A View of the Constitution of the United States of America*.[105] Austin College catalogs for the academic years 1856-1857 and 1859-1860 indicate that this course was dropped.[106] In 1855, the school added a law department, and it is likely that the study of the Constitution was transferred there.[107] Like Story, Rawle

---

[103]R. H. Rivers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, ed. Thomas O. Summers (Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1860), 264.

[104]Ibid.

[105]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College at Hunstville, Walker County, Texas for the Academical Year 1853-54* (Huntsville: "Texas Presbyterian," Print, 1854), 10; Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academical Year 1854-55* (Huntsville: G. Robinson, Printer, "Item" Office, 1855), n.p.; and Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, For the Academic Year, 1855-6* (Houston: Fairbairn & McClellan, Bayou City Office, 1856), 8.

[106]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County Texas, for the Academical Year 1856-7* (Huntsville: Cammer & M'Laughlin, Printers, 1857), n.p.; and Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academic Year 1859-60* (Houston: Telegraph Book and Job Establishment, 1860), 7.

[107]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, 1855-6*, 13.

was a well-known commentator on the Constitution. Unlike Story, however, Rawle's view of the Constitution included explicit recognition of secession.[108]

Just as Joseph Story's background seemed, on the surface, to make his commentary an unlikely candidate for adoption by antebellum Texas universities, so, too, did William Rawle's background. He was born into a prominent Quaker family in Pennsylvania in 1759. The formative years of his youth coincided with the American Revolution, and his family was directly impacted by it. His stepfather, for instance, was a Loyalist who served as mayor of Philadelphia throughout the British army's occupation of that city. Whatever Loyalist tendencies the young Rawle had did not last. After returning from England in 1783, he expressed his commitment to the United States. George Washington even offered to make him attorney general, an offer which Rawle declined. Rawle seemed to have little interest in a career in politics, but he was a strong Federalist.[109]

Rawle's *A View of the Constitution of the United States* is thought to be the earliest comprehensive study of the Constitution. As such it was widely circulated and often used as a textbook in colleges and universities, especially in the North.[110] Bauer's assessment of this text suggests that it was often viewed as controversial. Rawle's argument that the Union was not ironclad, that is, that secession was permissible under certain circumstances, was a doctrine simply not acceptable to those with strong nationalistic tendencies.[111] Although Bauer makes no mention of his textbook being used

---

[108]Bauer, *Commentaries on the Constitution*, 27.

[109]Ibid., 58-61.

[110]Ibid., 63.

[111]Ibid.

in Southern colleges and universities, she does acknowledge that it provided a "transitional step between the North and the South."[112] By this she means two things. First, Rawle's work was published between the adoption of the Constitution and the Civil War. Second, by recognizing the possibility of secession, his work found acceptance in the South. On the other hand, Rawle was an abolitionist who served as president of the Maryland Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery.[113] North and South, it seems, may have found reasons to like and reasons to dislike his commentary on the Constitution.

Bauer may well be correct in arguing that many Northerners found Rawle's assertions about secession controversial. In antebellum Texas, however, his views on slavery and secession would not have stirred up much controversy. Indeed, given the fact that Austin College was influenced by both secessionists and Unionists, this text was well suited for that campus. A closer examination of its actual content will prove this point.

Regarding Rawle's analysis of the Constitution, the first issue that must be addressed is his view of slavery. His Quaker roots and his association with an anti-slavery society appeared, on the surface, to make his text an unlikely candidate for use in antebellum Texas. However, his personal beliefs about slavery did not impact his constitutional interpretation. Like Joseph Story, Rawle adhered to a strict constructionist view of the Constitution. He accepted the three references to slavery in the document. Of the Three-Fifths Compromise, he wrote, "It would now be unseasonable and useless

[112]Ibid.

[113]Ibid., 63-64.

to consider or to answer the arguments on either side. It has been agreed to, and the question is for ever at rest."[114] For Rawle the question was closed.

Rawle's analysis of the constitutional restriction placed on Congress's power over the African slave trade also illuminated his disdain for slavery and his strict constructionism. Concerning Article I, section 9, he argued,

> An important clause with which this section commences, is partly of a commercial, and partly of a political and moral kind. It was foreseen, that the general power to regulate commerce would include a traffic now justly reprobated by most Christian nations, but some interests and opinions were to be respected, and while the power to abolish the slave trade entirely was indirectly conceded, the exercise of it till the year 1808, otherwise than by *laying a tax or duty of ten dollars on each person imported*, was prohibited. Congress did not fail to avail itself of the power, as soon as it became lawful to execute it.[115]

This was a straightforward analysis of the Constitution. In it Rawle made no effort to argue with the Framers over this clause. His distaste for slavery was evident, but by the time he wrote about this aspect of the Constitution, the slave trade had long since been abolished.

The final constitutional issue surrounding slavery was, of course, that of fugitive slaves. His strict constructionsist view of the Constitution was evident here as well. He wrote, "Every person has a right to remain within a state as long as he pleases, except the alien enemy, the person charged with crimes in any of the other states, or in a foreign state with whom a treaty to that effect exists, and fugitives from service or labour in any of the states. To the two latter descriptions no asylum can by the Constitution of the

---

[114]William Rawle, *A View of the Constitution of the United States of America* (Philadelphia: H. C. Carey & I. Lea, 1825), 42.

[115]Ibid., 113.

United States be afforded."[116] Notice that Rawle even used the euphemism found in the language of the Constitution when he referred to "fugitives from service or labour." Everyone, of course, knew that this was a reference to slaves. His reasoning for accepting the fugitive slave clause of the Constitution highlighted his commitment to the Union over his abolitionist tendencies. He argued, "The states are considered as a common family, whose harmony would be endangered if they were to protect and detain such fugitives, when demanded in one case, by the executive authority of the state, or pursued on the other by the persons claiming an interest in their service."[117] Because Texas secessionists and Unionists alike shared a commitment to slavery, nothing in Rawle's analysis offended either group's sensibilities.

Rawle's view of secession, however, was another matter. His belief in the right of secession was stated boldly and without hesitation. There was simply no way to misunderstand him on this particular point. He exclaimed firmly, "The states, then, may wholly withdraw from the Union, but while they continue they must retain the character of representative republics."[118] His justification for this assessment was derived from the political theory which supported the Constitution, not on any particular clause as such. He argued, "To deny this right would be inconsistent with the principle on which all our political systems are founded, which is, that the people have in all cases, a right to determine how they will be governed."[119] Secessionist-minded students found much encouragement in these words. At the same time, Unionist-minded individuals like Sam

---

[116]Ibid., 95.

[117]Ibid.

[118]Ibid., 290.

[119]Ibid., 289.

Houston may not have been overly offended by them. Recall that Houston's opposition to secession was based on his belief that the secessionists were simply wrong with regard to the federal government's behavior toward the South and slavery.

The use by some Texas denominational colleges and universities of both Story's and Rawle's textbooks indicates that throughout the 1850s, the curriculum in the area of American government matched the political conditions of the state. Up to the point of actual secession, when the fire-eaters finally prevailed politically, Texas denominational colleges and universities used textbooks with a more balanced set of ideas about the nature of the United States government. With regard to secession, this balance was also present. Textbooks offered something for both secessionists and Unionists. The curriculum was as complex as the political situation.

Evidence of this balanced approach to secession, states' rights, and the Union is seen not only in the books that were actually adopted; rather, it is also seen in the books that were *not* adopted. If schools like Baylor University, Soule University, and Austin College were wholeheartedly committed to promoting states' rights and secession throughout the tumultuous decade of the 1850s, they would have chosen other textbooks. Such commentaries on the Constitution were available. They did not have to rely on Northern nationalists who were also opposed to slavery. Bauer's research, for instance, highlights what she calls "The States [*sic*] Rights School of the South."[120] This school included commentaries written by St. George Tucker, John Taylor, and Henry St. George Tucker. All were Southerners, and all had studied at the College of William and Mary.[121]

---

[120]Bauer, *Commentaries on the Constitution*, 168.

[121]For a detailed discussion of their biographies and their commentaries on the Constitution, see Bauer, *Commentaries on the Constitution*, 168-207.

Literary Societies: Extra-Curricular Consideration of Secession and Union

The critical events of the 1850s often made their way into extracurricular activities. Secession and many of the events leading up to it were often among them. The most important and popular extracurricular activity was, of course, participation in student literary societies. In the last chapter the enthusiasm with which students applied themselves to the task of organizing and running these organizations was noted. Society activities gave students the ability to socialize, usually without running afoul of the college administration. Such activities also gave them the ability to break free from the strict living conditions placed on them. Cummins's description of the mid-nineteenth-century college campus certainly indicates why students would seek out such activities. He writes,

> Given the spirit of the time, almost all colleges and universities in the United States enthusiastically and completely embraced the doctrine of *locus parentis* by which the institution assumed responsibility for the daily regulation of all facets of a student's life. This was a philosophical imperative for most colleges and universities since they sought to be the primary agent for the moral instruction of each student.[122]

As was the case with the issue of slavery, questions centering on the nature of government and the tense political situation were often debated. The students of Baylor University's Philomathesian Literary Society were interested in both types of questions. In October 1860, two debates were held in which the question of secession must have been debated. Although a transcript of these debates does not exist, the nature of the questions debated indicates an interest in the question of secession. On October 13, 1860, the question debated was: "Resolved that the signs of the times indicate a

[122]Cummins, *Austin College*, 40.

subversion of the government."[123] The language of "subversion" appears in many secessionists' speeches. Their belief was that the Republican Party's platform, especially with regard to slavery, represented more than simply bad policy; it represented a subversion of government. These sentiments were echoed in a speech given by Judge O. M. Roberts at the capitol in Austin on December 1, 1860. Speaking on the political agenda of what he called the "Black Republican Party," Roberts exclaimed, "In other words, you [the Republican Party] subvert the very object of government, which is to protect rights,—not either to donate them gratuitously to one section,—or to destroy them in another."[124] Like Roberts, the Philomathesians of Baylor defined the current political situation in terms of government subversion. Though subtle, this indicates on one level at least that students were aware of secessionist arguments. Moreover, they chose to define their debate in secessionist terms rather than Unionist terms. To their credit, however, the students made sure that both sides were given equal time. Records show that two students argued in the affirmative and two argued in the negative.[125]

Lincoln's election was also the subject of debate in Baylor's Philomathesian Society. On October 20, 1860, the Society debated the following question: "Resolved that each state ought to prepare for resistance in the event of Lincoln's election."[126] Although the signs are subtle, the nature of this question also indicates that the students followed current events closely. In this regard, Baylor students were similar to their

---

[123]Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University, Philomathesian Minute-Book from October 14th 1859 to February 18-1868, Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

[124]O. M. Roberts, *Speech of Judge O. M. Roberts of the Supreme Court of Texas, at the Capitol, on the 1st Dec., 1860, Upon the 'Impending Crisis,'* (n.p.: n.p., 1860), 24-25.

[125]Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University, Minute-Book.

[126]Ibid.

fellow Southern students. Robert F. Pace, writing generally about college students in the Old South, asserts, "As the political climate heated up in the months before the war, college students expressed a variety of opinions. Both the young men and women of southern institutions wanted to feel a part of the growing debate."[127] The Philomathesians' choice of topic also shows that in their own activities on campus they mimicked what they saw in those events. Interestingly, the students debated the question *before* Lincoln was actually elected. Outside the halls of literary societies, many Southerners, especially secessionist-minded ones, were inclined to prepare for secession even before Lincoln became president. Indeed, some state governments made specific preparations for such an eventuality. The state of Alabama, for example, passed a resolution on February 24, 1860, calling for the state government to prepare for secession. This was nearly a full year before the state secession convention met in Montgomery.[128]

As was the case with nearly all of their debates, the Baylor men made sure to engage in a balanced discussion. Regarding resistance to the federal government in the case of Lincoln's election, two students argued in the affirmative and two in the negative.[129] The record does not give any indication as to content. Whether the Baylor students demonstrated a tendency toward secession or Union cannot be determined with certainty. However, the fact that they chose this question, the manner in which it was

---

[127]Robert F. Pace, *Halls of Honor: College Men in the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 100.

[128]State of Alabama, Joint Resolutions, 24 February 1860, in *The History and Debates of the Convention of the People of Alabama, Begun and Held in the City of Montgomery, on the Seventh Day of January, 1861*, ed. William R. Smith (Montgomery: White, Pfister & Co., 1861), 9-10.

[129]Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University, Minute-Book.

framed, and the timing of it, all indicate a secessionist bent. Oliver Wendell Holmes's assertion cited earlier that circumstances matter when it comes to understanding both the meaning and importance of events is instructive in this case.[130] Taken out of its context, this question would not indicate anything in particular. However, when placed within its historic context, ascertaining a reliable meaning becomes easier. The timing of this debate is critical. It occurred less than one month before Lincoln's actual election and less than three months before Texas seceded from the Union. Moreover, the question was framed using secessionist language. The students could have asked: "What does Lincoln's election mean for the South or for Texas?" Instead, they debated whether or not Texas should prepare to resist.

The complexities surrounding Austin College's handling of secession are also evident in its student organizations. The Clay Union Literary Society is one example. It was founded in 1853, and in 1863 changed its name to the Kappa Upsilon Society. The records of this society are somewhat sketchy due to destruction or loss during the Civil War.[131] A review of the Society's attempt in 1866 to reconstruct the previous membership roster indicates that the honorary membership contained both known secessionists and known Unionists.

Honorary membership was a coveted component of any society's identity. E. Merton Coulter's research suggests, for instance, that competition between rival literary societies for honorary members was fierce. Prestigious national and local politicians were the most sought after. However, societies were mindful of a politician's political

---

[130]See *Schenck v. United States*, 249 U.S. 47, 52 (1919).

[131]Kappa Upsilon Society of Austin College, *Register of the Kappa Upsilon Society Organized in Austin College, Huntsville, Texas, 1853* (Houston: Book and Job Office of E. H. Cushing & Co., 1866), 11.

persuasion when considering whether or not to offer honorary membership. High profile honorary members added both prestige and resources to the society. These resources often included books and money.[132]

The longest lists of new honorary members of Austin College's Clay Union Society before the Civil War appeared in 1856 and 1857.[133] These members represent different points on the political spectrum. In the class of 1856 were three Georgians: Howell Cobb, Alexander H. Stephens, and Robert Toombs. These three had made a name for themselves shortly after the Compromise of 1850 by halting the efforts of South Carolina secessionists. Theirs was a Unionist effort.[134] By the late 1850s, however, things had changed. Cobb was added as an honorary member the same year that James Buchanan was elected president. By the time he had become President Buchanan's Secretary of the Treasury, Cobb's allegiance had "tipped to the South."[135] Alexander H. Stephens eventually became the vice president of the Confederacy, while Robert Toombs made a name for himself during the secession debate in Georgia in 1860. Freehling and Simpson emphasize the erratic nature of his turn toward secession: "After delivering [a secessionist speech to the Georgia legislature], Toombs would become the state's most

---

[132]E. Merton Coulter, *College Life in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951), 108-111.

[133]For a list of all members, including honorary ones, see Kappa Upsilon Society of Austin College, *Register*.

[134]William W. Freehling and Craig M. Simpson, *Secession Debated: Georgia's Showdown in 1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), ix; William W. Freehling, *The Road To Disunion*, vol. 2, *Secessionists Triumphant, 1854-1861* (Oxford: University Press, 2007), 105.

[135]Freehling, *The Road To Disunion*, 105.

confusing leader. In early December, 1860, he would advocate one last attempt at compromise. Two weeks later, he would urge uncompromising secession."[136]

Other notable political figures made the list in 1856. Among them was Jefferson Davis of Mississippi. His fame as the president of the Confederacy goes without saying. Even after the war, Davis never stopped defending secession. The opening words of his book *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* published in 1881 asserted,

> The object of this work has been from historical data to show that the Southern States had rightfully the power to withdraw from the Union into which they had, as sovereign communities, voluntarily entered; that the denial of that right was a violation of the letter and spirit of the compact between the States; and that the war waged by the Federal Government against the seceding Sates was in disregard of the limitations of the Constitution, and destructive of the principles of the Declaration of Independence.[137]

John J. Crittenden of Kentucky also made the grade. He is best known, perhaps, for the Crittenden Compromise.

Advocates of popular sovereignty as a solution to the slavery question were also granted honorary membership in 1856. Among them were Lewis Cass of Michigan and Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois. Popular sovereignty meant, as Cass himself said, "leaving to the people of the territory to be acquired the business of settling the matter [of slavery] for themselves."[138] Douglas advocated popular sovereignty as a way to organize the Nebraska territory. His effort was manifested in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854. James McPherson writes that the passage of this bill was "clearly a Southern victory."[139]

---

[136]Freehling and Simpson, *Secession Debated*, 31.

[137]Jefferson Davis, *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*, vol. 1 (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881), v.

[138]Lewis Cass, quoted in McPherson, *Ordeal By Fire*, 67.

[139]McPherson, *Ordeal By Fire*, 99.

This fact notwithstanding, Douglas was not a secessionist. During the 1860 election, "he stumped to 'save the Union' and traveled through both northern and southern states tirelessly warning against dissolution of the nation."[140] In short, the honorary class of 1856 included known secessionists as well as known Unionists.

The honorary members of 1857 are also a diverse lot. Among them were John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky, former president Millard Fillmore, and Texas politician Elisha M. Pease. Breckenridge's appeal may have been the result of his position on slavery. Gillon and Matson describe him as "a staunch supporter of slavery's extension into the territories."[141] Millard Fillmore was vice-president to Zachary Taylor. Both were Whigs. Following Taylor's unexpected death in 1850, Fillmore became president. He supported the Compromise of 1850, which on the one hand added California to the Union as a free state and on the other hand included the Fugitive Salve Act designed to assist slave owners in capturing runaways.[142] Elisha M. Pease was the governor of Texas from 1853 to 1857. Perhaps he was added to the Clay Union roster of honorary members in 1857 because he was, at that time, the sitting governor of the state. On matters relating to the sectional crisis and secession, however, Pease was a staunch Unionist.[143]

Perhaps the most illuminating aspect of the list of Austin College's Clay Union honorary membership is derived from the individuals who were *not* on the list. Two of the highest profile competitors in the battle over secession and Union in Texas were not

---

[140]Steven M. Gillon and Cathy D. Matson, *The American Experiment: A History of the United States* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002), 555.

[141]Ibid., 555.

[142]George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, 7th ed., vol. 1 (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007), 575-577.

[143]Buenger, *Secession and the Union in Texas*, 53; Marten, *Texas Divided*, 65.

listed at all, namely, Louis T. Wigfall and Sam Houston. While their omission could be explained by the fact that the list is a reconstruction, it is unlikely that the men of Austin College could have so easily forgotten two of the most high-profile individuals.

Honorary membership tells only part of the story behind the Clay Union's view of the sectional strife that existed during this critical time. There were actually several different levels of membership delineated in the organization's *Register*: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Regular, and Honorary. The significance of the Alpha, Beta, and Gamma members is not explained, though because they are listed at the front of the *Register*, their status in the organization seems significant. More importantly, they are distinguished from regular members. The only person added in 1860, the year before Texas's secession, was Franklin Barlow Sexton, who was added as a Beta member. No new members were added to the roster until 1863.

Sexton was a secessionist and an ardent supporter of the Confederacy. He even served as a member of the Confederate House of Representatives. Before the war, he was elected to the Texas legislature as a Democrat. After the war and Reconstruction, he was chosen as a delegate to the 1876 Democratic national convention. During that convention he seconded Samuel J. Tilden's presidential nomination. In his personal life his religious affiliation was Methodist. He graduated in 1846 from Wesleyan College.[144] This college was one of Texas's pioneering denominational colleges and one of the predecessor institutions to Southwestern University in Georgetown.

Clay Union's relationship with Sexton predated his formal membership. On June 22, 1858, he addressed both student literary societies at Austin College, namely, Clay

[144]Ron Tyler et al., eds., *The New Handbook of Texas*, vol. 5 (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996), 982.

Union and Philomathean. This event was a joint venture. Records of the Philomathean literary society do not survive; therefore, it is not clear whether or not Sexton was an honorary member of that group. The title of his address was "Human Progress," which was mostly an inspirational piece designed to encourage the upcoming graduates to take their rightful place in Texas society. Their education at Austin College was placed directly in the stream of human progress. It was an optimistic speech in which graduates were encouraged to look with enthusiasm to the benefits Texas and the United States presented them, regardless of their chosen career or vocation.[145]

Although Sexton did not address secession directly, his comments about the nature of government contained some of the hallmarks of secessionist political theory. Moreover, the tone of these comments demonstrated that by 1858 the pressures exerted on Southern society by abolitionism were intense. He believed that one of the greatest dangers to human progress was for government to acknowledge equality among all human beings. Sexton divided the world into civilized and uncivilized people. He argued,

> But, perhaps, the most forcible illustration of human progress can be made by comparing the civilized or enlightened man of to-day, with the one of his fellow men of the same time, upon whom the elements of progress have not been brought into operation. Place the European Turk, or Spaniard, or Portugese beside the accomplished German, Frenchman or Englishman, or contrast the savages of Patagonia, South Africa or New Holland with the prosperous and happy children of America. The bare statement of the propositions exhibits the superiority of the latter,—to so great an extent, indeed, that the civilized man of to-day blushes to own his prototype.[146]

---

[145]See F. B. Sexton, *Human Progress: An Address Before the Literary Societies of Austin College, June 22nd, 1858* (Houston: Telegraph Book and Job Office, 1858).

[146]Sexton, *Human Progress*, 9.

Slaves, as such, were not mentioned by name, but it is obvious that explicit reference to them was not necessary. The audience understood the reference without needing to have it explained to them.

Sexton's view of the Constitution was a strict constructionist one. Only by interpreting the document in that fashion could the Republic and the liberties she provided survive. "But the liberty of which every American proudly boasts as his birthright," declared Sexton, "is a constitutional and legal liberty—a liberty which is distinctly defined and marked out—which can neither be strangled by tyrants, nor overwhelmed by anarchy. At least, such it was designed to be by our forefathers."[147] Southerners believed that owning slaves was one of the liberties "distinctly defined and marked out" in the Constitution. Attempts by abolitionists to promote the equality of blacks with whites was seen by Sexton as dangerous to the political order. He said to the students, "I repeat, we must drive from our council-chambers the monsters which are creeping into them, under the bewitching names of abstractions and philosophies. Republican liberty has no worse enemy—no more insidious foe, than the doctrine concealed by these euphonious words, 'MAN'S UNIVERSAL AND ABSOLUTE EQUALITY."[148] Was Sexton's speech in 1858 a secessionist speech or a Unionist speech? In reality, neither secession nor Unionism was directly addressed. What was said about the nature of the American government would not have offended students of either persuasion.

---

[147]Ibid., 20.

[148]Ibid., 21.

Given the importance that student literary societies placed on honorary membership, Austin College's Clay Union must have chosen such membership carefully. What, then, does the membership say about the politics of secession at this pioneering Texas denominational college? It demonstrates that in the politically unstable decade of the 1850s all of the political divisions which appeared in Texas public life found explicit expression on the Austin College campus. Clay Union's honorary members very much reflected many of those same complexities and divisions.

Summation

The antebellum political dispute over the slavery question culminated in the greatest crisis in American history: the secession movement and the Civil War. While Texans stood united behind the institution of slavery, they were much less united on the question of secession. James Marten is surely correct when he writes, "The surprising amount of unity with which Texans and their corevolutionaries marched against the Yankees obscured for a time the divisions within southern society."[149]

With regard to the matter of secession, Texans were asked to adapt to shifting political realities. True to form, Texas denominational colleges rose to the challenge. While it is true that college boards of trustees gave their full support to the Confederacy once secession had become a reality, the curriculum adopted by them in the preceding decade of the 1850s tells a different story. Unlike the problem of slavery where the unity among Texans was relatively strong, the divisive nature of the secession question proved to be much more difficult. In teaching students about American government and the

[149]Marten, *Texas Divided*, 1.

Constitution, these schools adopted curriculums which accommodated the political divisions of the day.

Baylor University and Soule University adopted Joseph Story's textbook on the Constitution. His beliefs about the federal Union pleased Texas Whigs without offending the secessionists' proslavery concerns. Both groups surely appreciated his strict constructionist approach to slavery and the Constitution. McKenzie College's reliance on R. H. Rivers's textbook, which had a secessionist bent, demonstrates that often schools affiliated with the same denomination developed different curricula around the question of secession (Soule University was a Methodist institution). In the case of Austin College, Rawle's textbook presented a Constitution in which secession was clearly recognized, though its content would certainly have been acceptable to those of the Whig persuasion. The fact that Rawle was a Quaker and active in an abolitionist society did not seem to offend either group. Like Story, Rawle maintained a strict constructionist view of the Constitution. In short, each of these textbooks allowed diverse factions to read the same Constitution and advocate for different things. They gave all students the tools to engage in the most critical political debate of the nineteenth century.

These textbooks did not just satisfy the political realities of Texas; they also satisfied the social needs of the state. Baylor University, Soule University, and Austin College chose widely respected and widely published commentaries on the Constitution. Knowledge of these textbooks would have prepared aspiring lawyers and judges for a career in law very well. American courts of the nineteenth century even allowed for legal textbooks to be cited by judges in court decisions. Such textbooks, then, were literally tools of the trade.

The activities of student literary societies also indicate that Texas denominational colleges and universities were prone to encouraging political discussion and debate, even if this debate focused on potentially divisive issues. Secession was one such example. Freed from the constraints of the classroom, students eagerly participated in society debates and other activities. The records of these activities from the early 1850s to the early 1860s indicate that the divisions over secession found in Texas politics were also found in the halls of the denominational college literary society. Austin College's list of honorary members included Whigs, Unionists, and secessionists. Honorary members were particularly important to a society's identity, especially with regard to an honorary member's prestige and political persuasion. Societies did not choose honorary members carelessly. Therefore, the political views of honorary members were a good reflection of the political views of the students.

Debates were the hallmark of literary societies. Baylor University's Philomathesian Literary Society engaged in debates related to secession at the same time that Texas politicians were discussing it. Although the records are limited, the timing of the debates and the nature of the questions asked indicate that the Baylor men were moving toward secession with increasing speed.

Graduates of Texas denominational colleges and universities were expected to be active participants in Texas society and politics. Franklin Barlow Sexton's address to the students of Austin College illustrates this point best. In it he made the following appeal: "In the ordinary course of events you must soon take the places of those who are now principal actors in the great drama of life. Especially will all of you soon be called upon to assist, in some form and to such an extent as you may determine, in building up the

interests of our great State, to whose welfare, I hope, you are ardently and faithfully attached."[150] Little did Sexton and the students in attendance know that in less than three years, many of them would be asked to give their lives in the Civil War.

Between 1836 and 1865, Texans offered their political allegiance to three countries: the Republic of Texas, the United States of America, and the Confederate States of America. In each case, Texas denominational colleges eagerly invested in these countries. Likewise, the state welcomed their participation.

In April, 1865, Robert E. Lee surrendered. With his surrender came the end of whatever hopes Southerners had for establishing their own nation. From 1865 to 1877 the United States engaged in a process called Reconstruction. It involved both political reconstruction and social reconstruction. Texas denominational colleges and universities would be asked yet again to participate in a new endeavor. As will be shown in the next chapter, they rose to the challenge.

---

[150]Sexton, *Human Progress*, 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

Texas Denominational Colleges and Reconstruction

Introduction

The South failed in its bid to found an independent slaveholding republic. This meant that after the war Southerners faced an uncertain future. At the same time, they were left to try to make sense of the past. Scholars have long suggested that Southerners created numerous myths about the South's past and its future as a way to respond positively to a socially and politically chaotic situation.

With regard to the past, post-war Southerners invented and perpetuated a romantic vision of the Old South and the Confederacy. James W. Silver's study of the role played by Southern religious leaders in the secession movement suggests that much of the belief in a resolute and united Southern population that fully supported the Confederacy was largely the product of myth. It was a myth created and perpetuated by the post-war generation.[1] He argues that the South "had been divided from the start."[2] Like their fellow Southerners, Texans have constructed a great many myths about the past. One such myth is that of the cowboy. Sandra L. Myres argues, "The mythic Texas male is a skillful blend of chivalrous Southern gentleman and equally chivalrous but more

[1]James W. Silver, *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda* (Tuscaloosa: Confederate Publishing Company, Inc., 1957), 7.

[2]Ibid.

enduring Western frontiersman. He is the Returned-Confederate-Veteran-turned-Rancher, the hero of hundreds of Western films and novels."[3]

There is a difference between a state and a nation. Whereas a state refers to a political connection between people, a nation refers to a social and cultural connection.[4] Failure to establish a state did not prevent Southerners from maintaining and perpetuating a sense of nationhood. Charles Reagan Wilson argues that "the South's kingdom was to be of culture, not of politics."[5] Post-war Southerners, then, worked hard to preserve a Southern culture. Central to this process was the myth of the Lost Cause. At its core was a belief in the moral superiority of the South. This implied that Southerners were God's chosen people. It also meant that churches and religious leaders would continue to assume a prominent role in Southern culture.[6]

When attempting to understand the actual defeat in war, Southerners utilized this relationship between religion and culture to their advantage. Reid Mitchell's work demonstrates that the motif of the Christian soldier became very important to post-war Southerners in their efforts to come to terms with defeat.[7] Southerners were able to

---

[3]Sandra L. Myres, "Cowboys and Southern Belles," in *Texas Myths*, ed. Robert F. O'Connor (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1986), 126.

[4]Leon P. Baradat, *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 9th ed. (Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2006), 43.

[5]Charles Reagan Wilson, *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980), 1.

[6]Ibid., 7.

[7]Reid Mitchell, "Christian Soldiers?: Perfecting the Confederacy," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, ed. Randall M. Miller, Harry S. Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 297.

accept military defeat by consoling themselves with the thought that their religious piety surpassed that of all other Americans, especially those in the North.[8]

Coming to terms with the past was only one aspect of Southern mythmaking after the war. Myths were also important in defining the South's future. One such myth was that of the New South. The work of Paul M. Gaston represents, perhaps, the best effort to identify and summarize this myth. Of the New South prophets such as Henry W. Grady, Gaston observes, "The term 'New South' in their lexicon bespoke harmonious reconciliation of sectional differences, racial peace, and a new economic and social order based on industry and scientific, diversified agriculture—all of which would lead, eventually, to the South's dominance in the reunited nation."[9] In Gaston's analysis, New South proponents did not repudiate the myth of the Old South and the Lost Cause; rather, they integrated it into their New South program.[10]

To what extent did Southern colleges and universities accept or reject the platform of the New South prophets? Joseph M. Stetar divides post-war Southern educators into four groups. One group consisted of those who held firm to a classical curriculum that stressed Latin, Greek, and morality. Latin and Greek provided a platform for instruction in mental discipline, while emphasis on moral development ensured that students would remain properly grounded.[11] Before the war, they believed that study of the classics was the best way to train the mind properly; after the war, they held fast to these ideas. Their

---

[8]Ibid., 301-302.

[9]Paul M. Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (Montgomery: NewSouth Books, 2002), 28.

[10]Ibid., 168-169.

[11]Joseph M. Stetar, "In Search of a Direction: Southern Higher Education after the Civil War," *History of Education Quarterly* 25 (Fall 1985): 348.

tendency was to reject the notion that education should serve the utilitarian needs of society.[12]

The second group advocated a program which Stetar calls "liberal Christian education."[13] They favored the classics, but for different reasons. Studying ancient languages was important "for their intellectual breadth rather than mental discipline properties."[14] A practical curriculum designed to train students in professional specialties had no place in their educational philosophy. This fact left little room in their educational worldview for the ideas of the New South. Their commitment to protecting and advancing religious education led them to reject the German-style university noted for research and scholarship. Religious truth became the foundation upon which they rested all disciplines.[15]

The last two groups in Stetar's analysis include those educators who pushed for a pragmatic, utilitarian curriculum and those who advocated the German model of a research-oriented curriculum. These two groups, argues Stetar, collaborated to mount a direct challenge to the mental disciplinarians.[16] While the utilitarian educators were pushing for a curriculum that was practical and that could address the needs of the New South, research-oriented educators were pushing for a greater role for science and the professions in the curriculum.[17]

---

[12]Ibid., 344-345.

[13]Ibid., 350.

[14]Ibid., 349.

[15]Ibid., 350-351.

[16]Ibid., 358.

[17]Ibid., 354, 358.

Stetar concludes that as the Civil War became more and more distant, the influence of the mental disciplinarians waned and the curriculum turned noticeably more utilitarian. However, he is quick to point out that individuals representing all of these educational paradigms were found on any given Southern campus at any given time following the Civil War. None of these competing ideas died out or triumphed totally.[18]

The period of Reconstruction was a time in which great political and social questions were raised simultaneously. The New South prophets outlined an agenda that sought to address these questions. Their call for a modern, industrialized South put pressure on colleges and universities to respond in kind. At the same time, these institutions "were called upon to serve as repositories for the region's history, mythology, and traditions."[19]

In the years immediately after the Civil War, historian Frederick Eby argues that "the people [of Texas] turned again to private schools for the training of their children."[20] Although his work is considered by many to be the classic work on Texas educational history and is still cited by many scholars in the field down to the present, Eby makes no attempt to divulge what type of education and training Texans of the post-war era wanted, at least with regard to denominational colleges and universities. His emphasis is on the development of state-sponsored education and places a heavy emphasis on schools rather than colleges.

---

[18]Ibid., 362-363.

[19]Ibid., 350.

[20]Frederick Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1925), 154.

This chapter addresses itself to the manner in which Texas denominational colleges and universities responded to the great political, social, and educational changes that were underway in Texas after the Civil War. Two primary questions will be asked. The first is: How did Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Church leaders in Texas view the role of their colleges in this new environment? The second question is: To what extent did the curriculum of Texas denominational colleges and universities reflect the ideas of the Old South and the New South? The answers to these questions will again demonstrate that Texas denominational institutions of higher learning were not islands unto themselves. They were part of the society in which they operated.

Denominational Churches and the Raison d'etre of their Colleges and Universities

The Baptists: Serving God by Training Ministers

Eby's observation about Texans turning to private schools to educate youth after the Civil War seems to be only partially accurate. His own research documents the slow-but-steady push for the establishment of a state-sponsored university. Before the war, notes Eby, opposition to a state university was driven by many motives. Some Texans feared the elitist nature of education, some wanted private colleges to receive state money, and some believed the state should focus on elementary education before establishing higher educational institutions.[21] In his 1866 inaugural address, Governor J. W. Throckmorton outlined his agenda. It included "the re-organization of the common school system, and the establishment of a State University, at the earliest period

[21]Ibid., 286.

compatible with the depressed financial condition of our affairs."[22] It took a decade before the first state-sponsored colleges and universities began operating. The Agricultural and Mechanical College, which was a land grant institution under the Morrill Act of 1862, opened for students in 1876. The University of Texas opened in 1883.[23] According to Eby, the final push for a state-sponsored university was the result of a "general quickening of educational interest."[24] This trend toward state-sponsored universities was not limited to Texas. Wilson's research suggests that similar movements were picking up speed around the country and in the South in particular.[25]

The Civil War had wrought political, physical, and social chaos on Texas society. Moreover, the state was clearly intent on a full-scale development of a public college and university system. In spite of all this, Texas denominational colleges and universities never lost sight of their primary mission. They believed themselves to be at once a part of the grand effort that was the state of Texas and, at the same time, to be at the tip of the spear in the battle for souls and the moral health of society. Texas Baptists, through their support for Baylor University and Baylor Female College, exhibited this dual mission.

Some scholars have argued that the trials and tribulations experienced by Southerners during the Civil War created in many of them a spiritual crisis. Daniel W. Stowell, for instance, suggests that General Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson's death profoundly impacted white Southerners. He writes, "For a people committed to the belief

---

[22]State of Texas, House of Representatives, Eleventh Legislature, *Journal* (Austin: Office of the "State Gazette," 1866), 23.

[23]Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 288-290.

[24]Ibid., 287.

[25]Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 139.

that an omnipotent God controlled the destiny of men and of nations, Jackson's death was a spiritual crisis."[26] Similarly, in her study of the impact of the Civil War on Southern women, Drew Gilpin Faust notes that the war traumatized and challenged their understanding of religion and its role in their lives. She writes, "Confederate surrender posed an all but insurmountable challenge to Confederate women's faith, to the system of belief that had explained their world and had justified the costly sacrifices demanded of them for four long years."[27] Her description of this crisis as an "insurmountable challenge" highlights the severity of it.

No such spiritual crisis is evident in the records of the Baptist State Convention of Texas. Scarcely, if ever, does one find any reference to the Confederacy's passing, this in spite of the fact that Texas Baptists generally gave their support to both slavery and secession, a fact which was established in the preceding two chapters. The only indication found in these records that the Civil War had taken place at all are the repeated calls for rebuilding the physical plant of Baylor University and Baylor Female College campuses and for rebuilding the student body numerically. One should not minimize these challenges, of course. For most denominational colleges, the loss of students as a result of the Civil War threatened their ultimate destruction. Regarding the impact of the war, Eby claims that "the most of them were completely destroyed."[28]

Calls to rebuild Baylor University's physical plant and its student body abound. In 1865, for instance, the president of Baylor's board of trustees reported to the State

---

[26]Daniel W. Stowell, "Stonewall Jackson and the Providence of God," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 187.

[27]Drew Gilpin Faust, "'Without Pilot or Compass': Elite Women and Religion in the Civil War South," in *Religion and the American Civil War*, 257.

[28]Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 151.

Convention, "We regret to say that the buildings though comfortable for ordinary purposes, need repairs immediately."[29] With regard to rebuilding the student body, the board recognized the challenge but was, at the same time, optimistic. "The number entered this fall is some fifteen less than at this time last year," reported the board's president, "but the students are of more advanced standing and many of them are young men of high promise."[30]

In 1877, with Reconstruction ended, similar sentiments were evident. In its report to the Convention, Baylor's board put forward a resolution calling on Texas Baptists to continue building Baylor's physical plant. The resolution read in part, "*Resolved*, That an effort be immediately commenced to finish the building of Baylor University commenced before the war."[31] Regarding the student body, the board reported with great satisfaction "that higher education is attracting greater attention among the young men of our State."[32] One reason for this positive assessment may have been the fact that Baylor's fortunes were often connected to those of the state in general. There was a sense among Baylor's leaders that as Texas rose from the ashes of war, so, too, would Baylor. Both would inevitably prosper. In the board's words, "The prospects of the University are brightening, its friends becoming encouraged, and with an improved financial outlook in

---

[29]H. Garrett, "Report of the Trustees of Baylor University," in *Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Church at Anderson, Grimes, County, commencing September 30th, and closing October 3, 1865* (Navasota: Texas Ranger Office, 1866), 12.

[30]Ibid., 11-12.

[31]H. Garrett, "Report of the Trustees of Baylor University," in *Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Baptist Church at Bryan, Commencing October 6th, and Ending October 8th, A. D. 1877* (Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1877), 10.

[32]Ibid., 8-9.

the State, the institution will become, in all respects, all its early friends ever expected of it."[33]

What was expected of Baylor University? In spite of the fact that this Baptist institution was impacted by the great political questions of the day, it never lost sight of its true calling: to serve as a missionary beachhead in Texas. Ministers and missionaries would fan out across Texas. Their presence in society would ultimately serve both God and the state. During the 1867 Baptist State Convention, Baylor's trustees advanced a resolution which declared that "Baylor University is intimately connected with every great interest of the denomination in Texas."[34]

Concerning the founding of Baylor, Eby writes, "The strongest motive for founding Baylor was the desire to prepare an educated ministry."[35] Although his work makes no attempt to support this statement with specific evidence, chapter two of this dissertation does. Following the Civil War, calls for Baylor to continue its mission of training ministers were made in earnest. References to them in the convention records are too numerous to repeat fully; however, a few examples are presented here to document this fact.

In 1865, the chairman of the Convention's committee on ministerial education reported, "We must have men of the most finished education for specific positions, and other men for places of less importance, still requiring strong natural sense and a fair

---

[33]Ibid., 9.

[34]John McKnight, "Report of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Baylor University," in *Minutes of the Twentieth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with Gonzales Baptist Church, on Saturday, November 30, 1867* (Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1868), 11.

[35]Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 135.

mental culture. With such a ministry, the Baptists can pervade the world, as their principles are best calculated to influence the unbiased human mind."[36] Ministers trained at Baylor, it was believed, would help evangelize the world. Attached to the same report was a resolution calling for an endowed professor of theology.[37] The need for ministers was apparently much more local. Before they could go out into the world, the needs of Texas churches would have to be met. In the postwar period, this need was great. In its 1867 report, for instance, the committee declared, "Churches are multiplying at a rate greatly disproportioned to the increase of the ministry."[38] Baylor was once again identified as the primary source of an educated ministry. The committee called on the Convention to pray "that our brethren be urged to and in supporting young men having the ministry in view, in prosecuting their courses of study at Baylor University, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary."[39] Texas Baptists and Baylor sought to fulfill this calling by providing ministerial students with free education. In 1868 the committee on ministerial education put forward a resolution calling on churches to help fund the education of these students at Baylor.[40] For the Baptists, then, the Civil War may have presented real challenges to the successful operation of Baylor, but it did little to alter Texas Baptists' ultimate educational mission.

---

[36]M. V. Smith, "Report on Ministerial Education," in *Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, 1865*, 13.

[37]Ibid.

[38]W. Carey Crane, "Report of Committee on Ministerial Education," in *Minutes of the Twentieth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, 1867*, 12.

[39]Ibid., 14.

[40]M. V. Smith, "Report on Ministerial Education," in *Minutes of the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas, Held with Independence Baptist Church, On Saturday, Monday and Tuesday, October 3d, 5th and 6th, 1868* (Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1868), 15.

The training of ministers at Baylor was the central pillar of the Baptist missionary effort in Texas. However, it was not the only pillar. Baptists identified Baylor Female College as an important institution in advancing Baptist missionary efforts. In its report to the Convention in 1868, the board of trustees of Baylor Female College proposed a resolution designed to highlight the College's place in missionary work. It read, "*Resolved*, That we urge upon the brethren, in co-operation with this Convention, especially to build up and cherish Baylor Female College, that it may prove as it should, a valuable auxiliary in extending the cause of truth and salvation."[41] In short, educated Baptist women had a role to play in spreading the Gospel.

The Baptists: Serving the State by Educating Generally

Before the Civil War, Baptists refused to see Baylor's ministerial ethos as separated from the outside world. Rather, they saw their support of education as positively impacting the people of the state of Texas generally. Education and civilization, especially Christian civilization, were linked. The advance of one would lead to the advance of the other. Denominational colleges and universities were believed to serve as the vanguard of this advance. After the Civil War, Baptists maintained and actively promoted this belief.

Perhaps the best expression of the Baptist belief that education served both God and society is found in a sermon preached by the Reverend Horace Clark in 1869. Clark was the president of Baylor Female College. He believed that civilization required education. "If the human mind were doomed to this infantile state forever," declared

[41]R. E. B. Baylor, "Report of the Board of Trustees of Baylor Female College," in *Minutes of the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas, 1868*, 14.

Clark, "what would be the world's history after the lapse of a thousand or ten thousand years of time?"[42] He answered that "without the inspiring power of THOUGHT centuries of centuries would roll away, and the world would be still a wilderness."[43] Such a deplorable condition was not acceptable to God, as He "willed another destiny for man."[44] In other words, God wants humans to live as civilized beings. Religion and education light the path to that goal. He exclaimed,

> Let [the skeptic] compare those lands where nature has reigned with unchallenged supremacy for six thousand years, where the sound of the church going bell has never been heard, and where the school house has never relieved the dreariness of the landscape, with those lands where art has triumphed over nature, intelligence over ignorance and enlightened civilization over barbarism; where churches and school houses rise side by side with the dwelling of the man of toil; where cities are resplendent with the achievements of science, and rich in monuments of art; where man commits his thoughts to the lightning's wing, and where, in his rapid transit across continents, skimming along plains, leaping across rivers, flying over vallies [*sic*], and plunging through mountains, he outstrips the very winds, and easily surmounts the obstacles with which Nature would thwart the conceptions of Science. Let him do all this; and then if he can see no advantage either to religion or humanity in obeying the laws of his being, *mental* as well as moral, he can conscientiously wash his hand of the whole matter, and piously turn over colleges, books and teachers and all the instrumentalities of mental development, to those who are led captive by the devil at his will.[45]

The rise of civilization coincides, in other words, with the rise of religion and education. The two were deemed inseparable in God's plan.

---

[42]H. Clark, "Educational Sermon, Delivered by Rev. H. Clark, President of Baylor Female College, Before the Baptist State Convention of Texas, at its Session held in Galveston, October, 1869, and Ordered to be Printed in the Minutes of the Convention," in *Minutes of the Twenty-Second Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with First Baptist Church, Galveston, Commencing Saturday, October 2 and Ending October 6, 1869* (Houston: Texas Baptist Herald, 1869), 33.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid., 36-37.

The Presbyterians and the Methodists: A Similar Story

The experience of Texas Baptists following the Civil War relating to the destiny of their educational efforts was mirrored to a large degree by the Presbyterians and the Methodists. Extensive analysis would not necessarily add to the strength of this statement; however, some documentation is provided here to support it. To begin, there is little evidence that the Civil War created a spiritual crisis among Texas Presbyterians or Texas Methodists. Although denominational records indicate that there may have been a lack of piety, there appeared to be no corresponding lack of faith. These, of course, were two separate problems. As the war was drawing to a close, Texas Presbyterians recognized that war often encourages a lack of piety. In its 1864 report to the Synod, the committee on the narrative noted, "A state of war is generally adverse to religious progress."[46] Nonetheless, the Synod had reason to hope that faith had not been destroyed by the war. The same committee declared optimistically that "we have much in the state & attitude of our churches generally to incourage [*sic*] us."[47]

Rebuilding after the war for Austin College meant primarily bringing stability to its finances. This concern was shared by all Texas denominational colleges. In attempting to explain the high failure rate of private institutions, Eby notes, for example, that "endowments were too meager to sustain these institutions during the adversities of the war."[48] In his 1866 report to the Synod, the president of Austin College, Samuel McKinney, reprimanded the denomination for its lack of financial support. He wrote,

---

[46]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1864, 120, Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 153.

"We are laboring to carry on the college without any aid from the Board. The great incubus upon the college is its indebtedness."[49] Annual Synod records during Reconstruction indicate that putting the college's financial house in order remained a primary concern.

Eby's observation about the driving force behind the founding of Baylor holds true for Austin College as well. He writes, "The training of a Christian ministry was the leading motive for the support of the school, yet its spirit was broad and tolerant."[50] Synod records abound with calls for ministers. Indeed, the lack of ministers reached crisis proportions after the Civil War. In its 1868 report to the Synod, the committee on the narrative lamented, "Our ministry is largely secularized. Our old members of the church are dying out, the young are not generally coming up to the help of the Lord against the mighty, & but for the word of promise of a covenant keeping God, we should despair of Zion. And death has been busy among our ministers."[51] In the same year, the committee on the minutes of the General Assembly fully supported the Synod's call to find and train candidates for the ministry. Its report insisted, in part,

> The injunction to the ministers, to preach to the people upon the importance of dedicating their sons to the work of the ministry, appeals to us with peculiar force. The Presbyterian Church has been established in Texas over thirty years, &, so far as your committee are aware, no person born, or even named, on the soil of Texas, has ever entered her ministry.[52]

---

[49]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1866, 134. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[50]Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas*, 137.

[51]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1868, 176. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[52]Ibid., 178.

This problem was a lingering one. In 1870 the committee of bills and overtures reported, "From all parts of our vast territory we have repeated the familiar lamentations over the spiritual dissolutions of the land, the extensive regions of the state within which there are no Presbyterian ministers and churches, and the inability of our Presbyteries to supply the abounding distitutions [*sic*] of the means of grace."[53]

Because missionary work was so central to the Synod's central purpose, the problem of a lack of trained ministers cannot be overstated. In 1875 the committee on sustentation and foreign missions urged the Synod to remember this central purpose above all else. It reported, "That the claims of [foreign] missions are among the strongest that can appeal to the Christian heart—that the spirit of Christ is the Spirit of Missions & that its greatly to be desired that all our congregations, even the feeblest, shall bestow a portion of their benefactions upon the Cause."[54] The church's missionary purpose was believed to be the bedrock upon which civilized society rested. A strong church presence implied a strong society; a weak church presence implied a morally depraved society. In 1867 the Synod's committee on the narrative wondered, "What of the world? What of the surrounding mass of the people when the light of the church is so dim, so feeble? If in the church the love of many waxeth cold, be assured beyond her pale iniquity abounds. Intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration and no fear of God before the eyes, are sins every where palpable."[55]

---

[53]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1870, 219-220. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[54]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1875, 59. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[55]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1867, 162. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

Education, especially an educated ministry, was seen as the primary way to fend off the advance of such impiety. Reporting in 1871 on the high level of indebtedness of Austin College, the committee on Austin College noted,

> The interests of the church in the state are suffering greatly now because the college is in such a condition; and it seems vitally necessary for us to have a college, and to have one worthy of the name, and if we fail a lasting stigma not only of weakness but even of want of honesty will attach to us. Every church and every individual in the church is morally, though not legally, responsible for their proportion of this indebtedness, and should not allow their agents, the trustees of the college, who have become legally responsible to bear the burden for them.[56]

Texas Methodists' first order of business after the Civil War was to physically rebuild their educational effort. Although their institutions, such as Rutersville College, Soule University, McKenzie College, and Wesleyan College, represented vibrant, pioneering educational efforts in Texas before and during the Civil War, by the mid-1870s Southwestern University had emerged as the flagship of Methodist education in the state. Donald W. Whisenhunt argues that "Southwestern University was designed to be the central Methodist college in Texas."[57] The reasons for the failure of the other venerable institutions are many. William B. Jones notes, "In the case of Rutersville College it was a defective relationship with the Church and a sexual scandal. In the case of Wesleyan College it was an unseemly competition with another school and a homicide. In the case of McKenzie College it was the destruction of its socioeconomic base by the war."[58] He downplays the role of the loss of students and the loss of their

---

[56]Presbyterian Church in the U.S., Synod of Texas, Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1871, 245-246. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

[57]Donald W. Whisenhunt, *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges And Universities: An Historic Profile* (Austin: Eakin Press, 1986), 133.

[58]William B. Jones, *To Survive and Excel: The Story of Southwestern University, 1840-2000* (Georgetown: Southwestern University, 2006), 55.

tuition money in the eventual end to these institutions.[59] Southwestern University began operations under the name Texas University on October 6, 1873.[60] University officials recognized several challenges faced by the Methodist educational effort in Texas. They noted them as follows:

> The disasters of the war, the formation of new Conferences, and the development of the upper and western portions of the State, prompted the Trustees, in October, 1869, to invite a convention of the Church throughout the State, to consider the question of reorganization and endowment. The call of the Trustees was unanimously concurred in by all of the Annual Conferences of the State.[61]

The causes of the downfall of early Methodist educational efforts notwithstanding, Texas Methodists poured their support into Southwestern University. Their goals for this institution were the same as those expressed by the Baptists and the Presbyterians. Regarding Methodist education and its role in Texas society, Southwestern styled itself as an integral partner in the endeavors of the state. In a memorandum published at the front of the 1874 annual catalog of Texas University, the president of the board noted,

> It [the University] IS WITHIN THE STATE, and our population can only be rendered homogeneous and devoted to the interests of the State through the moulding [*sic*] influences of higher education. Let our youth be gathered in our institutions, and educated in sympathy with the State, and in time we shall have leaders and teachers fully alive to her resources and wants.[62]

---

[59]Ibid.

[60]Texas University, [*Annual Catalog, 1874*] (Galveston: Strickland & Clarke, Stationers and Printers, n.d.), n.p. Texas University's name was changed to Southwestern University in 1875 after the state legislature refused to grant a charter to this private school with the name "Texas" in it. Many legislators, as well as Governor E. J. Davis, believed that the name "Texas" should be reserved for state-sponsored institutions only. See Jones, *To Survive and Excel*, 82.

[61]Texas University, [*Annual Catalog, 1874*].

[62]Ibid.

Commitment to the interests of the state was also reflected in the hiring of the faculty. By their own admission, the Board of Trustees of Texas University gathered a faculty whose members demonstrated that they were "citizens devoted to the country and the cause of education."[63] Military service was one of the primary ways they demonstrated this devotion, and Texas University eagerly made mention of this aspect of their curriculum vitae. Confederate military service was particularly important. Reverend F. A. Mood was listed as a University regent, professor of mental and moral philosophy, and head of the schools of history and political economy. His vita highlighted his service in the Confederate States Army as a chaplain from 1861 to 1865. Reverend George F. Round, who was professor of ancient languages, was listed as having served in the Confederate army as well. His colleague B. E. Chrietzberg, who was professor of pure and applied mathematics, was listed as having served in the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia. Although the Reverend A. Albright, who was listed as provisional professor of German, did not serve in the Confederate army, he was listed as having attended the Military College of Oldenburg, Germany, and subsequently serving in the army. According to his vita in the University's catalog, Albright achieved the rank of captain before moving to the United States.[64]

Military service, especially Confederate military service, was listed as prominently in these curriculum vitae as educational qualifications and attainments. According to Charles Reagan Wilson's book-length study of the relationship between religion and the Lost Cause myth, post-war denominational colleges and universities

---

[63]Ibid.

[64]Ibid.

often went out of their way to hire Confederate veterans. The presence of such faculty members on campus was one way to connect these institutions to the cause of preserving Southern culture.[65] With this in mind, Wilson writes, "Southerners realized that ultimately the Southern Way of Life could not survive if their children rejected the Confederacy. The Lost Cause movement helped Southerners to retain their identity in light of the crushing defeat and poverty that war had brought."[66] Wilson calls denominational colleges and universities that promoted a strong link between religion and the Confederacy "Lost Cause institutions."[67] The hallmark of these schools was their continuing commitment to the classical curriculum, in spite of the fact that the trend in post-war education was toward the practical.[68] They "continued to educate gentlemen on the prewar pattern."[69] Whether Texas University and its successor Southwestern University qualify as Lost Cause institutions can only be determined after a review of the curriculum, which will be done in the latter half of this chapter.

Before a thorough evaluation of the curriculum at post-war denominational colleges can be conducted, however, the religious mission of Methodist education in Texas must be addressed. Annual conference minutes of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South in Texas point to the fact that as much as Texas Methodists saw their educational efforts as a form of civic duty, they never lost sight of their duty to God. Educating ministers and missionaries was just as important to them as it was for Texas

---

[65]Wilson, *Baptized in Blood*, 139.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid.

[69]Ibid.

Baptists and Presbyterians. It was hoped that Southwestern University's educational efforts would "send forth into our county a tide of Christian enlightenment which shall diffuse itself all over the land, reaching to future generations."[70] This sentiment was not limited to Southwestern. Other Methodist institutions were likewise thought to be an integral part of the church's mission. Regarding Marvin College, for instance, the Northwest Texas Annual Conference declared, "This institution is a necessity to our church in the northeastern part of our Conference."[71]

The Curriculum: Preserving the Past and Looking Toward the Future

A review of the curriculum at Texas denominational colleges during Reconstruction shows that these institutions were at a crossroads. The battle between those committed to mental discipline and those committed to a practical curriculum noted by Stetar was evident at Texas denominational colleges. These two divergent views of education represent on the one hand a promotion of the Old South and the Lost Cause and on the other hand a commitment to the New South. They represent the past and the future respectively. Denominational colleges in Texas, therefore, had one foot in the past and one in the future.

The Past: The Curriculum of the Old South During Reconstruction

The classical curriculum did not pass away with the Confederacy. It survived at many Texas denominational colleges and universities. Horace Clark, Baylor Female

---

[70]Methodist Episcopal Church, South, West Texas Annual Conference, *Minutes, 1878*, in *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences, M. E. Church, South, Comprising Full Minutes and Statistical Reports*, ed. J. C. Keener (Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Publishers, 1879), 11. Hereafter cited as *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences*.

[71]Methodist Episcopal Church South, Northwest Texas Annual Conference, *Minutes, 1878*, "Reports Adopted: Education," in *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences*, 28.

College's president, expressed the educational philosophy behind maintaining a curriculum committed to mental discipline succinctly. In his educational sermon before the Baptist State Convention in 1869, he argued that human beings learn through both conscious and unconscious means. Unconscious education is the product of one's life experiences, while conscious education is the product of mental training, which relies on a formal education.[72] Mental discipline through this conscious education, he believed, was necessary for success in the world. He declared, "Exercise is the condition of mental growth. Under this culture the mind expands; all its powers are augmented and quickened. And man becomes the trained athlete, prepared for any encounter and equal to any toil."[73]

Baylor University's curriculum would have pleased Clark. The University maintained a strong classical curriculum in the Reconstruction years. In the immediate postwar years, Baylor's classical curriculum remained a centerpiece of the collegiate program. Roman authors such as Horace, Livy, Cicero, and Tacitus were featured prominently. Roman history and geography appeared along with Latin grammar in the course of study.[74] Just as in the antebellum period, the Reconstruction years involved a curriculum heavily influenced by the Greeks. Authors such as Herodotus and Homer were required reading in the Greek course of study along with Greek grammar, history, and geography. Seniors trained in Greek-English translation.[75] By the end of

---

[72]Clark, "Educational Sermon," 31.

[73]Ibid., 32.

[74]Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, at Independence, Washington, Co., Texas. (Twenty-First Year,) From January 1866, to January, 1867* (Houston: Gray, Smallwood & Co., Book and Job Printers, 1867), 11.

[75]Ibid., 12.

Reconstruction, the Romans and the Greeks held fast to their important place in the University's identity.[76]

Although Southwestern University was the newest educational effort by Methodists in Texas, the classical roots of its predecessor institutions like Rutersville College ran deep. During Reconstruction, it, too, emphasized the classics. The University's 1877-78 catalog indicated that there was a school of Latin and a school of Greek.[77] Pioneering Methodist educators like Chauncey Richardson of Rutersville College, William Halsey of Soule University, and J. W. P. McKenzie of McKenzie College would surely have approved.

Austin College's curriculum with regard to the classics changed little after the war and during Reconstruction. Like their Baptist and Methodist counterparts, the Presbyterians continued to rely on the Greeks and the Romans to mold the minds of the up-and-coming generation. Its 1859-60 catalog outlined a curriculum heavily tilted toward the ancients.[78] Twenty years later, little had changed. Latin and Greek grammar and composition were still very much a part of the curriculum.[79]

The classics were not the only part of the antebellum curriculum to survive to the end of Reconstruction. Moral philosophy courses also managed to remain relevant at Texas denominational colleges and universities. At the close of Reconstruction,

---

[76]Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fourth Year, From February, 1878 to February, 1879* (Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Company, 1879), 11.

[77]Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, For the Collegiate Year 1877-78* (Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Printers, n.d.), 23-25.

[78]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas. For the Academic Year 1859-60* (Houston: Telegraph Book and Job Establishment, 1860), 7.

[79]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1878-9* (St. Louis: Jno. McKittrick, 1879), 9-10.

Methodist educators at Southwestern University maintained a school of mental and moral philosophy. Rivers's moral philosophy textbook, which was analyzed in detail in chapter three, was still in use.[80] Similarly, Baylor University's 1879-80 curriculum listed moral philosophy as one of the courses.[81]

Continued commitment to the classical curriculum indicates that educators identified by Stetar as promoters of mental discipline found a home in post-war Texas denominational colleges and universities. It also indicates that Southerners, including Texans, held on tightly to an Old South curriculum which had served them so well. As was suggested in chapter three, the classical curriculum helped to define and advance Southern distinctiveness as well as Southern social goals.[82] However, the continued presence of moral philosophy courses indicates that Texas denominational colleges and universities were interested in more than fostering a Southern identity after the war; rather, they were interested in fostering a Christian one as well. In 1846, Chauncey Richardson declared, "Indeed, religion should be the soul of everything, the basis of all education, from the cradle to the grave."[83] The role of the moral philosophy course was central to a proper Christian education because it "has for its object the inculcation of correct sentiments of right and wrong."[84] The evidence suggests that denominational

---

[80]Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue, 1877-78*, 18.

[81]Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fifth Year. From February 1879, to February, 1880* (Moawequa, IL: T. M. Hughes, Printer, Illustrated Baptist Office, 1880), 12.

[82]Recall, for example, the work of George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, Michael Sugrue, Roger Geiger, E. Merton Coulter, Rachel Bryan Stillman, and Dan R. Frost cited in chapter three.

[83]Chauncey Richardson, *An Address on Education: Delivered Before the Educational Convention of Texas, The City of Houston, January, 1846* (New York: n. p., 1846), 8.

[84]Ibid.

leaders continued to agree with such sentiments. Although slavery no longer needed to be the focus of such courses, at least as a practical matter, the need to teach right and wrong remained. Richardson's views on moral philosophy were in concert with nineteenth-century educational philosophy. They reflect a commitment to what Julie Reuben calls "the unity of truth."[85] "The unity of truth," she writes, "entailed two important propositions. First, it supposed that all truths agreed and ultimately could be related to one another in a single system. Second, it assumed that knowledge had a moral dimension. To know the 'true,' according to this ideal, was to know the 'good.'"[86]

Change was, however, in the air. In very subtle ways, the role of the classics and of moral philosophy began to diminish in the post-war years. No longer would they serve as the two great pillars of the denominational educational program in Texas. Austin College's 1882-83 catalog, for example, listed a Professor Palmer as professor of moral philosophy, logic, and rhetoric.[87] Courses such as logic, rhetoric, metaphysics, and evidences of Christianity were taught in the department. However, no specific course in moral philosophy was listed in the published curriculum.[88] In the decade leading up to the Civil War, the College's catalogs had listed courses in either moral science or moral philosophy.[89] The fact that Austin College dropped this specific class by 1882 does not necessarily mean that Presbyterian educators had abandoned questions of right and wrong

---

[85]Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 17.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1882-83* (Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Co., 1883), 15.

[88]Ibid., 10-11.

[89]See the *Catalogue of Austin College* for the years 1853-54, 1854-55, 1855-6, 1856-7, and 1859-60.

in their educational program, but it does indicate that the focus of education shifted slightly during Reconstruction. The nature of this shift will be discussed in detail in the next section. The decline in importance of the moral philosophy course is also illustrated by the career of Professor John Robert Allen at Southwestern University. Beginning in 1892, his tenure at Southwestern lasted two decades. He was professor of mental and moral philosophy.[90] Historian Gerald F. Vaughn claims that Allen was "one of the last American university professors to bear this academic title carried over from previous centuries here and abroad."[91]

The end to moral philosophy's featured role in the American college curriculum was not unique to the South. Historians working in the field of educational history note the existence of a similar trend throughout the entire United States.[92] Several explanations are suggested. Douglas Sloan cites two primary factors. The first is what he calls the "internal weakness" of the moral philosophy course.[93] "For one thing," he writes, "the desire for social unity and harmony was so consuming that the philosophers often studiously avoided issues that involved conflict. Consequently, they were sometimes blind to, or silent on, some of the most critical ethical problems of the times."[94] The second factor was the changing nature of the curriculum generally. With

---

[90]Gerald F. Vaughn, "John R. Allen Asks, 'Do We Know God?': Teaching Psychology, Logic, Ethics, and the History of Philosophy at a Methodist University A Century Ago," *Methodist History* 44 (July 2006): 206.

[91]Ibid.

[92]Douglas Sloan, "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum, 1876-1976," in *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*, ed. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok (New York: Plenum Press, 1980), 8; and Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality*, 88.

[93]Sloan, "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum," 8.

[94]Ibid.

the balkanization of academics into distinct departments, the need for a unifying capstone course like moral philosophy was no longer believed to be necessary.[95] Belief in a unified curriculum was, according to Sloan, "becoming illusory even by midcentury."[96] Reuben asserts that one major factor in the decline of moral philosophy was the belief held by many educational reformers that religion, especially denominationalism, was hindering the advancement of science in the curriculum. They viewed the control of colleges by churches as harmful to true academic freedom. Charles W. Eliot, who became Harvard University's president in 1869, is cited as a quintessential spokesman for this view.[97]

As has already been noted above, the New South prophets understood that to succeed in promoting their vision for the future, they could not reject the past. The Old South had to be given its due. Southern distinctiveness and identity depended on it. To judge the extent to which Texas denominational colleges participated in this part of the New South program, a review of how United States history and politics were taught after the war is very informative.

Regarding U. S. history textbooks used at Texas denominational colleges and universities, strong evidence suggests that pro-southern apologists were quite popular. Two stand out in particular.[98] The first was George Frederick Holmes. His text *A School*

---

[95]Ibid.

[96]Ibid.

[97]Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University*, 76-77.

[98]For the sake of clarity, it is important to repeat here the statement made in chapters three and four about college textbooks: College catalogs of the period listed authors and titles of textbooks used in the curriculum. They did not typically list specific editions or dates of publication. Many books, of course, went through several editions. Consequently, it is difficult to say with exact accuracy which edition of these texts was used at any given time. Nonetheless, it is assumed for the purposes of this study that an

History of the United States of America was used by Baylor University throughout the 1870s and into the 1880s.[99] In Clinton Rossiter's study *Conservatism in America*, the author places Holmes in the group of antebellum Southern intellectuals and writers "who rose to the defense of their agrarian, slaveholding society and unleashed a barrage of novels, poems, sermons, and tracts damning the individualistic North and praising the communal South."[100] Holmes's biographer, Neal C. Gillespie, affirms this assessment. He writes, "That he saw justice in the Southern cause is certain, for he felt keenly the betrayal he detected in the conduct of both public officials and private citizens."[101] Joseph Dorfman writes of Holmes, "Holmes joined the leading southern thinkers in maintaining that slavery was a positive good."[102] Holmes's academic title at the University of Virginia was professor of historical science. He taught two courses, one entitled General History and the other entitled Political Economy and the Science of Society. The latter is thought to be among the pioneering courses in what would eventually become known as sociology. Holmes's academic reputation rested largely on the study of society, as he preferred to relegate the teaching of general history to other faculty members.[103]

---

author's views and conclusions did not change dramatically from one edition to the next. Therefore, it is believed that regardless of which specific edition was used, the textbooks cited in this chapter are a solid reflection of what students would have been asked to read.

[99]See, for example, the Baylor University *Catalogue* for the years 1871-72, 1872-73, 1878-79, 1879-80, and 1880-81.

[100]Clinton Rossiter, *Conservatism in America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), 128.

[101]Neal C. Gillespie, *The Collapse of Orthodoxy: The Intellectual Ordeal of George Frederick Holmes* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972), 203.

[102]Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, 1606-1865*, vol. 2 (New York: Viking Press, 1946), 925-926.

[103]Gillespie, *The Collapse of Orthodoxy*, 219-220.

In his textbook *A School History of the United States of America*, Holmes recognized that the early 1870s was a time when the Civil War was still strongly felt. He also recognized that writing about American history, especially about the sectional conflict which had played out in the preceding decades, could still ignite people's passions. In the preface of the 1872 edition, he observed,

> It is hoped that it may prove a serviceable manual for schools, till other years and calmer judgments permit a more complete, accurate, and satisfactory account to be composed or accepted. Before the task was undertaken it was known that there was misapprehension or misrepresentation in regard to the earlier periods, and that details were often discolored or disguised by political, sectional, or local prejudices. It is keenly felt that, during the late sad years, passions have been too violent and wounds too fresh for the preparation or reception of a dispassionate account. Many grave questions, too, are still in dispute without the possibility of reaching secure conclusions.[104]

Holmes's observation supports historian Carl Becker's belief about the role of history in the lives of people. In a letter to William E. Dodd, Becker wrote that "Mr. Everyman has and will have his history, true or false."[105] The job of the historian is to ensure that it is kept "in reasonable harmony with what actually happened."[106] For an historian to write about the history of the Civil War only a few short years after the conclusion of that conflict was a delicate undertaking. Holmes was merely recognizing that fact. What students should know and understand about a conflict that struck at the heart of the American polity had to be handled with care, especially since many students may have directly participated in that conflict. One gets a sense that Holmes felt as though he was a

---

[104]George F. Holmes, *A School History of the United States of America: From the Earliest Discoveries to the Year 1870* (New York: University Publishing Co., 1872), 3.

[105]Carl L. Becker to William E. Dodd, 27 January 1932, in *"What Is the Good of History?": Selected Letters of Carl L. Becker, 1900-1945*, ed. Michael Kammen (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973), 157.

[106]Ibid.

hostage to society's expectations regarding that part of American history. He openly acknowledged that he could not relate the story as accurately as he would wish to.

Since reverence for the Old South was an integral part of the ideas of the New South program, it is relevant here to investigate how Holmes handled issues related to antebellum sectional political disputes, slavery, and secession. His discussion of the Missouri Compromise, for instance, illustrated his effort not to offend. Consequently, his was a straight forward review of the facts with little or no commentary or interpretation. He wrote, "The great dispute, which culminated in the recent civil war, was brought prominently forward in Monroe's first administration by the discussions in regard to the admission of Missouri as a State. The contest was a struggle between the northern and southern sections of the Union for political power."[107] He acknowledged that when Missouri's proposed constitution recognized the new state as a slave state the plan "encountered violent opposition."[108] Similarly, he noted that the debates in Congress over this issue were "bitter."[109]

Holmes's descriptions of the Nullification Crisis and Texas annexation were equally balanced. Of the Nullification Crisis, he wrote, "The jealousies of the North and South were exposed, and the conflicting views of the hostile parties ably presented in a great debate in the Senate of the United States, between Colonel Hayne, of South Carolina, and Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts (Feb. and March, 1830)."[110] Save for a quote from Henry Clay expressing opposition to Texas annexation for fear of possible

---

[107]Holmes, *A School History of the United States of America*, 219.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Ibid.

[110]Ibid., 231.

disunion, Holmes's analysis made no mention of the question of slavery in this conflict.[111] In short, Holmes's account of many of the most divisive antebellum sectional disputes included no commentary as to which section of the country was "right." If Gillespie is correct that Holmes "had always been a convinced States' Rights man,"[112] the desire to comment on this important aspect of antebellum sectional politics must have been tempting. However, Holmes was true to his goal of keeping the account of such things direct and factual.

Regarding slavery specifically, Holmes continued to withhold commentary from the facts presented. In a single paragraph he outlined the facts of the Compromise of 1850 and ended with the benign, yet true, observation that "this enactment was often frustrated by mob violence or local legislation."[113] His descriptions of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the subsequent event known as "Bleeding Kansas" likewise offered no commentary on slavery as such. He proffered only an acknowledgement of the discord engendered in these events.[114]

Holmes's discussion of the secession crisis was equally bland. Considering that it represented the single largest political crisis in American history, one might have expected something more than an encyclopedic account of events presented in chronological order. Referencing, for instance, the South Carolina Ordinance of Secession, Holmes wrote, "In this conjunction of affairs the convention of South Carolina passed the first ordinance of secession, and 'solemnly declared that the union heretofore

---

[111]Ibid., 240-241.

[112]Gillespie, *The Collapse of Orthodoxy*, 203.

[113]Holmes, *A School History of the United States of America*, 255.

[114]Ibid., 258-259.

existing between this State and the other States of North America is dissolved' (29 Dec.)."[115]

Gillespie notes that Holmes's students often called him "Daddy Holmes, the walking Encyclopaedia."[116] It may well be that his textbook *A School History of the United States of America* contributed to this nickname. More likely, however, was the fact that Holmes made a conscious effort to publish a text that could be used by all students, North or South. His text neither promoted the mythology of the Old South and the Lost Cause nor explicitly rejected it. Neither Southern identity nor nationalism was threatened by it. It was neutral to the point of being wholly unimpressive.

The importance of Holmes's textbook to the current study is, of course, what it meant for Baylor University's view of how the past should be interpreted. There are, perhaps, two logical interpretations. First, by adopting this textbook, Baylor was attempting to keep the political and social disputes of the Reconstruction era out of its curriculum. As Holmes well knew, interpretations of the past can cause rancor in the present. Prior to and during the Civil War, the evidence suggests that Baylor had welcomed such political discussion, especially with regard to slavery and secession.[117] Adoption of this textbook in the 1870s indicated a desire to move forward without political distraction. Holmes's encyclopedic account of American history was exactly what was needed.

---

[115]Ibid., 265.

[116]Gillespie, *The Collapse of Orthodoxy*, 219.

[117]Refer to chapters three and four of this dissertation for a detailed discussion of these issues.

A second plausible explanation of Baylor's adoption of Holmes's textbook is that its objective approach to American history, to the point of not even discussing the specific arguments over slavery and secession, gave professors needed latitude in these matters. Since there is no way to know what commentary, if any, was provided by Baylor professors in class, this explanation, though logical, remains speculative.

A second history textbook author also stands out during Reconstruction, namely, Alexander H. Stephens. Southwestern University adopted his textbook *A Compendium of the History of the United States* as required reading in its American history course.[118] Stephens, of course, was the former vice-president of the Confederacy. At the time his textbook was published, he was teaching at the University of Georgia. The title page of the 1874 edition listed him as "Professor Elect of History and Political Science in the University of Georgia."[119] Unlike Holmes, Stephens made little attempt to present history as merely a list of facts. His textbook was filled with commentary, and that commentary was pro-Southern.

Stephens's coverage of the Missouri Compromise is a good illustration of what differentiated him from Holmes. After laying out the facts surrounding the Compromise, the author included a four-page footnote explaining his views of it. He wrote, "It was a conflict of principle. The friends of the Constitution and Union under it everywhere became alarmed."[120] He reminded his readers why many Americans were alarmed. From 1790 to the Missouri Compromise of 1820, "no attempt had been made in the

---

[118]Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, for the Collegiate Year 1877-78* (Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Printers, n.d.), 19.

[119]Alexander H. Stephens, *A Compendium of the History of the United States From the Earliest Settlements to 1872*, new edition-revised (Lexington: P. P. Johnston, Publisher, 1874).

[120]Ibid., 326.

Congress to bring the subject of Negro slavery, as it existed in the States or Territories, within the sphere of Federal legislation, under the new Constitution."[121] Credit for the success of admitting Missouri as a slave state went, at least in part, to those who maintained a strict constructionist view of the Constitution. He wrote, "The right to impose the restriction [on slavery], moved by the Amendment, upon the State of Missouri, was denied by the Strict Constructionists everywhere, North as well as South."[122]

In Stephens's analysis of the slavery question, abolitionists were called "Agitators."[123] His coverage of the Fugitive Slave Law and the Northern response to it are reminiscent of the Texas Declaration of Causes. He wrote, "After the settlement of the Slavery Question by the measure of 1850, which had quieted the excitement for a time, as we have stated, the Agitators changed the arena of their operations."[124] In his discussion of the Fugitive Slave Act, which was part of the Compromise of 1850, he referred to the Republican Party as the "Anti-Slavery Party."[125] Moreover, he made a distinction between abolitionists, who were described as opponents of the Constitution, and pro-slavery Americans, who were described as the protectors of the Constitution. He argued, for instance, "Every one who stood by the obligations of the Constitution was denounced by these Agitators as a 'Pro-Slavery' advocate."[126] The subtlety of his turn of

---

[121]Ibid.

[122]Ibid.

[123]Ibid., 405.

[124]Ibid.

[125]Ibid., 406.

[126]Ibid.

phrase hides a more direct meaning. For Stephens, abolitionist views on slavery were unconstitutional, and Southerners' attempts to defeat them were proper; the South and slavery stood on the right side of the Constitution.

His coverage of the tumultuous events of the 1850s, especially the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the *Dred Scott* case, portrayed the abolitionists as the instigators of strife and violence against the proponents of slavery. In reference to the matter of Kansas, Stephens wrote, "The plan of operations adopted by the Agitators immediately after the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska Act, was to create trouble and dissensions among the settlers in these Territories."[127] In other words, "Bleeding Kansas" was the result of the abolitionists, not pro-slavery Southerners. This, too, is reminiscent of the Texas Declaration of Causes which argued,

> By the disloyalty of the Northern States and their citizens and the imbecility of the Federal Government, infamous combinations of incendiaries and outlaws have been permitted in those States and the common territory of Kansas to trample upon the federal laws, to war upon the lives and property of Southern citizens in that territory, and finally, by violence and mob law, to usurp the possession of the same as exclusively the property of the Northern States.[128]

Stephens's language was, to be sure, a bit more muted, but the message remained the same. Southern slaveholders were under constant assault from abolitionists, whose intent it was to undue the legitimate constitutional arrangement pertaining to slavery.

Stephens's analysis of secession continued to heap responsibility for disunion on the so-called Agitators. In his analysis of the mood that surrounded the meeting of Congress in 1859, he observed, "The discussions between the Agitators and the advocates

---

[127]Ibid., 408.

[128]State of Texas, Secession Convention, *A declaration of the causes which impel the State of Texas to secede from the Federal Union*," in *Journal of the Secession Convention of Texas, 1861*, ed. Ernest William Winkler (n. p.: Austin Printing Company, 1912), 62.

of the maintenance of the Federal Union under the Constitution, with all its obligations and guarantees, were fierce and bitter."[129] They were, indeed. However, what was instructive in his example was the assignment of blame. Stephens blamed abolitionists for the strife, while Southerners were described as defenders of the Constitution. Regarding the formation of the Confederate States of America following secession, Stephens noted that said government was an attempt to reclaim a proper constitutional order. He wrote, "Their constitution was based upon all the essential principles of the Federal Compact of 1787, with its subsequent Amendments."[130]

Stephens used the events surrounding Fort Sumter to make clear that the ultimate blame for the Civil War fell squarely on the federal government, not the Confederacy. Writing of the Confederates, he argued, "They stood upon the well-established principle of public law, that 'the aggressor in a war' (that is, he who begins it) 'is not the first who uses force, but the first who renders force necessary.'"[131] In other words, the fact that the South Carolinians fired upon Fort Sumter first does not mean that Southerners started the war. On the contrary, efforts by the federal government to defend the garrison left them with no other choice. He claimed that

> they held, that under the Constitution of 1787, by which the previously existing Federal Union between the States had been strengthened and made 'more perfect,' the sovereignty of the several States was still reserved by the parties respectively, and with it the right of eminent domain was retained by each within its limits—that the Federal authorities had no rightful military jurisdiction over the soil upon which Fort Sumter was erected, except by the consent of the State of South Carolina.[132]

---

[129]Stephens, *A Compendium of the History of the United States*, 417.

[130]Ibid., 420.

[131]Ibid., 428-429.

[132]Ibid., 429.

As was noted in the previous chapter, Southerners justified the right of secession on the basis of reserved rights in the Constitution. Secession was thought to be one of those rights.

Stephens's understanding of Reconstruction politics included a states' rights view of the Constitution and a belief in the victimization of the South by the more powerful North. The "Agitators" in his analysis transformed themselves into a party of "Radicals."[133] This was, of course, a reference to the Radical Republicans in Congress. Using the state ratification conventions called by Southern states to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment as an example, he demonstrated his distaste for Radical Republicans. Stephens wrote, "By these bodies, so constituted, and under bayonet dictation, the exacted Fourteenth Amendment was declared adopted by the requisite number of States to make it part of the Federal Constitution."[134] The implication was that the Fourteenth Amendment was illegitimate.

Stephens's assessment of the current state of affairs, that is, the state of affairs as they existed at the time his book was published, was politically charged. Describing President Ulysses. S. Grant's administration, for instance, he wrote, "The administration of Gen. Grant thus far has been thoroughly on the line of Radical policy, and strongly marked by measures of very great importance—all tending directly to the centralization of power in the Federal head, and the destruction of the reserved rights of local self-government by the several States of the Union."[135] As evidence of this federal usurpation of the power of local self-governance he cites the Fifteenth Amendment. It, too, declared

---

[133]Ibid., 470.

[134]Ibid., 472.

[135]Ibid., 474-475.

Stephens, had been adopted "in like manner as the Fourteenth [Amendment]"[136] The reader is left to assume that the Fifteenth Amendment was equally illegitimate.

Also cited by Stephens as evidence of a Leviathan-like federal government were the Force Acts. These were a series of laws passed by Congress between 1870 and 1871 in response to the activities of violent groups like the Ku Klux Klan. Their goal was to protect all qualified Southerners, including blacks, in their right to vote. Anyone who stood in the way of another person's right to vote faced federal charges that carried harsh penalties.[137] Historians Carnes and Garraty suggest that these acts served their intended purpose. They write, "Troops were dispatched to areas where the Klan was strong, and by 1872 the federal authorities had arrested enough Klansmen to break up the organization."[138] In his textbook, Stephens referred to one of these Acts as the "Ku-Klux Act of 1871."[139] His dislike for it was quite evident. He wrote,

> This goes far beyond anything in the Sedition Act of 1798, under the elder Adams, in its direct attacks on liberty. But without further specification, it may be stated, that all the leading features of the present Administration and its general policy point directly, and, if not arrested by the Peoples of the several States at the ballot-box, will lead ultimately, to the entire overthrow of the Federal system, and the subversion of all the free institutions thereby attempted to be secured on the American Continent, and the history of which we have traced.[140]

The message here is stark. Readers were told that the Force Acts had the effect of infringing upon the Ku Klux Klan's right of free speech. This, they were informed, was a

---

[136]Ibid., 475.

[137]Mark C. Carnes and John A. Garraty, *The American Nation*, 11th ed., vol. 1, *A History of the United States to 1877* (New York: Longman, 2003), 438.

[138]Ibid.

[139]Stephens, *A Compendium of the History of the United States*, 475.

[140]Ibid.

greater evil than the Klan's goal to deny black men the right to vote. Comparisons to the Sedition Act, of course, were used by Stephens because it, too, was an attack on free speech. He wanted his readers to know that protecting the Klan's freedom to intimidate black voters with suggested or actual violence was more important than protecting the right of black voters to vote. Moreover, his textbook came as close as a textbook could come to endorsing a political candidate. Which candidate? Any candidate but a Republican would be acceptable, it seemed.

By the time the Civil War erupted, both Baylor University and Austin College had dropped their courses in the Constitution of the United States. These courses did not reappear during Reconstruction. A plausible reason for this seems to be the establishment of departments of law at both institutions. Southwestern University's curriculum, however, did include a course on government at the undergraduate level. Although no title of the course is listed in the University's 1877-78 catalog, it was taught in the school of history and political economy by professor Mood. The text used was John C. Calhoun's *A Disquisition on Government*.[141] Modern scholars have often described Calhoun's work as something more than a sectional treatise designed to defend Southern institutions such as slavery. Naphtaly Levy argues that Calhoun's *Disquisition* stands with the *Federalist Papers* as the most significant American contribution to political thought.[142] C. Gordon Post downplays Calhoun's views on slavery as they relate to his political theory. He writes, "Leaving aside the issue of slavery, Calhoun's thought displays a universality which will forever assure him a high position in the history of

---

[141]Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue, 1877-78*, 19.

[142]John C. Calhoun, *A Disquisition on Government*, with an introduction by Naphtaly Levy (New York: Poli Sci Classics, 1947), iii.

American political thought."[143] More recent scholarship continues this effort to remove sectionalism from the meaning of Calhoun's political theory. H. Lee Cheek, Jr., is one such scholar. Writing about the goal of his book, he asserts,

> John Caldwell Calhoun is usually recognized as one of the main figures in American political thought, but most observers attempt to minimize the philosophical significance of his work by arguing that Calhoun was merely a champion of sectional interests or that his ideas were antiquated even during his lifetime. This book will suggest that Calhoun was in fact a seminal political thinker who spoke not only to his own time and place, but also to the modern world.[144]

It is not the purpose of this study to judge the wisdom of uprooting Calhoun's political theory from the soil in which it grew. To the current study, the fact that Southwestern University instructed students on the nature of the American system of government using Calhoun's *Disquisition* speaks volumes about the University's political worldview. Reconstruction was a time when the sectional controversies of the antebellum period were still very fresh in the minds of most Texans. His views on states' rights and slavery would have helped students make sense of defeat. With regard to states' rights, for instance, Calhoun's view of nullification told them that although the South lost the war, its driving principle of states' rights was correct. Calhoun asserted,

> It is this negative power,—the power of preventing or arresting the action of the government,—be it called by what term it may,—veto, interposition, nullification, check, or balance of power,—which, in fact, forms the constitution. . . . It is, indeed, the negative power which makes the constitution,—and the positive which makes the government. The one is the power of acting;—and the other the power of preventing or arresting action. The two, combined, make constitutional governments.[145]

---

[143]John C. Calhoun, *A Disquisition on Government and Selections from the Discourse*, edited with an introduction by C. Gordon Post (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953), vii.

[144]H. Lee Cheek, Jr., *Calhoun and Popular Rule: The Political Theory of the Disquisition and Discourse* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001), ix.

[145]John C. Calhoun, *A Disquisition on Government*, with an introduction by Naphtaly Levy, 35-36.

In other words, resisting illegitimate federal encroachments on states' rights through the act of seceding from the Union was, therefore, necessary for the preservation of good government.

Historian John David Smith suggests that the antebellum proslavery arguments survived the end of slavery and became particularly prevalent during Reconstruction.[146] Southwestern's use of Calhoun's writings serves as one small example. Calhoun's beliefs about individual liberty bolstered the ongoing claim made by Southerners that slavery was proper. In his *Disquisition*, he wrote, "Liberty, then, when forced on a people unfit for it, would, instead of a blessing, be a curse."[147] Freeing slaves, in other words, would have granted them liberty in spite of the fact that they were not capable of handling it. Although slavery had been abolished by the Thirteenth Amendment, students at Southwestern University were not encouraged, at least by their assigned reading, to reevaluate the institution.

The Future: The Curriculum and the New South

Writing about the economic milieu of the South after the Civil War, Paul Gaston observes that "widespread poverty, coupled with and reinforced by fettered opportunity, seemed a strange anomaly in mid-nineteenth-century America."[148] Indeed, it must have been viewed with some dismay, given the fact that "Americans had been a people of plenty from early colonial days."[149] According to Gaston, all but one of the New South

---

[146]John David Smith, *An Old Creed for the New South: Proslavery Ideology and Historiography, 1865-1918* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985), 41.

[147] John C. Calhoun, *A Disquisition on Government*, with an introduction by Naphtaly Levy, 54.

[148]Gaston, *The New South Creed*, 65.

[149]Ibid.

prophets came of age in this post-war economic environment. They came of age during a time of economic deprivation in the South. With a desire to move the South onward and upward, this new generation looked northward. It was in the North's example that the South would find its economic salvation.[150] What was that example? Gaston writes,

> The essential lesson which they learned and then translated into the first plank of the New South program was that wealth and power in the modern world flowed from machines and factories, not from unprocessed fields of white cotton. To make the region rich, then—to bring into existence the opulent South—they became in the first place proponents of industrialism and urbanism.[151]

These twin pillars of industrialization and urbanization came to define the United States in the latter decades of the nineteenth and early decades of the twentieth centuries. Writing of this time period in American history, George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi argue, "In the process the United States abandoned the Jeffersonian dream of a decentralized agrarian republic and began to forge a dynamic new industrial economy nurtured by an increasingly national and even international market."[152] Scholars working in the field of the history of American education have long noted the impact of these forces on educational institutions. In the third volume of his history of American education, Lawrence A. Cremin argues, "The demands of metropolitan civilization upon education were far-reaching. At the very least, they placed added burdens on extant institutions, ranging from the insistence that they provide the social discipline essential to life amidst crowded conditions to the suggestion that they convey every manner of vital

---

[150]Ibid., 67.

[151]Ibid., 73.

[152]George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, 7th ed., vol. 2 (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007), 702.

specialized knowledge."[153] Cremin places special emphasis on the latter of these two demands. He writes, "At the same time that they broadened, statements of educational purpose asserted new demands for highly specialized knowledge and skill."[154] With regard to the transformative effect of industrialization and urbanization on educational institutions, Frederick Rudolph's conclusions mirror those of Cremin. He asserts,

> The transformation that took place in nineteenth-century America was celebrated in the great fairs in Philadelphia in 1876 and Chicago in 1893. This same transformation found expression in the colleges as they stumbled toward clarifying how they were going to fit into the world of new technology, vast material gains, and broadened opportunities. Colleges geared to the need of village elites to flaunt their Latin and Greek required either a new rationale for the old curriculum or an altogether new curriculum. One or the other or some packaging of both would be necessary if the colleges were to be vital instruments of a democratic society.[155]

The transformative effects of industrialization and urbanization also impacted elementary education. Schools, like colleges and universities, were transformed. Herbert M. Kliebard argues that schools "became an ever more critical mediating institution between the family and a puzzling and impersonal social order, an institution through which the norms and ways of surviving in the new industrial society would be conveyed."[156] In this new situation, teachers were no longer enforcers of community

---

[153]Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), 7.

[154]Ibid., 8.

[155]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), 102.

[156]Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge Falmer, 2004), 1.

values and discipline; rather, they were conveyers of a curriculum developed by others. They were expected to impart the values and the knowledge of that curriculum.[157]

The observations of Cremin, Rudolph, and Kliebard highlight one of the fundamental laws of the curricular universe, namely, that educational institutions must be relevant. That is to say, they must address the needs of the society in which they operate. The society in which Texas denominational colleges operated was one in which churches demanded that higher education, especially the institutions they supported, further a religious mission. At the same time, those institutions never attracted students solely on the basis of training ministers and missionaries. Before the Civil War, Texas society demanded that educational institutions promote the values of a slaveholding, agricultural society. Most importantly, it demanded that they help to advance Southern distinctiveness and nationalism. After the Civil War, these same institutions were called upon to address three specific needs: to continue the church's religious mission, to preserve Southern distinctiveness and nationalism, and to respond to an advancing industrialized society. The first two have already been discussed at length. It is to this last one that the discussion now turns. The key to understanding the extent to which Texas denominational colleges and universities met the demands of an industrializing society is found in the curriculum.

Cremin has observed that one of the consequences of the social need for more college and university graduates to acquire specialized knowledge was the development of a modern university system in America. He argues, "The leading reform in higher education during the half-century following the Civil War was the development of the

[157]Ibid.

American university as an institution offering postgraduate instruction in the arts, the sciences, and the professions with an emphasis on scientific inquiry leading to new knowledge and public service."[158] The result, argues Cremin, was the departmentalization of American scholarship, a fact which had both positive and negative consequences. On the positive side, the departments allowed for highly specialized scholarship on a level never known before. On the negative side, departmentalization led to interdepartmental squabbling and an increase in the bureaucratic nature of higher education.[159] "Whatever the particular ideal a university sought to serve," writes Cremin, "as a large, complex organization it ended up a bureaucracy, concerned with efficiency and fairness. And, inevitably, bureaucracy affected the academic enterprise."[160]

To be sure, it would be inappropriate to suggest that Texas denominational colleges and universities of the Reconstruction period developed into full-fledged research universities along the lines of the German model. However, changes were occurring that reflected a more practical, specialized curriculum. The New South prophets would surely have approved of these developments. Two changes stand out: a trend toward departmentalization and a trend toward practical and technical subjects.

Departmentalization of fields of study cut across all three of the denominations that are a part of this study, that is, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Methodists. In its last catalog before the outbreak of the Civil War, Austin College's curriculum can be described as mostly linear. It was broken down into four classes: freshman, sophomore,

---

[158]Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980*, 557.

[159]Ibid., 558-559.

[160]Ibid., 559.

junior, and senior. Within each class was a set curriculum. No departmentalization was evident.[161] By the early 1880s, the Austin College catalog described the curriculum not only by class but by department. Specific departments included modern languages; ancient languages; the English language; mathematics; physical sciences; moral philosophy, logic, and rhetoric; history and English literature; and book keeping and penmanship. Most of these were placed under the control of a single professor.[162] A similar pattern was found at Southwestern University and Baylor University.[163]

In addition to detailing the increasing fragmentation of knowledge, denominational college catalogs usually gave detailed descriptions of each department, often with special attention paid to the professor's qualifications in his given field. In the case of Austin College, for instance, the description of Professor J. C. Edmonds, who was assigned to lead the physical sciences department, read in part,

> Prof. Edmonds has had eight to ten years' experience as a teacher, two years as an assistant professor at his *Alma Mater* [the Virginia Military Institute], and the rest of the time in the schools of Kentucky and Texas. He has also had ample opportunities to put his knowledge of engineering into practice, having been in the field at different times in the actual work of locating railroads. Very recently he was employed on the road that is to connect Mt. Pleasant and Sherman.[164]

The 1870s and 1880s were a time in which railroad construction increased at a feverish pace. These decades gave rise to the great transcontinental railroads. One of these

---

[161]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas. for the Academic Year 1859-60*, 7.

[162]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1882-83*.

[163]See, for example, Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, for the Collegiate Year 1877-78*; and Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fifth Year. From February 1879, to February, 1880*, 11-15.

[164]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1882-83*; 15.

railroads, the Southern Pacific, crossed Texas by 1882.[165] No doubt Professor Edmonds's experience in the field of railroad construction and engineering was viewed by Austin College as a sign of the quality of education one could obtain there. Emphasis on such things as railroad engineering certainly reflected the beliefs of the New South.

Railroads represented very well the changes occurring in American society, especially in economic matters. Tindall and Shi write, for example, "Railroads were the first big business, the first magnet for the great financial markets, and the first industry to develop a large-scale management bureaucracy."[166] In this environment, then, it stands to reason that education needed to train students with the skills necessary to meet the demands of a changing economy. The shift toward a more practical curriculum at many Texas denominational colleges and universities indicates that these institutions were well aware of the changes going on around them.

Business-oriented courses and departments emerged at Austin College, Baylor University, and Southwestern University by the late 1870s and early 1880s. In the case of Austin College, there was no specific school or department, but courses in bookkeeping and penmanship were added to the curriculum by the early 1880s.[167] Courses in penmanship were not required, but Austin's catalog declared that "students who write badly are encouraged to take them."[168] This focus on penmanship may seem strange to the modern reader; however, in an era before typewriters and word processing

---

[165]Tindall and Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, 746-748.

[166]Ibid., 746.

[167]Austin College, *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1882-83*; 16.

[168]Ibid.

programs, students wishing to enter the world of business needed to meet the highest standards with regard to handwriting.

By the early 1880s, both Baylor University and Southwestern University had established commercial schools. Baylor's commercial school stressed bookkeeping and business calculations.[169] Southwestern's commercial school was described as follows:

> The course in this school covers one year. Admissions can be secured only by proficiency in the schools of Pure Mathematics and English Language and Literature, through the Freshman Year. The student is taught, theoretically and practically, the use of all the necessary books in single and double entry, and a great variety of business forms.[170]

Emphasis on penmanship, bookkeeping, and completion of standard business forms is a far cry from the modern business school curriculum. Nonetheless, the development of a rudimentary business curriculum reflected the development of a modern economy in which large corporations were a key component. Again, the New South prophets would have applauded these developments.

Emphasis on practical and technical fields was not only found in the formal curriculum but also in the manner in which many colleges and universities described themselves. Recall in chapter three that many antebellum Southern institutions promoted native or home education. Emphasis was placed on the benefits of a Southern education. Parents were encouraged to send their children to Southern schools rather than Northern ones. Baylor University's antebellum catalogs were cited as evidence of this trend in Texas.

---

[169]Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fifth Year. From February 1879, to February, 1880*, 12.

[170]Southwestern University, *Annual Catalogue of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, For the Collegiate Year 1877-78*, 27.

During Reconstruction, emphasis on a Southern education was replaced with emphasis on the benefits students would derive from the practical curriculum that a college or university offered. Once again, Baylor University serves as a good example of this development. The 1871-72 catalog described Baylor's location as follows:

> Independence is a quiet and remarkably healthy village, in the midst of a refined community. It is twelve miles from Brenham, on the Western Branch of the Houston and Texas Central Railroad, and eighteen miles from Navasota on the Main Trunk of the same road. The scenery is beautifully diversified by prairie, hill, valley and live oak groves. The village is near the centre of population, wealth, commerce and railroads in the State.[171]

Gone are the statements from the antebellum period in which Baylor's trustees lamented, "The Trustees see, with regret, the tendency with some Texians to patronize Northern or distant Colleges, instead of sustaining Institutions founded in their own State."[172] The emphasis during Reconstruction was on the commercial connections that surrounded the University, especially rail lines. If railroads symbolized the coming of a more industrialized South, Baylor wanted to highlight its relationship, though tangential, to them.

Summation

Just as the United States found itself at a crossroads after the Civil War, so, too, did Texas denominational colleges and universities. Theirs was a struggle to remain relevant. But what did that mean exactly? Denominational leaders and educators answered this question by doing what they had always done; namely, they remained true

---

[171]Baylor University, *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington Co., Texas. Twenty-sixth year, From February, 1871, to February, 1872* (Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., Booksellers and Importers, 1872), 16.

[172]Baylor University, *Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Trustee, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas 1856* (Galveston: Civilian Book and Job Office, 1856), 18.

to their religious mission while at the same time providing students with an education that reflected secular realities as well. They continued to see their institutions as a primary training ground for ministers and missionaries. To be sure, the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians all recognized a great need for this activity.

The postwar battle between those educators who favored a continuation of the classical curriculum and those educators who favored a more forward-looking, practical curriculum was evident on Texas denominational college campuses. Joseph M. Stetar's research was cited as a framework for discussing this battle. His conclusion that neither group emerged fully victorious over the other holds true for the schools discussed in the present study.

Reverence for the past, for the Old South, was evident in more than just the continuation of a classical curriculum. The teaching about the past in established American history courses also reflected this reverence. History textbooks used during Reconstruction illuminated on the one hand an attempt to teach about the past in a neutral, unoffending, non-partisan manner and on the other an attempt to teach history with an overt, pro-Southern point of view. Baylor's use of George Frederick Holmes's textbook was cited as an example of the neutral approach, and Southwestern University's use of Alexander H. Stephens's history textbook was cited as an example of an obvious pro-Southern apology.

Finally, Reconstruction-era Texas denominational educators were as much forward-looking as they were backward-looking. The fast pace with which the United States was industrializing had an impact on how they viewed the curriculum. Academic study became more departmentalized, reflecting a general trend in education all over the

United States. Specialization was what the modern, industrial economy demanded. School officials downplayed the uniquely Southern character of these institutions while, at the same time, highlighting their connection to railroads and commercial centers. Without a doubt, the New South prophets would have approved.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusions

One of the most poignant and personal accounts of life in the South during the Civil War was written by Mary Boykin Chesnut. She was the wife of Brigadier-General James Chesnut, Jr., of South Carolina. In her *A Diary From Dixie*, she unknowingly captured the relationship between church and state as seen through the prism of the denominational college. In her March 13, 1862, entry she wrote,

> Mr. Chesnut fretting and fuming. From the poor old blind bishop downward everybody is besetting him to let off students, theological and other, from going into the army. One comfort is that the boys will go. Mr. Chesnut answers: 'Wait until you have saved your country before you make preachers and scholars. When you have a country, there will be no lack of divines, students, scholars to adorn and purify it.' He says he is a one-idea man. That idea is to get every possible man into the ranks.[1]

This entry speaks volumes about the impact the Civil War had on the relationship between church-sponsored schools and the state. First, although she did not name any specific college, her reference to the bishop indicated that the students were patrons of a denominational college. Second, the students were more excited about participation in the war than were their elders. Finally, the state (represented by General Chesnut) specifically called on denominational institutions to support the Confederate nation, even at the expense of its own religious commitments.

The current study argued that Texas denominational colleges and universities actively participated in Texas's social and political development during the Civil War

---

[1]Mary Boykin Chesnut, *A Diary From Dixie*, ed. Isabella D. Martin and Myrta Lockett Avary (New York: Peter Smith, 1929), 141.

era. The central theme that ran throughout was one based on Frederick Rudolph's observation that the school curriculum "has been one of those places where we have told ourselves who we are."[2] For denominational institutions, however, the question of identity was often quite complicated. Perhaps the confusion inherent in this question is most fittingly expressed by the Gospel of Matthew. In response to an attempt by the Pharisees to trap Jesus into choosing between allegiance to God and allegiance to the state, he said, "Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."[3] The evidence indicates that Texas denominational colleges eagerly answered the call of Caesar during one of the most tumultuous periods in Texas history. Yet, at the same time, it indicates that the Baptists, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians never lost sight of the fact that their educational programs were first and foremost called to render unto God. In most instances, denominational leaders felt that God and Caesar were on the same side, or so it seemed.

Political questions were at the heart of this study. By examining the extent to which Texas denominational colleges participated in addressing these questions, a more complete picture of church-state relations during the Civil War era developed. To be sure, it was a complex picture. It was shown that such questions often presented civic and religious leaders alike with multiple possibilities. Once again, Scripture is instructive. Although Jesus' answer to the Pharisees cited above demonstrates that Jesus was far too smart and far too wise to fall into their trap, on its face, the question they presented him was, in many ways, quite simple. Inherent in their question was the

---

[2]Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977), 1.

[3]Mt. 22:21 RSV (Revised Standard Version).

assumption that Caesar was a unified whole. Jesus was asked to choose between Caesar and God; he chose to give allegiance to both, depending on the circumstance. However, what if Caesar was not presented as a unified whole? Another part of the Gospel of Matthew might well answer this question. After Jesus had healed a blind man, who was also possessed by demons, the Pharisees said that Jesus' work was that of Satan, as only Satan could have the power to cast out demons. In response, Jesus declared, "Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and no city or house divided against itself will stand; and if Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then will his kingdom stand?"[4] So appropriate was this passage in describing antebellum American politics that Abraham Lincoln used it in his famous "House Divided" speech in 1858. In other words the state was divided. It was divided on the question of slavery; it was divided on the question of secession; it was divided on what to do after the clouds of war had dissipated.

The evidence uncovered in this study demonstrated the complexities of a house divided. In spite of this, conclusions can be made with a great degree of certainty. With regard to the question of how the state and the church each viewed denominational colleges, several conclusions are evident. First, church and state were both committed to advancing higher education. Each saw such advancement as a necessary component to furthering the aspirations and purposes of Texas society. Second, in spite of this agreement, each had different interests. Texas's official interests were nonsectarian and secular. The state wanted a system of higher education befitting its drive to gain the respect of its sister states around the world and in the United States. At the same time, it

[4]Mt. 12:25-26 RSV.

wanted to accomplish this by using as little of the taxpayers' money as possible. Before, and to a large degree after, the Civil War, denominational colleges provided much of the answer. Third, although many scholars have tried to minimize the sectarian nature of denominational colleges, Texas denominational colleges were often driven by narrow sectarian goals. Training ministers and missionaries was their primary purpose. Educational leaders believed that fulfilling this purpose would advance more than just Christianity in Texas; it would advance their particular version of Christianity. Fourth, although saving souls trumped any political considerations, these two competing goals rarely, if ever, created a rift between denominational colleges and the state.

The question of slavery divided the United States of America. Not surprisingly, this debate made its way into Texas denominational colleges. The evidence suggests that denominational leaders were fully committed to the belief in Southern distinctiveness and superiority. Curriculums heavily laden with the classics and a senior-year moral philosophy course were cited as the strongest proof. To be sure, the prevailing mood on campus reflected a proslavery point of view. In many moral philosophy courses, efforts were made to teach students the biblical argument for slavery. However, the fact that some institutions adopted moral philosophy texts that expressed opposition to slavery debunks the assertion made by some historians that antebellum college campuses in the South frowned on any dissent from the proslavery argument. Open debate on slavery was also found in extra-curricular activities like student literary society debates.

Historians working in the field of Texas history have thoroughly documented the divisions in Texas that arose over the question of secession. The present study added credence to their assertions about these divisions. Specifically, the formal curriculum

related to American government and American constitutionalism was quite diverse. Some schools adopted Joseph Story's textbook on the Constitution. Story, of course, was well known for his Whiggish and nationalistic tendencies and for his opposition to secession. Other schools adopted William Rawle's commentary on the Constitution, which asserted the constitutional right to secession. As was the case with the debate over slavery, students devoted much of their extra-curricular time debating the merits of secession. Here, too, the complexities of Texas politics were evident. Various viewpoints—Whig, Unionist, and secessionist—were in evidence.

The questions posed by Reconstruction were equally divisive. In a general sense, the South found itself looking backward with a somber form of nostalgia. The values of the Old South were seen by some as the only way forward. On the other hand, the intellectual ideas of the New South, especially its commitment to embracing the values of an industrialized economy, were taking root. The curriculum at Texas denominational colleges reflected this dichotomy. Some educators held fast to the antebellum classical curriculum while others forged headlong into the arena of practical studies.

Although denominational college educators were often divided over whether to adopt an Old South or a New South curriculum, they were in agreement that students should be exposed to the study of American history. Far more than before the war, these classes found their way into the curriculum. The history textbooks that were adopted speak volumes about the political views of denominational colleges during Reconstruction. Baylor University adopted George Frederick Holmes's text, which presented a neutral approach to American history. Regarding slavery, secession, war, and Reconstruction, his book was devoid of commentary. Other schools, like Southwestern

University, adopted Alexander H. Stephens's history textbook. His was a pro-slavery, pro-Southern apology. It was also openly hostile to the Radical Republican approach to Reconstruction.

The boldest, most instructive conclusion to be derived from the Reconstruction years, however, brings this study full circle. Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian Church records indicate that the primary concern of denominational educators was to further a religious mission. Training ministers and missionaries was paramount. They did not shy away from their duty to render unto Caesar, but their preference was to render unto God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Anonymous letter to a student in Soule University, 26 September 1861. Special Collections, A. Frank Smith, Jr., Library Center, Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas.

Austin College. Records of the Board of Trustees of Austin College, April 5, 1850 to May 29,1912. College Archives and Special Collections, Abell Library Center, Austin College, Sherman, Texas.

McLean, William to Sam Houston, 21 August 1837. A. J. Houston Collection Documents, Texas State Library, Austin, Texas.

Philomathesian Literary Society of Baylor University. Philomathesian Minute-Book from October 14th 1859 to February 18th 1868. Texas Collection, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

Presbyterian Church in the U.S, Synod of Texas. Minutes of the Synod of Texas, 1851-1900. Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary Archives, Stitt Library, Austin, Texas.

Raguet, Henry to Sam Houston, 26 November 1837. A. J. Houston Collection Documents, Texas State Library, Austin, Texas.

Rutersville College. Minutes of Board of Trustees, 1853-1867. Rutersville College Records, 1835-1885, Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin.

Books and Articles

Calhoun, John C. *A Disquisition on Government and Selections from the Discourse*. Edited with an introduction by C. Gordon Post. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1953.

_____. *A Disquisition on Government*. With an introduction by Naphtaly Levy. New York: Poli Sci Classics, 1947.

Elliott, Stephen, et al. "University of the South." *De Bow's Review* 26 (March 1859): 330-335.

Gammel, Hans Peter Neilsen, ed. *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897*. 10 vols. Austin: The Gammel Book Company, 1898.

Gulick, Charles Adams, Jr., et al., eds. *The Papers of Mirabeau Buonaparte Lamar*. 2 vols. Austin: Pemberton Press, 1968.

Holmes, George F. *A School History of the United States of America: From the Earliest Discoveries to the Year 1870*. New York: University Publishing Co., 1872.

Keener, J. C., ed. *Minutes of the Five Texas Annual Conferences, M. E. Church, South, Comprising Full Minutes and Statistical Reports*. Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Publishers, 1879.

Rawle, William. *A View of the Constitution of the United States of America*. Philadelphia: H. C. Carey & I. Lea, 1825.

Rivers, R. H. *Elements of Moral Philosophy*. Edited by Thomas O. Summers. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1860.

Smith, William R., ed. *The History and Debates of the Convention of the People of Alabama, Begun and Held in the City of Montgomery, on the Seventh Day of January, 1861*. Montgomery: White, Pfister & Co., 1861.

Smither, Harriet, ed. *Journals of the Fourth Congress of the Republic of Texas, 1839-1840*. Vol. 1, *The Senate Journal*. Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones Co., Printers, n.d.

Stephens, Alexander H. *A Compendium of the History of the United States From the Earliest Settlements to 1872*. Lexington: P. P. Johnston, Publisher, 1874.

Story, Joseph. *A Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States: Containing a Brief Commentary on Every Clause, Explaining the True Nature, Reasons, and Objects thereof; Designed for the Use of School Libraries and General Readers*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1852.

Wallace, Ernest, ed. *Documents of Texas History*. Austin: Steck Company, Publishers, 1963.

Wayland, Francis. *Elements of Moral Science*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1853.

Winkler, Ernest William, ed. *Journal of the Secession Convention of Texas, 1861*. N.p.: Austin Printing Company, 1912.

Newspapers and Journals

Texas Christian Advocate (Austin). 10 January 1867.

Texas Christian Advocate (Dallas). 2 August 1900.

Texas National Register (Washington, Texas). 22 March 1845.

Texas Presbyterian (Victoria, Texas). 3 November 1846-14 August 1847.

Tri-Weekly Telegraph (Houston). 27 June 1862.

Published Addresses, Messages, and Speeches

Houston, Sam. *Message of Gov. Sam Houston, on the South Carolina Resolutions*. Austin: John Marshall & Co., State Printers, 1860.

Richardson, Chauncey. *An Address on Education: Delivered Before the Educational Convention of Texas, The City of Houston, January, 1846*. New York: n. p., 1846.

Roberts, O. M. *Speech of Judge O. M. Roberts of the Supreme Court of Texas, at the Capitol, on the 1st Dec., 1860, Upon the 'Impending Crisis.'* N.p.: n. p., 1860.

Sexton, F. B. *Human Progress: An Address Before the Literary Societies of Austin College, June 22nd, 1858.* Houston: Telegraph Book and Job Office, 1858.

Taliaferro, R. H. *An Oration Delivered at Baylor University Before the Erosophian and Philomathesian Societies.* Austin: "State Gazette" Job Office, 1854.

Government Documents and Records

State of South Carolina, Convention of the People of South Carolina. *Journal of the Convention of the People of South Carolina, Held in 1860, 1861, and 1862, Together with the Ordinances, Reports, Resolutions, Etc.* Columbia: R. W. Gibbes, Printer to the Convention, 1862.

State of Texas, House of Representatives, Eleventh Legislature. *Journal*. Austin: Office of the "State Gazette," 1866.

College and University Publications

Austin College. *Catalogue of Austin College at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas for the Academical Year 1853-54*. Huntsville: "Texas Presbyterian," Print, 1854.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academical Year 1854-55*. Huntsville: G. Robinson, Printer, "Item" Office, 1855.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academical Year 1855-6*. Houston: Fairbairn & McClellan, 1856.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County Texas, for the Academical Year 1856-7*. Huntsville: Cammer & M'Laughlin, Printers, 1857.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College, at Huntsville, Walker County, Texas, for the Academic Year 1859-60*. Houston: Telegraph Book and Job Establishment, 1860.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1878-9*. St. Louis: Jno. McKittrick, 1879.

_____. *Catalogue of Austin College, Sherman, Texas, for the Session of 1882-83*. Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Co., 1883.

Baylor University. *Fourth Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas 1856*. Galveston: Civilian Book & Job Office, 1856.

_____. *Fifth Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors and Students, of Baylor University, Independence, Texas, 1857*. Galveston: Civilian Book and Job Office, 1857.

_____. *Seventh Annual Catalogue of the Trustees, Professors, and Students, of Baylor University, Male Department, Independence, Texas, November 26, 1858*. Anderson: Texas Baptist Book and Job Office, 1858.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, at Independence, Washington, Co., Texas. (Twenty-First Year,) From January 1866, to January, 1867*. Houston: Gray, Smallwood & Co., Book and Job Printers, 1867.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington Co., Texas. Twenty-sixth year, From February, 1871, to February, 1872*. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., Booksellers and Importers, 1872.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington Co., Texas. Twenty-Seventh Year, From May, 1872 to May, 1873*. Houston: A. C. Gray, Steam Printer and Bookbinder, 1873.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fourth Year, From February, 1878 to February, 1879*. Cincinnati: Elm Street Printing Company, 1879.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Fifth Year. From February 1879, to February, 1880*. Moawequa, IL: T. M. Hughes, Printer, Illustrated Baptist Office, 1880.

_____. *Catalogue of Officers and Students of Baylor University, Independence, Washington County, Texas. Thirty-Sixth Year. From February 1880 to February 1881*. N.p.: n. p., n. d.

Dialectic Society of M'Kenzie College. *The Constitution and By-Laws of the Dialectic Society of M'Kenzie College; Together with a Catalogue of the Honorary and Regular Members for 1859-1860*. Nashville: A. A. Stitt, 1860.

Kappa Upsilon Society of Austin College. *Register of the Kappa Upsilon Society Organized in Austin College, Huntsville, Texas, 1853*. Houston: Book and Job Office of E. H. Cushing & Co., 1866.

McKenzie College. *Annual Catalogue of the Students and Faculty of M'Kenzie College, Near Clarksville, Texas, for the Session of 1860-61*. Nashville: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1861.

Philologian Society of McKenzie College. *Revision of the Constitution, By-Laws, and Regulation of the Philologian Society of McKenzie College Adopted April 7th, 1860*. Nashville: A. A. Stitt, 1860.

Rutersville College. *First Annual Catalogue of Rutersville College, Rutersville, Fayette County, Texas*. Austin: Sentinal Print, 1840.

Soule University. *Catalogue of Soule University, Chappell Hill, Texas, 1859-60*. Galveston: Texas Christian Advocate Book Press, 1860.

Southwestern University. *Annual Catalogue of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, For the Collegiate Year 1877-78*. Galveston: Shaw & Blaylock, Printers, n.d.

Texas University. [*Annual Catalog, 1874*]. Galveston: Strickland & Clarke, Stationers and Printers, n.d.

Church Publications

Baptist State Convention of Texas. *Organization and Proceedings of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Antioch Church, Anderson, Grimes County, September, 8-12, 1848*. Huntsville: Banner Print, n.d.

_____. *Proceedings of the First Anniversary of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, May 11-14, 1849*. Huntsville: Office of the Texas Banner, 1849.

_____. *Proceedings of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas: Held with the Huntsville Baptist Church, From the 10th to the 14th Day of May, 1850*. Huntsville: Texas Presbyterian, 1850.

_____. *Minutes of the Fourth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Independence in June, 1851*. Washington, TX: Texas Ranger Office, 1851.

_____. *Minutes of the Fifth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas, Held at Marshall, in June, 1852*. Washington, TX: Lone Star Office, n.d.

_____. *Minutes of the Sixth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Huntsville, in June, 1853*. Galveston: Civilian Office, 1853.

_____. *Minutes of the Seventh Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held at Palestine, Anderson County, in June, 1854*. Anderson, TX: Central Texian Office., 1854.

_____. *Minutes of the Eighth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of the State of Texas, Held at Independence, Washington County, in November, 1855*. Anderson, TX: Texas Baptist Office, 1855.

_____. *Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Church at Anderson, Grimes, County, commencing September 30th, and closing October 3, 1865*. Navasota: Texas Ranger Office, 1866.

_____. *Minutes of the Twentieth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with Gonzales Baptist Church, on Saturday, November 30, 1867*. Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1868.

_____. *Minutes of the Twenty-First Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention, of Texas, Held with Independence Baptist Church, On Saturday, Monday and Tuesday, October 3d, 5th and 6th, 1868*. Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1868.

_____. *Minutes of the Thirtieth Annual Session of the Baptist State Convention of Texas, Held with the Baptist Church at Bryan, Commencing October 6th, and Ending October 8th, A. D. 1877*. Houston: Office of the Texas Baptist Herald, 1877.

Southwest Texas Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, 1942 Session of the Conference. *Official Minutes of the Southwest Texas Annual Conference*. N. p.: n. p., n. d.

Secondary Sources

Books

Alexander, Kern, and Erwin S. Solomon. *College and University Law*. Charlottesville: Michie Company, 1972.

American Jurisprudence: A Modern Comprehensive Text Statement of American Law, State and Federal, Completely Revised and Rewritten in the Light of Modern Authorities and Developments. Vol. 15A. N.p.: West Group, 2000.

Baker, Eugene W. *A Noble Example: A Pen Picture of William M. Tryon, Pioneer Texas Baptist Preacher and Co-Founder of Baylor University*. Waco: Baylor University, 1985.

_____. *In His Traces: The Life and Times of R. E. B. Baylor*. Waco: Baylor University, 1996.

_____. *Nothing Better Than This: The Biography of James Huckins, First Baptist Missionary to Texas*. Waco: Baylor University, 1985.

Baradat, Leon P. *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 8th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2003.

_____. *Political Ideologies: Their Origins and Impact*, 9th ed. Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2006.

Bauer, Elizabeth Kelley. *Commentaries on the Constitution, 1790-1860*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Bloesch, Donald G. *Essentials of Evangelical Theology*. Vol. 2, *Life, Ministry, and Hope*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979.

Boles, John B. *Masters & Slaves in the House of the Lord: Race and Religion in the American South, 1740-1870*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1988.

Bower, Carolyn, and Lisa Ascenzo, eds. *Corpus Juris Secundum: A Contemporary Statement of American Law as Derived from Reported Cases and Legislation*. Vol. 14A. N.p.: Thomson/West, 2006.

Brundage, Anthony. *Going to the Sources: A Guide to Historical Research and Writing*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2002.

Buenger, Walter L. *Secession and the Union in Texas*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984.

Callahan, Daniel, and Sissela Bok, eds. *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education*. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Calvert, Robert A., Arnoldo De León, and Gregg Cantrell. *The History of Texas*. Wheeling, Il: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2002.

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

Carnes, Mark C., and John A. Garraty. *The American Nation*, 11th ed. Vol. 1, *A History of the United States to 1877*. New York: Longman, 2003.

_____. *The American Nation: A History of the United States*, 12th ed. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2006.

Carwardine, Richard J. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Cheek, H. Lee, Jr. *Calhoun and Popular Rule: The Political Theory of the Disquisition and Discourse*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001.

Chesnut, Mary Boykin. *A Diary from Dixie*. Edited by Isabella D. Martin and Myrta Lockett Avary. New York: Peter Smith, 1929.

Cole, Arthur Charles. *The Whig Party in the South*. N.p.: n.p., 1912. Reprint, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1962.

Coulter, E. Merton. *College Life in the Old South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951.

Crane, Theodore R. *Francis Wayland: Political Economist as Educator*. Providence: Brown University Press, 1962.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

_____. *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.

_____. *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980.

Culligan, Lawrence J., and Milorad Nikolic, eds. *Corpus Juris Secundum: A Contemporary Statement of American Law as Derived from Reported Cases and Legislation*. Vol. 18. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1990.

Cummins, Light Townsend. *Austin College: A Sesquicentennial History, 1849-1999*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1999.

Davis, Jefferson. *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government*. Vol. 1. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1881.

Dorfman, Joseph. *The Economic Mind in American Civilization, 1606-1865*. Vol. 2. New York: Viking Press, 1946.

Dumond, Dwight Lowell. *The Secession Movement, 1860-1861*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1931.

Duvall, Sylvanus Milne. *The Methodist Episcopal Church and Education up to 1869*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

Dye, Thomas R, L. Tucker Gibson, Jr., and Clay Robison. *Politics in America, Texas Edition*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2005.

Eby, Frederick. *Christianity and Education*. Dallas: Executive Board of the Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1915.

_____. *The Development of Education in Texas*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1925.

Eighmy, John Lee. *Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987.

Elliott, L. R. *Centennial Story of Texas Baptists*. Dallas: Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1936.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *A Sacred Circle: The Dilemma of the Intellectual in the Old South, 1840-1860*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

_____. *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.

Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.

Freehling, William W., and Craig M. Simpson. *Secession Debated: Georgia's Showdown in 1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Freehling, William W. *The Road to Disunion*. Vol.2, *Secessionists Triumphant, 1854-1861*. Oxford: University Press, 2007.

Frost, Dan R. *Thinking Confederates: Academia and the Idea of Progress in the New South*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2000.

Gallagher, Richard B., ed., *Texas Jur*, 3d ed. Vol. 12. N.p.: Thomson/West, 2004.

Gaston, Paul M. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*. Montgomery: NewSouth Books, 2002.

Geiger, Roger, ed. *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000.

Gillespie, Neal C. *The Collapse of Orthodoxy: The Intellectual Ordeal of George Frederick Holmes*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972.

Gillon, Steven M., and Cathy D. Matson. *The American Experiment: A History of the United States*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2002.

Godbold, Albea. *The Church College of the Old South*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944.

Goen, C.C. *Broken Churches, Broken Nation: Denominational Schisms and the Coming of the American Civil War*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985.

Hambrick-Stowe, Charles E. *Charles G. Finney and the Spirit of American Evangelicalism*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.

Hamilton, Neil. *Zealotry and Academic Freedom: A Legal and Historical Perspective*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Harrell, David Edwin, Jr., ed. *Varieties of Southern Evangelicalism*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1981.

Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Walter P. Metzger. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Holt, Michael F. *The Political Crisis of the 1850s*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

Howard, Victor B. *Conscience and Slavery: The Evangelistic Calvinist Domestic Missions, 1837-1861*. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1990.

_____. *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990.

Howe, Daniel Walker, ed. *The American Whigs: An Anthology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1973.

Huebner, Timothy S. *The Taney Court: Justices, Rulings, and Legacy*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2003.

Johnson, Curtis D. *Redeeming America: Evangelicals and the Road to Civil War*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993.

Johnson, Tony W., and Ronald F. Reed, eds. *Historical Documents in American Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.

Jones, William B. *To Survive and Excel: The Story of Southwestern University, 1840-2000*. Georgetown, TX: Southwestern University, 2006.

Kaestle, Carl F. *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.

Kammen, Michael, ed. *"What Is the Good of History?": Selected Letters of Carl L. Becker, 1900-1945*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Kaplin, William A., and Barbara A. Lee. *The Law of Higher Education: A Comprehensive Guide to Legal Implications of Administrative Decision Making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004.

Kuklick, Bruce, and D. G. Hart, eds. *Religious Advocacy and American History*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.

Kyle, Richard. *Evangelicalism: An Americanized Christianity*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2006.

Landolt, George L. *Search for the Summit: Austin College Through XII Decades, 1849-1970*. Austin: Von Boeckman-Jones Co., 1970.

Lefever, Alan J. *Fighting the Good Fight: The Life and Work of Benajah Harvey Carroll*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1994.

Lehman, Jeffrey, and Shirelle Phelps, eds. *West's Encyclopedia of American Law*. Detroit: Thomson/Gale, 2005.

Loveland, Anne C. *Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order, 1800-1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1980.

Lowe, Richard G., and Randolph B. Campbell. *Planters & Plain Folk: Agriculture in Antebellum Texas*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1987.

Marten, James. *Texas Divided: Loyalty and Dissent in the Lone Star Sate, 1856-1874*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990.

Mathews, Donald G. *Religion in the Old South*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.

_____. *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

McBeth, Harry Leon. *Texas Baptists: A Sesquicentennial History*. Dallas: Baptistway Press, 1998.

McCaslin, Richard B. *Tainted Breeze: The Great Hanging at Gainesville, Texas, 1862*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994.

McCloskey, Robert G. *The American Supreme Court*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

McKitrick, Eric L. *Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

McKivigan, John R. *The War against Proslavery Religion: Abolitionism and the Northern Churches, 1830-1865*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

McPherson, James M. *Ordeal By Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2001.

_____. *What They Fought For, 1861-1865*. New York: Anchor Books, 1995.

Meyer, Adolphe E. *An Education History of the American People*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.

Miller, Randall M., Harry S. Stout, and Charles Reagan Wilson, eds. *Religion and the American Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Miller, Thomas Lloyd. *The Public Lands of Texas, 1519-1970*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.

Murray, Lois Smith. *Baylor at Independence*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 1972.

Noll, Mark A. *The Civil War as a Theological Crisis*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

_____. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

O'Connor, Robert F., ed. *Texas Myths*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1986.

Pace, Robert F. *Halls of Honor: College Men in the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Pangle, Lorraine Smith, and Thomas L. Pangle. *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideas of the American Founders*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1993.

Paschal, George H., Jr., and Judith A. Benner, *One Hundred Years of Challenge and Change: A History of the Synod of Texas of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1968.

Pickering, David, and Judy Falls. *Brush Men & Vigilantes: Civil War Dissent in Texas*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2000.

Red, William Stuart. *A History of the Presbyterian Church in* Texas. N.p.: Steck Company, 1936.

Reuben, Julie A. *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Rossiter, Clinton. *Conservatism in America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Rudolph, Frederick. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

_____. *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Schwartz, Bernard. *A History of the Supreme Court*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Schwartz, Mortimer D., and John C. Hogan, eds. *Joseph Story: A Collection of Writings by and About an Eminent American Jurist*. New York: Oceana Publications, Inc., 1959.

Silver, James W. *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1964.

Smith, H. Shelton. *In His Image, But…: Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.

Smith, John David. *An Old Creed for the New South: Proslavery Ideology and Historiography, 1865-1918*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Snay, Mitchell. *Gospel of Disunion: Religion and Separatism in the Antebellum South*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges. *Criteria for Accreditation, 1998*. Decatur, GA: Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 2000.

Stout, Harry S. *Upon the Altar of the Nation: A Moral History of the American Civil War*. New York: Viking, 2006.

Tindall, George Brown, and David Emory Shi. *America: A Narrative* History. 2 vols. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2007.

Tyler, Ron, et al., eds. *The New Handbook of Texas*, 6 vols. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996.

Veysey, Laurence R. *The Emergence of the American* University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wallace, Ernest, ed. *Documents of Texas History*. Austin: Steck Company, Publishers, 1963.

Walther, Eric H. *The Fire-Eaters*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.

Whisenhunt, Donald W. *The Encyclopedia of Texas Colleges and Universities: An Historical Profile*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1986.

Wilson, Charles Reagan. *Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1980.

Articles

Calvin Dickinson. "Collegiate Life in Nineteenth Century Texas: A Case Study." *Texana* 7, no. 4 (1969): 313-321.

Dobney, Fredrick J. "From Denominationalism to Nationalism in the Civil War: A Case Study." *Texana* 9, no. 4 (1971): 367-376.

Ezell, John S. "A Southern Education for Southrons." *Journal of Southern History* 17, no. 3 (August 1951): 303-327.

Felton, Galyle Carlton. "John Wesley and the Teaching Ministry: Ramifications for Education in the Church Today." *Religious Education* 92 (Winter 1997): 92-106.

Humphries, Jack W. "Notes and Documents: The Law Department at Old Austin College." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 83 (April 1980): 371-386.

Lang, Aldon Socrates. "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas." *Baylor Bulletin*, 35, no. 3 (July 1932): 13-262.

Magrill, Rose Mary. "Higher Education on the Frontier: Chapel Hill College in Daingerfield, Texas." *East Texas Historical Journal* 43 (Spring 2005): 49-67.

Marsh, Daniel L. "Methodism and Early Methodist Theological Education." *Methodist History* 1, no. 3 (October 1962): 3-13.

McKitrick, Reuben. "The Public Land System of Texas, 1823-1910," *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, 9, no. 1 (February 1918): 1-172.

Nelson, Guy, Jr. "Baylor University at Independence: The War Years, 1861-65." *Texana* 2 (Summer 1964): 87-111.

Stetar, Joseph M. "In Search of a Direction: Southern Higher Education after the Civil War." *History of Education Quarterly* 25 (Fall 1985): 341-367.

Thompson, E. Bruce. "William Carey Crane and Texas Education." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 58 (January 1955): 405-421.

Vaughn, Gerald F. "John R. Allen Asks, 'Do We Know God?': Teaching Psychology, Logic, Ethics, and the History of Philosophy at a Methodist University A Century Ago." *Methodist History* 44 (July 2006): 204-215.

Watson, Samuel J. "Religion and Combat Motivation in the Confederate Armies." *Journal of Military History* 58 (January 1994): 29-55.

Theses and Dissertations

Dannelly, Clarence Moore. "The Development of Collegiate Education in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1846-1902." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1933.

Doegey, Lorane Miller. "Sam Houston: Southern Spokesman for the Cause of Union." Ph.D. diss., Southern Illinois University, 1968.

Engelder, Conrad James. "The Churches and Slavery: A Study of the Attitudes Toward Slavery of the Major Protestant Denominations." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1964.

Huehner, David Robert. "Reform and the Pre-Civil War American College." Ph. D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972.

Ledbetter, Billy Don. "Slavery, Fear, and Disunion in the Lone Star State: Texans' Attitudes Toward Secession and the Union, 1846-1861." Ph.D. diss., North Texas State University, 1972.

Menna, Larry Keith. "Embattled Conservatism: The Ideology of the Southern Whigs." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1991.

Stillman, Rachel Bryan. "Education in the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865." Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972.

Vaughan, Margaret R. "William Carey Crane and the Sectional Conflict." M.A. thesis, Baylor University, 1968.