

LYNCHING IN TEXAS

by

DAVID L. CHAPMAN, B.A.

A THESIS

IN

HISTORY

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved

August, 1973

805
T 3
1973
No. 103
Cop 2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply indebted to Professor Alwyn Barr for his direction of this thesis and to Professor James V. Reese for his helpful criticism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	ii
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
II. THE LYNCH MOB	15
III. THE VICTIMS	39
IV. THE DECLINE OF LYNCHING	58
V. CONCLUSIONS	83
APPENDIX	93
A. LYNCHINGS BY YEAR AND BY RACE	94
B. CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PERSONS LYNCHED IN TEXAS.	97
C. CRIMES FOR WHICH LYNCHED.	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Lynching is an act of mob violence which results in the killing or maiming of a person or persons charged with or suspected of a serious crime. Because lynching is similar to ordinary murder, other criteria are necessary to further define lynching. The Tuskegee Institute in 1940 established two additional guidelines. First, there must be legal evidence of a person's illegal death. Second, there must be evidence of group participation in the killing under the pretext of service to justice, race, or tradition. Since the Tuskegee Institute has compiled the only reliable record of lynchings in existence, the above definition and criteria have been used herein.

That lynching occurred often in the state of Texas has been fully documented in previous works. Only Georgia and Mississippi exceeded Texas in the number of people who died at the hands of the lynch mob.¹ Yet these works, which will be covered in detail later, serve only to give

¹National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918 (New York: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1919), 7.

narrative accounts of the lynchings and to catalogue persons lynched, crimes for which they were lynched, and other statistical areas. As informative as these previous works are, however, their authors wrote at a time when efforts were still being made to eliminate lynching. Therefore, many of them, such as Arthur Raper in The Tragedy of Lynching and Walter White in Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch, sought to influence public opinion against lynching rather than to relate the history of lynching in a scholarly manner. Furthermore, since these and other authors wrote at a time when lynchers remained widely active, they could not consider the reasons for its eventual disappearance. Thus, no significant attempt has been made previously to analyze the composition and motivations of the lynch mobs, to compare the incidents of black lynchings to lynchings of whites and Mexican-Americans, or to show why lynching declined. This study will attempt to answer these and other related questions about lynchings.

The exact origin of lynch law is uncertain as there are several theories concerning the identity of the real Judge Lynch. The most widely accepted theory states that lynch law received its name from Charles Lynch who administered summary justice against the Tories and other desperadoes who terrorized the region around Lynchburg, Virginia,

during the Revolutionary War. In order to curb the activities of these men, Charles Lynch organized and led a strong body of similarly-minded men, "men of moral character, and commanding influence," who scoured the countryside day and night.² The desperadoes whom they captured received an extra-legal trial at which Judge Lynch presided as judge, impaneled the jury, and, upon conviction, executed the punishment. In this instance, he gave the accused an opportunity to defend themselves and to show extenuating circumstances. If the jury found them guilty, the desperadoes received thirty-nine lashes on the bare back and were required to leave the country.³

The phenomena of lynching, however, did not have its absolute origins with the famous Colonel Lynch of Lynchburg. The practice had existed in other countries under other names. The English knew it as "Lydford Law," the Scottish as "Jeddart Law," the Germans as "Vehmgerichte," and the Spanish as "Hermanadad."⁴ The name Lynch also had appeared

²Austin Weekly Record, September 17, 1887, quoting from Recollections of Lynchburg by its Earliest Inhabitants (n.p., n.d.).

³Ibid.

⁴New York Times, December 24, 1933. A good presentation of the alternate theories concerning the origin of lynch law is found in Mary Elisabeth Estes, "An Historical Survey of Lynchings in Oklahoma and Texas" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1942), 1-15.

previously in connection with this type of justice. In 1493, James Lynch Fitzstephen, the mayor of Galway, a town on the west coast of Ireland, reputedly hanged his own son from the window of his house for some violation of the law.⁵ Furthermore, the first recorded lynching in this country predates even the activities of Colonel Lynch. In Roxburg, Massachusetts, in July, 1741, the Boston Newsletter reported "a very sorrowful affair in which a Negro man was suspected of stealing some money, was by divers persons ty'd to a tree and whip'd in order to bring him to confess the fact; after which he was taken down and lying some time upon the grass was carried to his master's house, but died soon after."⁶ A white murderer caught red handed also met lynching in Virginia in 1792.⁷ Thus, whether or not the practice received its name from some European practitioner or from Colonel Lynch, it is evident that lynching existed in the early days of this country.

One reason for considering lynching a criminal practice

⁵New York Times, January 7, 1934.

⁶Winthrop D. Jordan, White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), 121, citing the Boston Newsletter, July 23, 1741.

⁷Ibid., citing the Norfolk, Virginia Chronicle, September 8, 1792.

peculiar to the United States⁸ is the extent of lynchings that occurred in this country. For the period from 1889 to 1962, 3,858 lynchings occurred in the United States.⁹ Although the greatest number of lynchings took place in the South, only Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and Vermont avoided lynching. The South, however, became the only region to practice lynching on an extensive basis. For the period 1889 to 1918, while the rest of the nation lynched 390 people, the South alone lynched 2,834.¹⁰ Of all the southern states, Texas ranked third in the number of lynchings, surpassed only by Georgia and Mississippi. For the period 1889 to 1918, Texas had 335 lynchings¹¹ and

⁸Elbert Cutler, Lynch-Law, An Investigation into the History of Lynching in the United States (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1905), 1.

⁹N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 7; Harry A. Ploski and Ernest Kaiser, eds., The Negro Almanac (New York: Bellwether Publishing Company, 1971), 267. Scholars have been unable to agree on the exact number of lynchings. Richard Hofstadter in American Violence (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1970), 20, says there were 4,950 lynchings from 1882 to 1927. He obtained that figure from Walter White, Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1929), 232. White stated that he combined the figures given in Cutler, Lynch Law, in N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, and in the World Almanac, 1927. In most instances, the yearly totals in those sources did not agree. White consistently used the highest number given for any one year. Thus, he obtained a larger total than the 4,736 given by the Tuskegee Institute for 1882-1962.

¹⁰N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 7.

¹¹Ibid.

through all the years for which accurate lynching records exist, 1882 to 1962, Texas lynched 493 people.¹² The fact that records were kept only after the Chicago Tribune began to publish statistics on lynchings in its annual summary of disasters and violent deaths, however, prevents an accurate estimate of the number of lynchings that actually have occurred. For example, Walter White, in his book Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch, estimated that over a thousand blacks were lynched in Texas in the years 1865 to 1868.¹³ White probably obtained his total of 1,035 possible lynchings from statistics of homicides in Texas published in the Journal of the Reconstruction Convention (Austin, 1870). A previous report on homicides made at the convention showed 939 homicides. Only 373 of these were committed by whites against Negroes.¹⁴ Furthermore, the report failed to categorize the homicide as to causes. Thus, the number of lynchings in that period is still unknown. In any case, the number of persons lynched in the United States easily would exceed the number of similar

¹²Ploski and Kaiser, The Negro Almanac, 267.

¹³White, Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch, 96.

¹⁴Ann Patton Baenziger, "The Texas State Police During Reconstruction: A Re-examination," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, LXXII (April, 1969), 471-472, citing the Journal of the Reconstruction Convention (Austin, 1870), 193, 194, 500-505.

recorded instances in other countries. If lynch law originated in another country, it justifiably became associated with this country because of the enormous number of its victims here.

The majority of the earlier studies of lynching sought either to justify or to end the practice. Those who defended lynching offered two arguments for its existence. First, they believed lynching necessary for the protection of white womanhood. They based this argument on the tradition of chivalry in the South which decreed that any white southern male stood ready to avenge the honor of any white woman and to punish the commission of any wrong.¹⁵ With white southerners, rape committed by a Negro ranked as the greatest offense against white womanhood. They repeated almost incessantly the theme that the crime justified the punishment. "It is not necessary to be an apologist for barbarity because one states with bluntness the cause," wrote Thomas Nelson Page. "The stern underlying principle of the people who commit these barbarities is one that has its roots deep in the basic passions of humanity: the determination to put an end to the ravishing of their women by an inferior race, no matter what the consequences."¹⁶

¹⁵E. L. Godkins, "Southern Lynching," Nation, LVII (November 2, 1893), 322-323.

¹⁶Thomas Nelson Page, "The Lynching of Negroes--Its Causes and Its Prevention," North American Review, CLXXVII (January, 1904), 38.

Page credited the emancipation of the Negro with causing the first raping of white women by Negroes. He stated that "to the ignorant and brutal young Negro," social equality "signifies but one thing: the opportunity to enjoy equally with white men, the privilege of cohabitating with white women."¹⁷ By way of example, he recollected giving a lecture in a town in the cotton belt of Texas. Two days later, he recalled, the newspapers gave an account of the burning at the stake in that town of a Negro.¹⁸ But Page gave inflammatory and erroneous details about the lynching of Henry Smith in Paris, Texas, on January 31, 1893. He stated that the body of the five year old allegedly raped and murdered by the Negro was "broken and mangled, he had cut the throat and thrown her into a ditch."¹⁹ In On Lynching, Ida Wells disputed the mutilation of the body and the reports of the coroner refute the allegation that she had been "split asunder."²⁰ Furthermore, even contemporary authors refuted Page's arguments that lynchings resulted only from the crime of rape by Negroes and only began after

¹⁷Ibid., 35.

¹⁸Ibid., 38.

¹⁹Ibid., 39.

²⁰Ida Wells, On Lynching (New York: Arno Press, 1969), 25-26.

the Civil War. In reply to a Southerner's defense of lynching, E. L. Godkin wrote that the allegations of rape as the exclusive cause of lynching were false, that rape was fairly rare in the South and certainly no more prevalent than in the North.²¹ When one considers the fact that only a third or less of all lynching victims ever faced the accusation of rape, the rationalization that rape caused lynching collapses.²²

The white South put great faith in the theory that the rape of white women by Negroes prompted lynchings because of the mistaken belief in and fear of Negroes' supposed sexual superiority. The sexual powers of the Negro were legendary--he was thought to be more of a brute sexually than a man. These beliefs had existed from the earliest days of slavery in this country. In White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro 1550-1812, Winthrop D. Jordan details several reports by slave masters and physicians concerning the massive size of the Negro males' genitals.²³ Hence the readiness with which the public accepted false rumors concerning the mutilation of the little girl

²¹Godkins, "Southern Lynching," 322.

²²Southern Commission for the Study of Lynchings, Lynchings and What They Mean (Atlanta: The Commission, 1931), 10.

²³Jordan, White Over Black, 158.

murdered by the Negro. Since she reportedly had been raped, and since they assumed a Negro had a gigantic penis, she must have been horribly mutilated. Some also felt Negro males had a peculiar power over white women, which brought out their suppressed desires.²⁴ With such commonly held beliefs, whites easily could rationalize the murder of Negroes by mobs. Since rape ranked as a crime punishable by death, however, why did the Southerners refuse to try the rapist and legally execute him?

People most commonly answered that they distrusted the courts.²⁵ Some writers saw lynchers as frustrated by the courts' delay in acting and by the belief that the punishment handed down was too lenient.²⁶ Lynchers also felt justice was often circumvented by legal technicalities.²⁷ After the previously mentioned lynching in Paris, Texas, the Dallas Morning News editorialized that the people of that city were convinced "the justice of the courts would be tardy and somewhat uncertain even in the case of this

²⁴Ibid., 152.

²⁵Henderson M. Somerville, "Some Cooperating Causes of Negro Lynching," North American Review, CLXXVII (October, 1905).

²⁶Bruce W. Cabell, "Lynch Law in the South," North American Review, CLV (September, 1892), 380.

²⁷Ibid.

fiend in human form." People expressed fear that an error in the indictment or a misspelled word would result in the suspect being released. Furthermore, many felt even execution to be small justice if it came too late to impress other would-be criminals with the consequences of such criminal activities.²⁸ This argument persisted for many decades as is evidenced by the 1935 statement of the county judge of Colorado County, Texas. Following the lynching of two fifteen year old Negroes accused of rape and murder, he said: "The fact that the two Negroes who so brutally murdered Miss Killmann could not be adequately punished because of their ages prevents me from condemning those citizens who meted out justice to the ravishing murderers."²⁹

The allegations that the justice meted out by the courts was too slow, too lenient, and too unsure actually served as rationalizations for the administration of mob justice, not reasons based upon fact. The usual administration of justice in cases of Negroes accused of assault upon white women may have been many things, but it was not slow, nor was it lenient. In some instances, the accused received a trial and a sentence of execution within a matter of a few days. Yet, as in the case of Jesse Washington,

²⁸Dallas Morning News, February 3, 1893.

²⁹New York Times, November 14, 1935.

accused of the murder of a white woman near Waco in 1916, even a speedy trial and a death sentence did not prevent a mob from seizing him, as the jury read their sentence, and carrying him off to be burned alive.³⁰ Other investigations as to the causes of lynchings have similarly shown that "on the basis of evidence, it cannot be said that judicial inefficiency is a main factor."³¹

Another popular explanation of mob violence suggested that the heinousness of the crimes caused the mob to go "temporarily insane."³² This perhaps described the results of mob action, for what sane person would willingly cremate another living being; but, the generalization that mobs went "insane" hardly applied to their actual operations. Lynchings often followed fairly elaborate preparations as in the burning of Henry Smith in Paris, Texas, in 1893. On January 30, one day before authorities apprehended Smith in connection with the murder of a small child, the Dallas Morning News reported that "if captured alive, it is almost universal sentiment that he will be burned at the stake."³³

³⁰ Waco Times-Herald, May 15, 1916.

³¹ James Harmon Chadbourn, Lynching and the Law (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933), 9.

³² Atticus G. Haygood, "The Black Shadow in the South," Forum, XVI (October, 1893), 167-175.

³³ Dallas Morning News, January 31, 1893.

After his capture, the newspapers announced that he was being returned to Paris to be "thoroughly identified and then executed in the most public manner, and by a death which will convey the message to all men with inclination to his ways."³⁴ As predicted, his captors returned Smith to be tortured and burned in the presence of a huge crowd. Evidence that the preparations had been calculated and calm is given by this eyewitness account:

In an open field near the Texas and Pacific depot, all the horrible preliminaries had been arranged. A scaffold about ten feet high had been built and a stake run up through which to pinion the culprit. On the ground below and close to the scaffold about thirty plumber's braziers have been placed with the charcoal burning so as to keep the soldering irons at a red heat. A supply of coal oil was within reach. The program had been carefully arranged.³⁵

Other incidents, such as similar cremations which also occurred in Paris, in 1920, show that even in the face of serious accusations lynchers carried out their actions coolly and deliberately. The newspaper story declared that "There was no disorder. The prisoners were taken to the fairgrounds north of the city where a stake and fuel had been prepared."³⁶ Similar comments as to the orderly

³⁴Ibid., February 1, 1893.

³⁵Ibid., February 3, 1893.

³⁶New York Times, July 7, 1920.

conduct of lynch mobs described the lynching of Lige Daniels in Center, Texas, in 1920³⁷ and the burning of three Negroes in Kirvin, Texas, in 1922.³⁸ Furthermore, as will be fully discussed later in this study, the victims of many mobs did not face accusations of serious crimes as supposed by the proponents of the "mass hysteria" thesis. In many cases, nothing more than a simple insult or argument provided the "crime" which provoked the lynching.³⁹

If public reaction to certain sensational crimes, or courts delay in prosecuting criminals, or the white southern code of chivalry did not cause lynchings, what did cause them and why did they linger on into the 1940's? To answer these questions it is necessary first to define a lynch mob and to describe its operations, membership and motivations.

³⁷Ibid., August 3, 1920.

³⁸Ibid., January 4, 1922.

³⁹N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 9-10.

CHAPTER II

THE LYNCH MOB

The historical context of lynch mobs is closely tied to the more generalized form of extra-legal violence, vigilantism.¹ Vigilantism had several forms other than the lynch mob, namely the Ku Klux Klan, whitecapping, night-riders, claims clubs and other miscellaneous manifestations. The major difference between vigilantism as practiced in frontier areas or in areas undergoing great social upheavals, such as San Francisco in the 1850's, and lynch mobs is that lynchings resulted from "an organized, spontaneous, ephemeral mob which gathers quickly, does its fatal work and disperses speedily."² Vigilantism implied organizations designed to administer justice in areas where regular law enforcement agencies either did not exist or were ineffective. Thus vigilantism often represented violence in support of the principles of law and order. Lynchings,

¹Richard Maxwell Brown, "The Historical Patterns of Violence in America," in Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, editors, The History of Violence in America (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), 45.

²Ibid., 50.

however, occurred in areas where the regular institutions of law and order existed and functioned.

Vigilantism activities developed frequently in Texas, where some fifty-two separate movements have been noted.³ Most of the movements remained rather small, however, and most occurred before lynchings were first catalogued in 1882. Of the counties which produced these movements, thirteen also had subsequent lynching activities. Since the majority of vigilante groups formed in the eastern part of the state where most lynchings later occurred, however, some coincidental similarities might be expected. In only two areas, Coryell County in 1894 and San Saba County in 1897, did lynchings and vigilante activity coincide. Furthermore, vigilante activity did not always involve the use of deadly force, as evidenced by the fact that only seventeen movements resulted in the loss of life. In all, approximately 140 persons met their deaths at the hands of vigilante mobs.⁴ Lynch mobs accounted for nearly four times as many victims and the height of lynching came some years after the decline of vigilantism. Only four areas reported vigilante activity during or after the 1890's

³Richard Maxwell Brown, "The American Vigilante Tradition," in The History of Violence in America, 224-225.

⁴Ibid.

while lynching in Texas reached its peak in the 1890's. It would seem that in the latter part of the nineteenth century the activities of the lynch mob made organized vigilantism unnecessary.

The lynch mob, as earlier defined, lacked organization, but only in the sense that there was no predetermined structure. That does not mean that a lynch mob lacked leaders or that it was necessarily chaotic. Rather, the lynch mob had an informal structure which allowed it to do its deadly work and then disperse quickly. The typical lynch mob consisted of three principle groups: the leaders, the lynchers, and the spectators.⁵ Those individuals who instigated the lynching provided the leadership. Because lynchers rarely faced an accounting for their actions, only general descriptions are available of lynch mob leaders. Those few accounts which allude to the leaders of the mob generally credit them with being "among the most respectable portion of the community."⁶ These were "men of substance and reputation, prosperous businessmen and merchants."⁷ For example, the mob which lynched John Williams in Sulphur

⁵Frank Shay, Judge Lynch, His First Hundred Years (New York: I. Washburn, Inc., 1938), 87.

⁶Claude H. Nolen, The Negro's Image in the South (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967), 48.

⁷Shay, Judge Lynch, 87.

Springs, Texas in 1894 contained both young and "old and grey-headed men who had always opposed mob law." A Dr. Becton tried to quiet the mob by saying "if we had got hold of the Negro before the officers did, I would have said 'kill him,' but he is now in the hands of the sheriff and his deputies." When someone reported that the mother of the woman allegedly murdered by Williams had said that "she hoped there was patriotism enough in this country to burn that Negro," the mob seized the prisoner and burned him.⁸ Often men who had some influence in local politics led mobs. In some cases, active churchmen and even women have been among the leaders.⁹ The relatively high status enjoyed by the mob leaders lent a certain respectability to the proceedings as if their ". . . good standing was a sufficient guarantee that they shed no blood except under the demand of necessity."¹⁰ More importantly, the mob leaders proved influential enough to frustrate any attempt to investigate the lynching, thus insuring almost absolute immunity from prosecution for the lynchers.

A larger group of younger men less influential than

⁸Dallas Morning News, June 29, 1894.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Nolen, The Negro's Image, 48.

the instigators of the mob actually provided most of the manpower necessary to carry out the lynching. Frank Shay described the lynchers as "native whites, mostly the underprivileged, the unemployed, and the unattached."¹¹ In rural areas, tenant farmers and unskilled workers formed this group. Often Negro labor provided the chief economic competition faced by these men. This competition provided the motivation for the burning of the Negro business section of Sherman, Texas, after a lynching in 1930. The Negroes later said that the riot was a "phase of a long standing 'battle for bread' between the poorer whites and the Negroes of that section."¹² Thus lynching provided an opportunity for them to uphold what they felt was southern tradition and also to eliminate the only real threat to their livelihoods. Primarily, the lynchers as the brawn of the mob with a youthful lust for violence and adventure, could be counted upon to perform the actual atrocities. Interestingly, these relatively ignorant people also served a secondary function; they would provide excellent scapegoats in the event that any repercussions from the lynching were felt. The actual leaders of the mob always could foist the blame on this rather despised group and thus escape prosecu-

¹¹Shay, Judge Lynch, 88-89.

¹²Raper, Tragedy of Lynching, 340.

tion. The efforts to investigate lynchings were so perfunctory that even when grand juries received information concerning the identities of the lynchers, they refused to act.¹³

Spectators formed the third main component of a lynch mob. While the spectators usually did not participate actively in a lynching, they served important functions in the activities of the mob. First, the onlookers usually comprised a very large group, often as many as several thousand lynching sympathizers.¹⁴ Their presence encouraged the lynchers and their sheer numbers often prompted unspeakable barbarities. The spectators also gave the lynchers a feeling of social prominence unavailable to them normally. Finally, the crowds that witnessed lynchings effectively prevented efforts by most law enforcement officers to save their prisoners because the officers hesitated to attempt to thwart the execution for fear of killing these "innocent bystanders."¹⁵ Typical "solid" citizens including women

¹³Dallas Morning News, December 28, 1920. The report noted that the grand jury in Tarrant county returned no indictments because of insufficient evidence, although they listened to nine witnesses, including the two jailers who gave up the prisoner at gun point and the sheriff.

¹⁴Shay, Judge Lynch, 90.

¹⁵Matagorda County News, November 7, 1916.

and children often made up the spectators, as in this report in the St. Louis Daily Republic concerning the Paris, Texas, lynching of 1893. "Fathers, men of social and business standing took their children to teach them how to dispose of Negro criminals. Mothers were there too, even women whose culture entitles them to be among the social and intellectual leaders of the town."¹⁶ Though not active participants, the men and women who flocked to see the fatal proceedings provided an important part of most lynch mobs.

Even with influential leaders, reckless lynchers, and sympathetic onlookers, the lynch mob could only exist in a climate of legal immunity. To see how this immunity developed, it is necessary to examine the conditions which surrounded the majority of lynchings and the extent to which local law enforcement and governmental officials often became involved. In the majority of lynchings in Texas, the mob took the victim from the custody of law enforcement officers because of their laxity. In some instances, the mob leaders enlisted the cooperation of the local sheriff, either because the sheriff sympathized with the intent of the lynchers or because he feared the polit-

¹⁶B. O. Flower, "The Burning of Negroes in the South: A Portrait and a Warning," Arena, VII (April, 1893), 638.

X ical consequences of resisting the mob.¹⁷ This cooperation took several forms. Often, an understanding existed between the officers and the mob that the officers would not resist. Sometimes, as in the case of Julius Stevens in Longview on March 15, 1905, a mob took the prisoner from the jail while the sheriff and his deputies were conveniently out of town.¹⁸ At other times, the sheriff would do "all he could to protect his prisoner, except to kill several other men and endanger himself."¹⁹ The elimination of any possible physical danger for the lynchers served to embolden the mob and made the victim's fate almost certain.

Local law enforcement agencies and the local press often aided in another way, by giving the potential lynch-ers the necessary information as to the whereabouts of the prisoner. The mob which lynched Henry Smith in Paris, Texas, in 1893 knew, because of newspaper accounts, exactly when Smith was to be returned to Paris and what was expected to happen to him. Special trains brought spectators from the surrounding area and over 15,000 people witnessed his burning.²⁰ Even when officers moved a prisoner, often at

¹⁷Shay, Judge Lynch, 87.

¹⁸Longview Times-Clarion, March 16, 1905.

¹⁹Matagorda County News, November 7, 1916.

²⁰Dallas Morning News, January 31, February 1, 2, 3, 1893.

night, to a supposedly secret destination, the lynch mobs obtained sufficient notice to easily prevent the escape. For example, law officials decided that they could prevent the lynching of George Grey, a twenty-five year old Negro charged with the attempted rape of white woman, only by moving him from the Streetman bank where he was being held to nearby Fairfield. Some 250 automobiles joined in the procession when the officers removed the prisoner from the building where he had been held. Lynchers overtook the car containing the prisoner at a bridge and seized the Negro. chained him to a tree, and riddled him with bullets.²¹ About one thousand people witnessed the lynching. In most cases where the mob successfully thwarted an attempt to move the prisoner, the officers meekly surrendered their charge. When forty men in three cars took Tom Payne from officers escorting him to Huntsville for safekeeping, the officers realized that "resistance was useless" and gave up their prisoner without a struggle.²²

The local sheriffs and deputies did not stand singularly responsible for the ease with which mobs obtained their victims. The local government officials, such as the mayor or county judge, also appeared often guilty of

²¹New York Times, December 12, 1921.

²²Austin American, February 3, 1927.

negligence. The mayor of a town which expected mob violence had it within his power to request that the governor call out the national guard to protect prisoners or, in cases of emergency, to call them out himself. When officials took this action, the guard often stopped the lynch mob.²³ As the adjutant general's report for 1901-1902 pointed out, however,

It has been too often the case that the civil authorities have acted too late to secure aid in time to prevent lynching, and in a few instances no request was made for military aid, nor did the sheriff of the county, or mayor of the town, exercise his authority to order the organizations of the Guard nearest to the scene. It is reasonable to suppose that the lynchings in Navarro, Grayson, and other counties could have been prevented, if some civil officer had notified Your Excellency of the conditions in time, or if the sheriff of the county or mayor of the town, had issued his writ to the commanding officers of the nearest military organizations, whether in his or other counties, directing them to parade their commands at the proper place, thereby saving the time necessary to communicate with you.²⁴

Apparently, the civil authorities mentioned failed to prevent lynchings, not because they lacked the power to do so, but because they lacked the will to stop them.

²³The examples of successful militia protection of prisoners threatened by mobs will be examined fully in Chapter IV. Examples as early as 1889 to 1890 can be found, however, in Texas Adjutant General, Report, 1889-1890.

²⁴Texas Adjutant General, Report, 1901-1902, p. 21.

Free from the fear of meeting armed resistance, the lynch mob could be harmed only by post-lynching investigations and prosecution. In the vast majority of lynchings, the mob had little to fear on that account as local citizens and law officials usually made sure that any investigation died a quick, silent death. One sure way to end an inquiry into a lynching was to declare that "persons unknown" committed the act. When a mob of 700 lynched two fifteen year old Negroes accused of rape and murder, the sheriff first said "none of the men were masked although some carried guns."²⁵ He later reversed that statement and swore: "Of course I couldn't recognize any members of the mob because they all had on masks. I didn't hear any voices that I might recognize again. All the license plates were covered with cloth or pieces of paper tied around them."²⁶ Such statements seemed unconvincing as shown by this editorial following a lynching.

Every mob murder that is allowed to be hushed up with a perfunctory investigation, or perhaps no investigation at all, lays a predicate for other mob murders . . . Lynchings are usually committed in small communities where most of the people are known to each other and to the peace officers. It is contrary to reason

²⁵El Paso Times, November 13, 1935.

²⁶New York Times, November 14, 1935.

that in such a community a group of thirty-five or forty men can wrest a prisoner from the custody of the law and leave no clue to their identity.²⁷

Even when authorities knew the identity of the lynchers, they seldom acted upon the information. As late as 1938, X Texas courts had convicted of a lynching only three men who X all received two-year suspended sentences after they plead X guilty to charges of manslaughter.²⁸ That lynchers felt secure hardly seems surprising when one considers the sentiment expressed by the County Attorney of Colorado County, Texas, following a lynching in 1935, when he said "I do not call the citizens who executed the Negroes a mob. I consider their action an expression of the will of the people."²⁹ By insuring that the lynchers would not be punished for their actions, these local officials provided the lynch mob with virtual immunity.

The willingness of local officials to protect the lynchers existed in direct proportion to the amount of community support for the lynchings. For even with legal immunity, lynch mobs could not survive in an atmosphere of antipathy. Nothing sustained and encouraged lynchings more

²⁷Galveston Daily News, February 5, 1927.

²⁸Chadbourn, Lynch Law, 13.

²⁹New York Times, November 14, 1935.

than their endorsement by prominent citizens of the community. Examples of such approval can be found throughout the lynching years. In 1893, following the infamous Paris burning of Henry Smith, newspapers printed several comments favorable to the lynching. Several gentlemen were "overheard to make remarks that though they had always deprecated mob violence, on this occasion, they would at least stand off and look at whatever might be done." A reporter quoted a clergyman known for speaking against violence as saying "it would be hard to raise his voice to keep this wretch from being summarily dealt with."³⁰ An attorney, Colonel J. C. Hodge, stated that:

Smith's death was simply the will of the people, and they cannot be blamed. Some may think it very wrong to permit Vance and his son to apply those irons (used to torture Smith) but let us take the thing home with us, put ourselves in his place and who would not have done as he did? The deed is done, and as good citizens, we must endorse it.³¹

Other opinions echoed the same sentiments that the treatment of Smith was no more than he deserved. A Dr. Yedile stated that "it was awful in the extreme, yet his crime was

³⁰The Facts in the Case of the Horrible Murder of Little Myrtle Vance and its Fearful Expiation at Paris, Texas, February 1, 1893 (Paris, Texas: P. L. James, 1893), 35-36.

³¹Dallas Morning News, February 3, 1893.

fiendish enough to deserve any punishment that could have been imposed on him."³² Forty-two years later, after a lynching in Columbus, Texas, a minister in Fort Worth declared: "I deplore all forms of lawlessness but the slowness that our courts and officials use in administering justice sometimes makes it necessary for the people to take the law into their own hands."³³ On the same occasion, the mayor of San Antonio, a former Columbus resident and district judge said "any mob violence ultimately becomes dangerous, but the populace sometimes becomes so enraged that it cannot be controlled."³⁴ From these sentiments, some taken from the peak years of lynching and others from one of the last lynchings in Texas, it clearly can be seen that prominent people continually defended or tried to justify the practice.

Since the widespread public support provided the root system of the lynch mob, motivations for this support bear examining. Superficially, lynching received support for the usual reasons: blacks, the principle victims of the lynchers, were criminal beasts who preyed on white womanhood, the courts acted too leniently and too slowly, and

³²Ibid.

³³Galveston Daily News, November 14, 1935.

³⁴Ibid.

the punishment inflicted would deter others from committing certain offenses. These justifications received wide acceptance and quotation after many lynchings as previously mentioned. Justifications are often self-serving, however, and therefore do not reveal other reasons for the support of lynchings. Since blacks did not become the victims in all lynchings, and since not all blacks lynched were accused of sexual offenses, the allegation that such crimes committed by blacks cause lynching cannot explain community support of mob violence. Neither can the excuse of judicial incompetence be used, for no evidence exists which supports that argument. Finally, in the many years of lynching, the belief that horrible punishments deterred crime is impeached by the fact that a large percentage of lynchings involved no offense, or a trifling offense, if any.³⁵ During 1890, lynchers in Lamar County shot and killed Andy Hardy, a Negro, because he argued with a white woman.³⁶ The lynching of persons who had committed minor crimes or none at all hardly justified lynching as a deterrent. Thus the public probably supported lynching for reasons not generally given. Lynching essentially involved controlled terrorism, directed toward a feared element of

³⁵Ploski and Kaiser, The Negro Almanac, 272.

³⁶Dallas Morning News, July 22, 1890.

the population and dedicated to the existing social structure. In short, lynching offered the ultimate social control available to protect the social and economic status quo.

That fear resulted from the social upheaval which occurred in the post-Civil War South. The blacks, who had for centuries lived under a rigid caste system, received freedom and, in principle if not in fact, virtual social, economic, and political equality with the white population. In order to re-establish their superior status, the white population resorted to a number of social and political techniques to reduce the newly freed Negroes to secondary class citizenship. Yet such controls would be effective only if whites intimidated blacks into compliance. Whites resorted to terrorist activities, such as lynching or visitations by the Ku Klux Klan, whenever legal methods fell short of attaining these goals. What better way to show the blacks their real status than to brutally murder them with total impunity.³⁷

The frequency of lynching apparently was affected by conditions within society. In times of social crisis or tension, lynchers often increased their activities. During the period 1893 to 1897, which spans a depression,

³⁷ Herbert L. Stewart, "The Causistry of Lynch Law," Nation, CIII (August 24, 1916), 173-174.

seventy-five victims met lynching. After the 1907 recession, lynchers took twenty-one lives during 1908. Finally, lynchings increased during the First World War. While there were only four lynchings in 1914, mobs lynched twenty-nine persons during the period 1916 to 1918.³⁸ The increased lynching rate in those periods apparently reflected the fear of social change experienced by the white community.

Whites not only used lynchings to keep Negroes from voting, but also "as an instrument of economic exploitation, reinforcing peonage in the cotton raising sections of the country, making it almost hopeless in many sections for colored men even to ask for simple justice . . ."³⁹ In Texas, over half of all lynchings occurred in counties where cotton formed the principal agricultural product.⁴⁰ Since the harvesting of cotton required a large amount of common labor, the percentage of Negroes in those counties ranked above the state average. With large concentrations

³⁸N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 95-99.

³⁹James Weldon Johnson, "Lynching, America's National Disgrace," Current History, XVIII (January, 1924), 596.

⁴⁰U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of the Census, Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census, 1890 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895), 396-398 and Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, VI, Agriculture, pt. 2, Crops and Irrigation (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902), 434-435.

of blacks in a county, the possibility naturally existed that they could control local political offices. In the black belt counties along the eastern edge of Texas, the Negroes did control many local offices in the years following Reconstruction. By the turn of the century, however, whites successfully disenfranchised the Negroes, thereby ending their political influence.⁴¹ To some degree, lynching was responsible for that happening. In many counties with a high percentage of Negroes, (thirty percent or more), there existed a proportionately high lynch rate. Grimes County, located in the heart of East Texas, had in 1890 a total population of 21,312, of which blacks formed fifty-seven percent.⁴² From 1889 to 1918, ten blacks met lynching in that county. In Harrison County, on the Texas-Louisiana border, blacks formed sixty-seven percent of the population and suffered sixteen lynchings. In all, multiple lynchings occurred in fifteen counties, twelve of which had Negro populations larger than the state average of 20.1 percent.⁴³ Of the forty Texas counties

⁴¹Lawrence D. Rice, The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1971), 86.

⁴²U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of the Census, Compendium of the Eleventh Census, 1890, I, Population (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892), 1508-1510 and Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, I, Population, pt. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901), 601-604.

⁴³Ibid.

which had at least one lynching from 1889 to 1918, only nine had Negro populations less than the state average. Thus, lynchings of Negroes in Texas tended to occur in counties with significant black populations.⁴⁴ That whites occasionally used these lynchings to intimidate potential black voters can be seen in the case of Grimes County. In 1896, a combination of the Populist party and the Republican party, which was made up primarily of Negroes, defeated the Democratic ticket. The next election, in 1898, ended in a disputed victory for the Populists-Republicans after a Democratic protest failed because the ballots disappeared. Because of this defeat, the defeated Democratic candidate for county judge, J. G. McDonald, organized a secret meeting in the spring of 1899 with other prominent local citizens. These men created a political institution designed to end the Populist rule: a White Man's Union. For the time being, they decided to quietly organize the association until the public attitude could be sounded. In July of 1899, a mob of white men lynched a Negro who had killed a white boy in the Roan's Prairie community. A few days after that incident, a white church burned in the Erwin community. A mob caught and hanged a Negro suspect after

⁴⁴This contrasts with the findings of the Southern Commission for the Study of Lynchings, Lynchings and What They Mean, 12-13.

a skirmish in which two white men were wounded. Subsequently, the White Man's Union was announced publicly. All white men could join but applications were subject to black-ball.⁴⁵ The appearance of the White Man's Union preceded several acts of terrorism. In July, a Negro, Jim Kennard, was shot and killed within sight of the courthouse. In September, unknown assailants shotgunned to death a black Populist leader, Jack Haynes. In the November elections of 1900, the White Man's Union won and from that time on no Union candidate met defeat.⁴⁶ Undoubtedly, the lynchings and other terrorist activities increased the ease with which the Union took hold of the political reins in Grimes County.

The campaign to keep the Negro subservient actually helped stimulate the migration of 500,000 Negroes to the North.⁴⁷ While the North held greater economic opportunities for the Negroes, the desire for personal safety also acted as an important factor in the migration. "Lynching and mob violence are the reasons given as second, if not

⁴⁵E. L. Blair, Early History of Grimes County (Austin: E. L. Blair, 1930), 197-198.

⁴⁶Lawrence Goodwyn, "Populist Dreams and Negro Rights: East Texas as a Case Study," American Historical Review, LXXVI (December, 1971), 1439-1443.

⁴⁷James Weldon Johnson, "Lynching," 600.

first, by nearly all migrants among whom systematic inquiry has been made."⁴⁸ Other proof exists that mass departures of Negroes often followed lynchings. In 1892, a mob hanged three Negroes in Paris, Texas, after they helped protect a Negro woman who complained that white men had tried to lynch her. The Houston Post reported that "the Negroes have all left that part of the country . . ."⁴⁹ When the Negroes could not be forced out of an area, whites sometimes destroyed their property to eliminate competition with white businessmen. Such a motive helped stimulate the burning of much of the Negro business section in Sherman, Texas, following the lynching of George Hughes. After the mob burned down the county courthouse in their effort to get the prisoner, the lynchers inflicted heavy damage in the Negro section of the town. Some whites apparently businessmen, made sure that their black competitors were burned out.⁵⁰ Lynching therefore provided a method of either forcing Negroes to leave an area or eliminating them as economic competitors. Placed in a larger perspective, the white population simply used mob violence as another tool to deny the Negro his constitutional rights in the

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Houston Post, September 7, 1892.

⁵⁰Raper, Tragedy of Lynching, 337-338.

political and commercial arenas of southern society.

To this point, it has been understood that Anglos exclusively composed the lynch mobs. In a few isolated cases this was not the case, however, as there are recorded instances in which Negroes lynched other Negroes. These rare instances provoke several questions. What motivated these Negroes to use the Anglos' extra-legal methods upon their own race; what circumstances surrounded these lynchings; and how did these lynchings compare to the usual Anglo lynchings of Negroes? The first such lynching in Texas occurred on October 26, 1891, when forty-six Negroes burned Lee Wilson, a mulatto charged with the murder of a white family near Douglass, Texas. The only white participant, a woman, chained Wilson to a tree.⁵¹ The last successful lynching carried out by Negroes happened in 1894, at Jefferson, Texas, when a crowd of 100 Negroes seized a black man, Henry Scott, from three deputy sheriffs as they took him to jail. In a nearby swamp the mob hung Scott who had been accused of the murder of his sixteen year old daughter. No arrests were made.⁵² The only other instance of a Negro lynch mob occurred in 1921 in Bowie County, Texas. The mob sought another Negro, Edley Hopkins, who had been arrested

⁵¹Dallas Morning News, October 27, 1891.

⁵²Ibid., May 17, 1894.

for the murder of his wife. The mob twice had its hands on the prisoner, but finally the deputies regained control of their prisoner and with pointed guns, dispersed the mob. They then transported the prisoner safely to the Boston, Texas, jail.⁵³ Other lynching reports recounted black approval of the action taken or mentioned Negroes who witnessed the lynching. Such expressions of sympathy for lynchings can be explained by Negroes' fear of retribution if they expressed the slightest opposition to the proceedings. Furthermore, the accounts given by the newspapers could have been doctored to give evidence of universal support for the lynching. The actual lynching of blacks by other blacks is more difficult to explain. Those incidents may have indicated an acceptance of lynching as a self-policing method or they may have resulted from the Negro community's frustration at the laxity of white controlled law enforcement agencies in dealing with crimes committed against blacks. Unfortunately, the evidence is too fragmentary to make any definitive analysis.

In the majority of lynchings Anglos were the lynchers and Negroes the victims. Mob violence in Texas and in the rest of the South, however, claimed some victims other than Negroes. Although mobs lynched far fewer Anglos and

⁵³San Antonio Express, October 18, 1921.

Mexican-Americans, a significant number of these victims lost their lives nonetheless. Thus it becomes important to determine the differences, where they exist, in the lynchings of blacks, Anglos, and Mexican-Americans.

CHAPTER III

THE VICTIMS

Although lynchers primarily directed their actions against the Negro, they did not limit themselves exclusively to black victims. In the nation, mobs lynched 4,736 people in the years 1882 to 1962. Of these, blacks numbered 3,442 and whites 1,294. In Texas, a total of 493 people lost their lives to Judge Lynch's court, 352 blacks and 141 whites. Texas had a large lead over all other states in the number of whites lynched, however, as the next highest counts were in Oklahoma and Montana, which had 82 white victims.¹ One explanation for this higher figure is that the Tuskegee Institute, which compiled the basic records of lynchings, made a distinction only between Negroes and non-Negroes. It applied the label "white" equally to Anglos and Mexican-Americans. Since Mexican-Americans constituted a minority group which faced discrimination by Anglos, they should be studied as a separate category of lynching. Because a racial or ethnic breakdown exists only for the years 1889 to 1962 (the records for the

¹Ploski and Kaiser, The Negro Almanac, 267.

years 1882 to 1889 supply only total numbers of lynchings), these years will comprise the period under study. Texas had 378 lynching victims--306 Negroes, 33 Mexican-Americans, 39 Anglos, and 1 Indian.² Since lynchers acted primarily against Negroes, the study of lynching as applied to other groups has been largely neglected. Thus it is important to analyze these lynchings to determine the motivation for them and to discover any similarities or dissimilarities between the lynchings of blacks, Anglos, and Mexican-Americans.

The annual figures established blacks as the predominant victims of lynchings in the 1890's and, with the exception of one year, Negroes continued to be the main targets of mob violence in Texas. The lynchings of Mexican-Americans did eclipse the number of Negroes lynched in 1915 when lynch mobs killed twenty-six Mexican-Americans compared to two Negroes and one Anglo. In only three years, 1889, 1891, and 1899, did the lynchings of Anglos even approach the number of Negroes executed. In 1889, mobs lynched eight Negroes and six Anglos, in 1891 ten Negroes and four Anglos, and in 1899 five Negroes and four Anglos. The number of black lynching victims reached double figures

²Compiled from N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching; Estes, "A Historical Survey of Lynchings in Oklahoma and Texas"; and the New York Times, 1919-1942.

in eleven years: 1890 (18), 1891 (10), 1892 (10), 1894 (10), 1895 (20), 1897 (20), 1901 (11), 1905 (12), 1908 (21), 1918 (10), and 1922 (17). The first year to record no lynchings of Negroes came in 1925. Lynchings of blacks ceased again from 1937 to 1941, with the last one recorded in 1942.³

The lynching of Anglos never reached a figure larger than the six recorded in 1889 and in 1891. Other years in which mobs lynched more than one Anglo were: 1894 (2), 1895 (4), 1896 (2), 1897 (3), and 1899 (4). The majority of years in which Anglos became victims had only one such incident: 1892, 1900, 1905, 1909, 1910, 1915, 1916, 1918, 1920, 1921, 1926, and 1929. In all other years there were none.

In the case of Mexican-Americans, in only one year, 1915, did mobs lynch more than one. In 1915, twenty-six Mexican-Americans were lynched. All but three of those lynched met death in Cameron County, which is in the southern-most part of Texas.⁴ Only one lynching occurred

³See Appendix A, "Lynchings by Race and by Year."

⁴N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 99. The complete list of persons lynched, 1889 to 1942, appears in Appendix B. Whereas a similar list appears in the Estes thesis (Oklahoma, 1942), it is appropriate to point out that several lynchings not included in her list, but reported in other reliable sources, have been added. Hence, the inclusion of the complete list in the Appendix was made to update Estes' work.

in any other single year. These were in the years: 1891, 1893, 1895, 1901, 1905, and 1910. Thus, as with the Anglos, the lynching of Mexican-Americans seemed a fairly isolated phenomenon.

The crimes charged against the lynching victims varied somewhat among the three ethnic groups. Mobs lynched Negroes for a wider variety of offenses than the other two groups. Many of the Negroes faced accusations of murder (33 percent), with rape the second most numerous charge (25 percent). The figures for accusation of rape in Texas ranged somewhat higher than the national average of 19 percent.⁵ A significant number of Negroes lynched had been charged with less-than-capital crimes. About 15 percent met lynching for miscellaneous crimes, as disagreeing with a white man, marrying a white woman, quarrelling over profit sharing, gambling, and being troublesome.⁶ Furthermore, over 10 percent of all black victims either stood innocent of any offense, or faced unknown charges or died just for being black. The notion held by some defenders of lynching, that mobs lynched Negroes mainly for raping white women existed in contradiction to the facts. Furthermore, no

⁵N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 10; Ploski and Kaiser, The Negro Almanac, 267.

⁶Compiled from Appendix B. See Appendix C for "Crimes for Which Lynched."

explanation can be given for the many instances of Negroes being lynched for trivial offenses or none at all, except that the lynching formed part of an overall pattern of discrimination developed to keep the Negro subservient.

Murder or crimes which involved murder comprised the major offenses for which mobs lynched Anglos and Mexican-Americans. Approximately 42 percent of all Anglos lynched faced accusations of murder.⁷ Another 22 percent became victims for unknown offenses. The whites lynched for miscellaneous reasons, 11 percent of the total, had been accused of acts such as wife beating, elopement, and helping a murderer to escape. A last general accusation, made in 13 percent of the cases, charged the victims with being outlaws. Only one white man ever met lynching for rape--a Curley Hackney hanged in Waco, Texas, in 1921 for raping an eight year old girl. Mobs lynched three Anglos, however, for attempted rape. Mexican-Americans were lynched almost exclusively for murder as about 73 percent of the victims were accused of that and associated crimes.⁸ Except for an explosive year, 1915, the number of Mexican-Americans lynched would have been much smaller. The vast majority of those lynchings followed border incidents in Cameron County

⁷See Appendices B and C.

⁸See Appendices B and C.

in which the victims were accused of pillage, train wrecking, and murder. The other leading charge was banditry, which claimed six victims in that year. Only one lynching, in 1905, involved the charge of rape. In general, the lynching of Anglos and Mexican-Americans followed accusations of more serious offenses and these groups were less likely to be lynched for superficial reasons.

The method or severity of punishment, however, did not always reflect the seriousness of the accusations. Although more Anglos and Mexican-Americans stood accused of serious crimes, mobs reserved the most ingenious and diabolical treatment for Negroes. Lynchers used torture, mutilation, and death by fire almost exclusively against blacks. Few lynchings were as barbarous as that in Waco, Texas, during May, 1916, of Jesse Washington, a seventeen year old Negro who had been arrested for the murder and rape of a white woman from a nearby community. Although public feeling ran high, the authorities believed that a speedy trial and a quickly executed death sentence would forestall the mob. As soon as the jury read the verdict in the crowded McLennan County Courthouse, however, the judge and sheriff left the room and a mob seized Washington. An investigator for the N.A.A.C.P. described what followed:

They dragged the boy down the stairs, put a chain around his body and hitched it to an automobile. The chain broke. The big fellow took the chain off the Negro

under the cover of the crowd and wound it round his own wrist, so that he was holding the boy. The boy shrieked and struggled.

The mob ripped the boy's clothes off, cut them in bits and even cut the boy. Someone cut his ear off, someone else unsexed him. A little girl working for the firm of Goldstein and Mingle told me that she saw this done . . .

. . . While a fire was being prepared of boxes, the naked boy was stabbed and the chain put over a tree. He tried to get away, but could not. He reached up to grab the chain and they cut his fingers off. The big man struck the boy on the back of the neck with a knife just as they were pulling him up on the tree. Mr. Lester thought that was practically the death blow. He was lowered into the fire several times by means of the chain around his neck. Someone said they would estimate the boy had about twenty-five stab wounds, none of them death-dealing.

About a quarter past one a friend got the torso, lassoed it, hung a rope over the pommel of a saddle, and dragged it through the streets of Waco.⁹

That was no backwoods lynching, it occurred in front of Waco City Hall, in full view of the mayor's office.¹⁰

Unfortunately, while one of the worst and most widely publicized lynchings, the burning of Washington did not represent an unusual practice where Negroes were concerned. When a mob simply hanged the victim, the affair frequently ended with the corpse being riddled with bullets. Finally,

⁹"The Waco Horror," The Crisis, XII (July, 1916), supplement, 1-8, cited in Thomas R. Frazier, Afro-American History: Primary Sources (New York, 1970), 238-246.

¹⁰Ibid., 242.

on at least two occasions, the mob performed its pyristic rites on the bodies of Negroes who had been killed before the mob had an opportunity to capture them. One such incident, occurred in Waco in 1922. Jesse Thomas had been captured in connection with the rape of a Mrs. Hays. His captors took Thomas before her and, after she identified him, her father, Sam Harris, shot Thomas seven times and killed him. A mob seized the body from a morgue, dragged it through the streets, and burned it in the town square. Afterward, lynchers pulled the charred remains through the Negro district of Waco while white men struggled with each other in attempts to obtain parts of the body as souvenirs.¹¹ The mob could not be cheated even by death.

The brutality exhibited toward blacks was noticeably missing from the lynchings of the Anglos. Mobs usually executed whites by hanging and, as far as can be determined, never mutilated or burned to death a white victim. In one case, the mob did fire shots into the still body of a white man, Curley Hackney, who had been hanged in Waco, Texas. Hackney had been charged with sexually assaulting a young girl and a mob took him from the custody of the police. He confessed his crime, but asked that the mob not fire at his body after he was hanged. In a perverse display of ferocity,

¹¹New York Times, May 28, 1922.

the lynchers perforated his corpse with hundreds of bullets.¹² Otherwise, lynchers showed more restraint in dealing with Anglo transgressors than they did for Negroes. Apparently they felt some qualms about subjecting a member of their own race to torture and a fiery death.

While the lynching of Negroes became part of the arsenal of racial discrimination, the lynchers of Anglos and Mexican-Americans acted primarily out of a desire for immediate punishment of offenders. Since most of the people lynched had been accused of murder, lynching became a retaliatory weapon to deter such criminals. The 1920 lynching of T. W. Vickery provides such an example. Vickery was accused of the murder of a policeman. Twenty-five men took him from the Fort Worth, Texas, jail at midnight on December 23 and hanged him from a tree in a grove near the packing house district.¹³

Lynchers sometimes acted when dissatisfied with normal judicial processes. A small group of men in Port Arthur, Texas, lynched James Sweeney, who had been acquitted of the murder of a man with whom he had shared a shanty in that town. Sweeney reportedly had threatened to settle some old scores upon his return to Port Arthur and when he stepped

¹²Dallas Morning News, December 14, 1921.

¹³New York Times, December 24, 1920.

off the train from Galveston, the lynchers took him a few blocks away and hanged him from an electric light pole.¹⁴ Similarly, twenty-five masked men took W. J. Mayfield from the Bowie County jail on January 24, 1916, and hanged him. The victim stood accused of the ax murder of his mother, father, and brother. The failure of a jury to reach a verdict in his trial provoked the lynchers into taking their action.¹⁵ The slowness of the law to execute a convicted murderer and an unsuccessful escape attempt by the convict which mortally wounded a deputy prompted the citizens of Eastland to take the law into their own hands in 1929. A mob of 22 took the outlaw, Marshall Ratliff, an Anglo, and hanged him while a crowd of 1000 looked on. Ratliff had been convicted of a previous murder and had been under a sentence of death for two years. Apparently his execution had been delayed by a series of appeals, the last one a request for a sanity hearing. Instead of awaiting the results of his request, Ratliff seized an opportunity to attempt an escape by overpowering and mortally wounding his guard. He was recaptured, however, and returned to the jail.¹⁶ Many expressed the sentiment that:

¹⁴Dallas Morning News, February 12, 1900.

¹⁵Ibid., January 25, 1916.

¹⁶Ibid., November 20, 1929.

off the train from Galveston, the lynchers took him a few blocks away and hanged him from an electric light pole.¹⁴ Similarly, twenty-five masked men took W. J. Mayfield from the Bowie County jail on January 24, 1916, and hanged him. The victim stood accused of the ax murder of his mother, father, and brother. The failure of a jury to reach a verdict in his trial provoked the lynchers into taking their action.¹⁵ The slowness of the law to execute a convicted murderer and an unsuccessful escape attempt by the convict which mortally wounded a deputy prompted the citizens of Eastland to take the law into their own hands in 1929. A mob of 22 took the outlaw, Marshall Ratliff, an Anglo, and hanged him while a crowd of 1000 looked on. Ratliff had been convicted of a previous murder and had been under a sentence of death for two years. Apparently his execution had been delayed by a series of appeals, the last one a request for a sanity hearing. Instead of awaiting the results of his request, Ratliff seized an opportunity to attempt an escape by overpowering and mortally wounding his guard. He was recaptured, however, and returned to the jail.¹⁶ Many expressed the sentiment that:

¹⁴Dallas Morning News, February 12, 1900.

¹⁵Ibid., January 25, 1916.

¹⁶Ibid., November 20, 1929.

"This has gone on long enough, we've waited long enough."¹⁷

While the lynching took place, County Judge Clyde L. Garrett said: "I guess the county will have to bury him."¹⁸

A grand jury investigation followed the lynching, but produced no indictments.¹⁹ The lynching of Will Jones, an Anglo, in Tyler, Texas, on May 23, 1897 provides a bizarre example of the lynchers' distrust of the courts. Will Jones allegedly hired a Negro, Efie Jones, to murder W. R. Stewart of Lindale in order to collect a \$7,000 life insurance policy he held on Stewart. The authorities captured the Negro after the murder and he implicated Will Jones. A mob of 200 men from Lindale rode into Tyler with the intention of meting out justice for the murdering of their fellow townsman. The lynchers stormed the jail and shot Will Jones to death in his cell. Inexplicably, the lynchers then left the jail and returned to Lindale, leaving the Negro who carried out the murder of Stewart in the hands of the law.²⁰ Perhaps the lynchers felt certain that the Negro would be sentenced to execution for his crime and only feared that Will Jones would escape a similar fate.

¹⁷Austin American, November 20, 1929.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid., November 22, 1929.

²⁰Galveston Daily News, May 24, 1897.

The comparative rarity of Anglo lynchings demonstrates that such acts of mob reprisal remained isolated incidents. Several reasons help explain the small number of Anglo lynchings. First, law enforcement officials showed more diligence in protecting Anglo prisoners from the mobs. When authorities arrested Joe Shield of Brownwood for the murder of his wife and her parents in 1930, the sheriff had him removed to another county to prevent mob violence.²¹ Secondly, whenever a mob lynched an Anglo a strong reaction against the lynching followed immediately. After the lynching of Marshall Ratliff, Governor Dan Moody issued this statement: "Lynching is a crime punishable by death. I don't know what can be done to enforce the law against a mob, but whatever can be done, we are going to do it."²² The El Paso Times stated that "Eastland, Texas, proved by its mob lynching of the bandit, that after all human passions are but little removed from the jungle state."²³ The threat of prosecution implied in Governor Moody's statement and the critical comments of Texas newspapers probably reflected public opinion regarding the lynching of Anglos. Thus, despite the fact that lynch mobs which killed Anglos seemed

²¹El Paso Times, May 17, 1930.

²²Austin American, November 22, 1929.

²³El Paso Times, November 21, 1929.

as immune from punishment as those who lynched Negroes, Anglo criminals met their fate most often through the regular courts of the state.

As with the Anglos, lynchers rarely subjected Mexican-Americans to the sadistic treatment often used against blacks. The only lynching of a Mexican-American in which lynchers burned their victim occurred in Edwards County on November 3, 1910. An Anglo mob took the victim, Antonio Rodriquez, from law officers and burned him at the stake. The authorities had charged him with the murder of a white woman in Rock Springs, Texas.²⁴ In all other cases for which documentation exists, lynchers shot or hanged their victims.

The lynchings of Mexican-Americans were for the most part isolated incidents and, as with the Anglos, resulted from vigilante-type activity. The happenings in Cameron County in 1915 support this view. During that year, lynch-ers claimed twenty-six Mexican-American victims in that area. Mexico was in the process of a long and violent revolution and the Texas-Mexico border was the scene of some revolutionary activity. In response to the attempts of revolutionaries to recruit from the Mexican population in South Texas, the United States Army, along with citizens

²⁴Dallas Morning News, November 4, 1910.

of that area, pursued the agitators. In one confrontation, a group of 400 cavalry, infantry, and private citizens killed six of the Mexican intruders. While this incident was not characterized by the Texas press as a lynching, some declared that "all the bandits should be killed or captured."²⁵ Lynching was evident on two other occasions, however, when on August 22, authorities found two unidentified bodies hanging in western Cameron County, and two hanged and one shot near Donna, Texas.²⁶ On September 14, officers discovered three escaped Mexican prisoners shot in the back by persons unknown.²⁷ Newspaper accounts provide no information about the circumstances around those killings. The Texas Rangers, however, had been known to summarily execute Mexican suspects rather than bring them to trial.²⁸ Evidently, the lynchers formed part of the local vigilante efforts to preserve law and order in Cameron County.

In studying the victims of lynching in Texas, one important group has not been examined: women. Lynching

²⁵Ibid., Spetember 4, 1915.

²⁶Ibid., August 23, 1915.

²⁷Ibid., Spetember 14, 1915.

²⁸Wesley Hall Looney, "The Texas Rangers in a Turbulent Era" (unpublished Masters thesis, Texas Tech University, 1971), 56.

usually presupposes a male victim, but a significant number of women have been lynched. Ten women met death at the hands of Texas lynch mobs. Why was lynching extended to women when most supporters of lynching defended the practice as being for the protection of women? The answer is that lynchers concerned themselves with protecting only white women, because they used lynching mainly as an instrument of racial terror. Of the ten women lynched, one was a Mexican-American, one was an Anglo, while the rest were black.²⁹ In the majority of lynchings where the victims included women, they perished because they were with a man being sought by the mob. The one white woman lynched died along with her husband and her son who were connected in some way with a murder.³⁰ Lynchers, motivated only by racial prejudice, dynamited to bits two Negro women and five Negro men in house near Mant, Texas, in 1895. The only female victim who stood accused of a crime, Floatina Suitta, was hanged by a mob for murdering a white man in Cotulla in 1895.³¹ With the exception of the Suitta lynching, females met lynching only in conjunction with the

²⁹Compiled from Appendix B.

³⁰N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 96.

³¹Ibid.

lynching of a male. The fact that mobs lynched women simply because they were with others being sought demonstrated the total disregard for humanity that characterized lynch-ers.

Some differences existed between the geographic areas where blacks, Anglos and Mexican-Americans met lynching. Despite the frontier heritage of the western part of the state, very few lynchings were recorded in that region. Lynchings in Texas happened almost entirely within the eastern half of the state. Only sixteen counties located west of the 98th meridian had lynchings.³² To the east of the 98th meridian, eighty-one counties had lynchings. This is not unexpected as settlers came later and in smaller numbers to the western parts of Texas and the Negro population remained relatively small. In the eastern section of the state which had a large Negro population the fear of social change rose to a proportionately higher level. In the easternmost portion of the state, only six counties between the 96th and 94th meridians survived without at least one lynching. Thus, the further east from which the area under study is drawn, the more universal lynching became. The eastern counties of Texas produced primarily cotton. Since cotton farming depended upon unskilled labor

³²Compiled from Appendix B.

for harvesting, a large percentage of blacks found jobs and lived in those counties. Over 50 percent of all Negro victims met lynching in counties with more than 50,000 acres devoted to cotton production.³³ Whereas in other southern states studies indicated that Negroes were safer in the "Black Belt" counties, in Texas the reverse appeared true.³⁴

Whereas blacks most often faced lynching in east Texas, mobs lynched Anglos more commonly in Central and East Central Texas, roughly between the 100th and 97th meridians. Eighteen white lynchings can be verified in that area, while to the west there was only one. Only five Anglo lynchings took place further east than the 97th meridian. The counties in which Anglos met lynching generally did not border each other in groups. Thus, no one area can be designated as the center for white lynching activity. Since only one or two counties had more than one such incident, as compared to the twelve blacks lynched in Waller County,³⁵ the lynching of Anglos seemed more of an isolated phenomenon than an instrument of extra-legal control.

³³U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of the Census, Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census, 1890, 396-398.

³⁴Southern Commission for the Study of Lynchings, Lynchings and What They Mean, 12.

³⁵See Appendix B.

In the case of Mexican-American victims, only six counties accounted for all the lynchings. In five of these counties only one lynching occurred. The last county, and the southernmost in all of Texas, Cameron County, accounted for twenty-six victims of that ethnic group. Since all these occurred during the border strife in 1915, the high number evidently points up a period of great instability and agitation, which had no antecedents or recurrences. Obviously, Anglos made no attempt to use lynching against the Mexican-Americans as they did against the blacks. Mexican-Americans formed only 6 percent of the population of Texas in 1910³⁶ and were concentrated in the southern part of the state. Therefore, fewer of them resided in the major lynching areas of Texas. Furthermore, Mexican-Americans had been reduced in status to landless and dependent wage earners in most of Texas by 1900. The Anglos accomplished the disposition of Mexican landowners as a result of armed conflicts and the spread of fenced ranges. In some instances, the confused status of Mexican land grants contributed to the declining status of Mexican-Americans.³⁷ Because it was seldom used against Mexican-

³⁶Rupert Norval Richardson, Texas (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), 406.

³⁷Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore and Ralph C. Guzman, The Mexican American People (New York: The Free Press, 1970), 49.

Americans, lynching apparently was not a factor in that decline.

The isolated nature of Anglo and Mexican-American lynchings underlines the racial nature of lynching. Lynchers used sadistic methods almost exclusively against blacks, rarely against Anglos or Mexican-Americans. Negroes met lynching for lesser offenses more often than did Anglos or Mexican-Americans. Finally, the lynchings of Negroes occurred in greater frequency over a greater area than did the lynchings of the other ethnic groups. Clearly, the frequency and nature of lynching depended largely upon the race of the victim.

While the racial prejudice of the lynchers explains the large number of Negro victims, one important question remains unanswered: Why did lynching disappear even though racial prejudice remained strong? To answer this and other related questions, it is necessary to examine the reasons for the decline of lynching.

CHAPTER IV

THE DECLINE OF LYNCHING

Lynchers left a trail of blood across a century of Texas history. Lynchings occurred during the early days of the Republic of Texas, peaked in the 1890's, declined slowly through the 1930's and died in the early 1940's. Such might be the epitaph of that institution. Yet the pattern of lynching over the years cannot be defined so neatly. Lynchings tended to peak in one year and to decline dramatically the next. For example, in 1895 mobs lynched twenty-six persons, in 1896, only six, and in 1897 again twenty-six. This pattern of fluctuation continued from 1889 to 1923.¹ It is difficult to distinguish any long range reduction in the lynching rate between 1889 and 1922, although some is shown by examining five-year totals for the period. From 1889 to 1893, mobs lynched sixty-five persons; from 1894 to 1898, seventy-three; from 1899 to 1903, thirty-eight; from 1904 to 1908, forty-seven; from 1909 to 1913, thirty-one; from 1914 to 1918, sixty-two, from 1919 to 1923, thirty-nine.² There seems to be a

¹Compiled from Appendix A.

²Ibid.

relation between periods of lynchings and times of social crisis and tension as the three peak periods span a depression, 1893 to 1897, a recession, 1907, and the First World War. In the intervening periods, there were fewer lynchings. From 1922, the numbers decrease steadily. From 1924 to 1928, mobs lynched nine persons; from 1929 to 1933, nine; from 1934 to 1937, four; and from 1938 to 1942, one. The turning point seems to be 1922, the last major lynching year when seventeen people died at the hands of the mob.³ The next three years had two, one, and none, respectively. After that, lynching never achieved the prevalence it had before 1922. Therefore, it is important to study the years before and after 1922 to examine the factors which contributed to the rather sudden decrease in the number of lynchings.

Since lynching depended on community support for its protection, any erosion of that support would jeopardize its existence. The major newspapers of the state contributed to this erosion with an uncompromising stand against lynching after 1900. The Austin American, San Antonio Express, El Paso Times, Houston Post, Galveston Daily News, and the Dallas Morning News increasingly denounced lynchings and called for punishment of lynchers. The editorials

³Ibid.

which followed lynchings during the 1910's in Texas expressed a general sentiment not of outrage because of the punishment given the offender, but rather one of disgust that the law had been denied its course. Such was the feeling expressed by the Galveston Daily News following a lynching in 1917:

The death of miserable victim of the mob is not a vital consideration in the case. He probably got what he deserved. At least that seems to be the judgment of public opinion with reference to his personal fate. The public feels the offense was not against him. The offense was against the majesty of the law.⁴

A San Antonio Express editorial in 1919 evidenced the same view when the editor stated that "this newspaper's constant denunciations of lynching and other mob violence has as its only motive the respect and safety due to the American National social and political institutions of law and order."⁵ By focusing on the negative effect that lynching had upon the institutions which commanded the respect of most citizens, the newspapers appealed to the majority of citizens who abhorred lynching but who silently assented to its practice.

The press also used its editorial power to influence

⁴Galveston Daily News, June 28, 1917.

⁵San Antonio Express, July 26, 1919.

public opinion by attempting to point out how lynchings damaged the state's reputation. A particularly embarrassing lynching occurred in Houston on the eve of the 1928 Democratic National Convention. Eight men took a Negro man, Robert Powell, who was charged with the murder of a city detective, from a hospital and hanged him from a bridge outside the city.⁶ The state's press reacted immediately as in this El Paso Times editorial:

These criminals in an atrocious defiance of the law flaunt the good name of the city of Houston and the state of Texas to a scoffing world.

Every resource of both city and state must be brought to bear that these men meet speedy justice. Neither pull, power, nor possible sympathy of a few of their like should enable them to escape swift and effective punishment . . .

The country must be convinced that the Houston killing was a murder, not a lynching, and it can be convinced in only one way, by speedily bringing the criminals to justice.

A lynching presupposes that the sympathy of the community is with the criminals. There is no sympathy for such criminals in Houston or anywhere else in Texas.⁷

A similar statement appeared in the Galveston newspaper, which stated that "to say that this is an unfortunate advertisement for Texas does not adequately express the case: it publishes to the whole world that Texas has so failed to suppress lynching that it is possible in one of Texas'

⁶Austin American, June 21, 1928.

⁷El Paso Times, June 21, 1928.

greatest cities for a man to be deprived of his life without trial as casually as if courts did not exist."⁸ Whether or not these editorials assisted in the fight against lynching is impossible to know now. In combination with greater pressure upon law enforcement officers to prevent lynchings or to punish lynchers, however, they at least represented a concerted attempt to end the reign of Judge Lynch.

In addition to efforts to influence public opinion, the press challenged the police power of the state to end lynching. The press often mentioned that the ineffective protection given prisoners and that the equally futile attempts to punish lynchers emboldened the lynch mob. "From all accounts the responsibility for the mob at Leesburg cannot be wholly escaped by the officials," stated one Texas newspaper in 1920.

Failure to handle the mob in its incipency is the explanation of its success. The fact that it (the mob the night before) was permitted to disperse without arrests was sufficient encouragement for lynching the next night. When sheriffs stop compromising with mobs there will be fewer mobs. There is no such thing as a citizen too good to be arrested for participation in a mob bent on murder; there is no prisoner so vile to be denied the protection of law while under arrest.⁹

The press criticized even the governor for failing to en-

⁸Galveston Daily News, June 21, 1928.

⁹Dallas Morning News, October 13, 1920.

force the law. The San Antonio Express called upon Acting Governor Davidson to order "state governmental action against such violators of the constitution."¹⁰ The Dallas Morning News observed in 1934 that although all the candidates for governor had spoken out against lynching, "it is often easier to talk about enforcement of law and constituted authority while making the race for office than it is to do something about it after being elected."¹¹ While noting the lack of real power available to the governors, the Morning News pointed out that "when it comes to suppressing mob violence, good political strategy is likely to suggest getting the Rangers to the scene of the action after the action is over."¹² As a result of these types of editorials, local and state officials could not shirk their duties without fear of being castigated in the editorial pages of the state. Thus, knowing that the eyes of the opinion makers focused upon them, the local officials became more hesitant to cooperate with a lynch mob.

x The increased number of aborted lynchings in the 1920's and 1930's seems to bear this out. In 1931, R. R. Morton

¹⁰San Antonio Express, July 5, 1923.

¹¹Dallas Morning News, July 22, 1934.

¹²Ibid.

of Tuskegee Institute reported twenty-one lynchings in the South during 1930, and forty instances where lynchings were prevented, thus saving sixty lives.¹³ In 1947, the Tuskegee Institute reported that in the last decade there had been 273 lynchings prevented in the South as opposed to forty-three successful lynchings.¹⁴ The figures cited do not contain any subtotals for Texas, but numerous examples of aborted lynchings do exist for Texas. In the period 1889 to 1890, the national guard responded to calls for the protection of prisoners from mobs on four occasions, each time successfully.¹⁵ During the years 1890 to 1891, the sheriff of Longview requested the national guard to protect three prisoners from mob violence. One prevented lynching in Fort Bend County was reported in 1896 to complete the available material concerning the 1890's. For the years following the turn of the century the adjutant general reported five lynchings prevented in 1900 to 1902 and four lynchings carried out when militia could not act in time; five lynchings stopped in 1903 to 1904 and one prisoner lost to a mob; four lynchings prevented in 1905 to 1906; six lynchings prevented in 1907 to 1908 and one

¹³New York Times, January 2, 1931.

¹⁴Ibid., July 26, 1947.

¹⁵Texas Adjutant General, Reports, 1889-1890.

prisoner lynched before troops arrived; three lynchings prevented in 1909 to 1910; one in 1911 to 1912; two in 1915 to 1916; and one in 1937 to 1938.¹⁶ Unfortunately, no figures on prevented lynchings are available for the years 1917 to 1935. The state militia could be called in to prevent mob violence only by the governor of the state or by the major, district judge, or sheriff of the locality where violence threatened. As the record shows, however, calls for the militia came only rarely in relation to the number of lynchings that actually occurred in those years.

Local law enforcement officials bore the major responsibility for the protection of the prisoners. When these officials applied effective protective measures, they often were able to safeguard their prisoners. The decrease in the lynching rate became more rapid after some officers began to foil mobs by either removing the prisoner to another county or facing down the mob by a show of arms. The year 1921 produced two examples of lynching attempts prevented by the action of the local judge. In October, Judge James Hamilton of Austin quieted a mob of 150 to 200 men by assuring them that "the Negro should have as speedy a trial as the law allows."¹⁷ In an even more dramatic act Judge

¹⁶Ibid., 1890-1891, 1896, 1900-1912, 1915-1916, 1937-1938.

¹⁷San Antonio Express, October 14, 1921.

George B. Hall of Greenville quelled a mob in the district court room "during the trial of Andrew Taylor, charged with the assault of his fourteen year old daughter. The judge rose from his seat, pointed his finger at the leaders, and told them that they would have to cross his dead body to reach Taylor. The mob dispersed and the trial continued."¹⁸

In two other instances, more forceful measures proved necessary to prevent the taking of prisoners by a mob. One such incident occurred in Dallas during 1925. The authorities held two Negroes charged with murder and criminal assault in the Dallas County jail. A mob of 300 persons assembled at 1:00 a.m. and attempted to storm the jail. The officers responded with fire and wounded five of the lynch-ers. In addition, the lawmen made 100 arrests, although they filed no charges against members of the mob.¹⁹ In 1930, another sheriff courageously and successfully defended his prisoner. On June 28, a mob containing several women tried to storm the Jefferson County jail after a Negro who had confessed to eight attacks on white women in Port Arthur. The sheriff and officers prepared to fire at the mob after tear gas and water had failed to stop its onslaught. When the sheriff received reports that the mob

¹⁸Dallas Morning News, December 19, 1921.

¹⁹New York Times, May 22, 1925.

planned another attempt, he took extra precautions to guard the jail.²⁰ The real confrontation between the sheriff and the lynchers came the next night. The self-appointed leader of the mob, a sailor, approached the sheriff. The sheriff struck the sailor on the jaw and sent him reeling, which so surprised the sailor and his forty companions that they abandoned their attempt to get the prisoner.²¹

Local officials usually did not repel lynch mobs by the use of force. Rather, they usually spirited away the prisoner and kept his location secret from the public. The sheriff used this procedure to protect a prisoner in Houston in 1927. He removed the man, accused of the murder of a police officer, to a nearby county but refused to disclose the exact place where the prisoner was being held.²² The number of times authorities moved a prisoner because of the threat of mob violence is unknown, largely because records are complete only on the lynchings which actually occurred. From all indications, the number of prevented lynchings exceeded the number of successful attempts in the last years of lynching.

If the possibility of armed resistance deterred

²⁰Ibid., June 29, 1930.

²¹Ibid., June 30, 1930.

²²Galveston Daily News, February 2, 1927.

potential lynchers, a similar effect would result from any arrests or prosecutions of lynchers. While arrests remained rare, in some cases they did occur. In Upshur County, the grand jury indicted four men for the lynching of Chilton Jennings during 1919.²³ In the aftermath of a 1921 lynching, the authorities arrested twenty men in Austin.²⁴ Finally, after the lynching of Robert Powell in Houston during June, 1928, the grand jury indicted six men.²⁵ These arrests unfortunately did not result in convictions, but for the first time lynchers were subject to investigation and identification. Therefore, another of the protections enjoyed by the lynch mob was being eroded. Local sympathy and support provided the greatest source of strength for the mob. A shift from support to condemnation became evident in statements made by prominent citizens in the areas where lynchings occurred. Following a lynching in that city during 1921, the Waco Lawyers' Club denounced the action of the mob. District Judge James P. Alexander declared that "the men who composed mobs were 'cowards' and declared that one courageous officer standing in a doorway could stand off a mob." The Judge continued: "An officer

²³New York Times, August 3, 1919.

²⁴San Antonio Express, December 19, 1921.

²⁵Austin American, June 23, 1928.

who, after taking a prisoner into his custody and disarming him, fails to lay down his life, if necessary, in defense of his prisoner is unfit to hold a commission."²⁶ In the wake of the Houston lynching which preceded the 1928 Democratic National Convention, Jesse H. Jones, the man responsible for bringing the convention to that city made these observations:

It is unfortunate and much to be regretted that men should be so blindly self-indulgent as to take the law into their own hands and attempt to administer what they regard as justice. While they are only a few in number, we all are affected and the lynching is a stigma and a blot on the good name of Texas that must be lived down.

There is not a more law-abiding section of the United States than Texas; there is no section of the country where the two races have so little friction.

The South, and especially Texas, has been comparatively free of lynchings for the last few years and we all deeply deplore this one. The local authorities are being aided by the Governor in the assignment of Texas rangers and state officers to run down those guilty of the crime.²⁷

Local ministers made lynching the subject of many sermons after such events occurred. Following the Sherman lynching and courthouse burning in 1930, Dr. J. A. Ellis of the First Baptist Church at Sherman stated that "those who led the mob and those who condone its actions are striking

²⁶Dallas Morning News, December 18, 1921.

²⁷Ibid., June 21, 1928.

at the very foundation of all that is worth preserving in human society."²⁸ A Methodist minister, A. N. Evans, theorized that some parents had failed "to teach their children the observance of moral and spiritual laws. This lack of teaching," he continued, "was really responsible for the mob's terrorizing tactics."²⁹

Finally, whenever someone of importance spoke out in support of lynching, the protestations of other leading citizens soon drowned out their voices. For example, when the county attorney and county judge at Columbus, Texas, both condoned the lynching of two Negro boys during 1935, their statements were condemned far and near. The county attorney had said that he considered the action "an expression of the will of the people."³⁰ The county judge had stated that "the fact that the Negroes who so brutally murdered Miss Killman could not be adequately punished by law because of their ages, prevents me from condemning those citizens who meted justice to the ravishing murderers."³¹ L. G. Phares, the head of the Department of Public

²⁸ El Paso Times, May 12, 1930.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., November 14, 1935.

³¹ New York Times, November 14, 1935.

Safety and the Texas Rangers disagreed: "I don't believe lynchings are the will of the people and if they are, certainly ought not to be."³² A San Antonio minister, Rabbi Ephram Frisch of Temple Beth-El, stated that "if the statement of the county attorney is correct, he should be immediately rebuked in no uncertain terms and dismissed from his office."³³ Finally, Governor James V. Allred condemned the lynching.³⁴

The statements of the county officials received criticism from Texas and national newspapers. In reference to the statement made by the county attorney, the Galveston Daily News declared:

That is an astonishing statement to come from a public official who is sworn to enforce the law. The lynching may have expressed the will of a majority of the people of Colorado County, though even that is debatable. But to argue that the citizens who took part in the lynching were not a mob is the most transparent sort of sophistry.

The lynch victims, both about sixteen years old, had confessed to ravishing and murdering a young white girl. Under the law the maximum punishment to which they were liable was confinement in the state reformatory until they became of age--a punishment wholly inadequate to the heinousness of the crime. But the criminal law

³²Galveston Daily News, November 14, 1935.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

makes punishment secondary to reformation in the case of juveniles on the assumption that they have not reached the age of accountability.

Perhaps there was more justification for the Columbus lynching than can be found for most lynchings. But lynching is a matter which admits of no compromise, even though adherence to the orderly processes of law may entail an occasional miscarriage of justice. County Attorney Moore must have seen in his official experience that the law doesn't always make the punishment fit the crime. He might with equal justice defend extra-legal public action to rectify any failure of the law.³⁵

Similarly, the New York Times rebuked the officials:

. . . The will of the people of Texas; and of all other states, has been deliberately "expressed" by setting up a system of government by law. This provides sworn officers to prosecute crime, and courts to try and punish the guilty. It also enacts penal laws, which are to be enforced in an orderly manner, without fear or favor, against all violators of them, white or black. The will of the people has declared in the State Constitution and in the Statutes of the Legislature to be opposed to entrusting in a mob the execution of those who had taken life or committed other capital offenses. The citizens who took the Negro boys from the custody of the sheriff and hanged them showed that they were conscious of acting in defiance of the law by wearing masks so they would not be recognized and themselves brought to trial. In that case the will of the people was expressed with a handkerchief over its face. There is to be an official inquiry into this lynching, but not much can be hoped from it. No inquiry is needed, however, to prove that the County prosecutor and the County Judge have by their

³⁵Ibid., November 15, 1935.

extra-ordinary language, added their quota of disgrace to the whole affair.³⁶

The strong reaction by private citizens, law enforcement officers, and newspapers to those statements made by the county officials demonstrated that those citizens who abhorred mob violence were being heard.

The governors of Texas in the 1920's and 1930's also took increasingly strong stands against lynching. Perhaps the lowest point in terms of gubernatorial influence to improve race relations occurred during the term of Governor William P. Hobby. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had sent a representative to Austin to see the governor in 1919. The county judge and constable met the representative, John R. Shellady, on the capitol steps and proceeded to beat him up. Rather than expressing embarrassment at this brutal attack, Governor Hobby made clear his satisfaction with the treatment the white secretary had received. In reply to a telegram from the N.A.A.C.P., Hobby stated that "Shellady was the only offender in connection with the matter referred to in your telegram and he was punished before your inquiry came. Your organization can contribute more to the advancement of both races by keeping your representatives and their

³⁶New York Times, November 15, 1935.

propaganda out of the state than in any other way."³⁷ The record of Governor Pat Neff showed a marked improvement over that of Hobby. In 1921, Governor Neff addressed a grand jury in his home county, McLennan. He made it clear that in his opinion, "no individual, and no organization, however large, should be above the law."³⁸ When lynching again occurred in his hometown of Waco in 1922, Governor Neff, in an unreserved condemnation of mob justice, stated that "the growing tendency of mob law is indeed a sad commentary on our civilization."³⁹ Governor Neff called for a special law which would prosecute lynchers in a county other than the one in which the crime occurred.⁴⁰ Another governor, Dan Moody, spoke out strongly against lynching. Following a lynching in Montgomery County he said that if he "were district attorney of Montgomery County, I would prosecute to the limit every man participating in the lynching."⁴¹ Governor Moody proved even more adamant in a state-

³⁷ Melvin James Banks, The Pursuit of Equality: The Movement for First Class Citizenship Among Negroes in Texas, 1920-1950 (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1962), 78, citing N.A.A.C.P., Tenth Annual Report, 1919, p. 33.

³⁸ Galveston Daily News, November 12, 1921.

³⁹ Dallas Morning News, May 25, 1922.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ San Antonio Express, February 3, 1927.

ment made in 1929. He announced that "the full power of his office would be thrown into an effort to impose the death penalty upon those responsible for lynching Marshall Ratliff."⁴² Governor Moody repeated those sentiments following the Sherman lynching of 1930. He said:

It is regrettable that the state is forced to take the extreme steps of calling out the National Guard to prevent mob violence but this is a government of law and order and not of mobs. The power of the State government should be utilized to the fullest to protect the orderly administration of justice in accordance with the law of the land.⁴³

While the governors admittedly lacked the power to produce the indictments and the convictions of lynchers necessary to make these sentiments reality, the governors, by their statements, demonstrated their desire to see an end to lynching. Furthermore, their statements concerning the death penalty for lynching may have deterred some men from taking the law into their own hands, as the possibility of facing prosecution had become more real.

The anti-lynching crusade of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People contributed greatly to the decline in lynchings. Founded in 1908, the N.A.A.C.P. actively sought the enactment of a federal anti-lynch law.

⁴²Austin American, November 22, 1929.

⁴³El Paso Times, May 10, 1930.

Since the federal law would remove the prosecution of lynch-ers from the influence of local officials and therefore, remove the mantle of immunity from the lynchers, many viewed its passage as the death knell of lynching. The first successful attempt to bring such a law to a vote in Congress occurred in the critical year of 1922. The debate on the Dyer Anti-lynching bill took place just as Texas began one of its worst months of lynching with ten recorded mob actions. The Dyer bill passed the House of Representatives but died in the Senate as a result of filibustering tactics by southern senators.⁴⁴ Yet the fight for an anti-lynching law did not end in 1922. Supporters introduced similar bills in 1925, 1935, and 1938, all of which died because of filibusters in the Senate.⁴⁵

While the absence of a United States law meant no help in the fight against mob law, the attempts to adopt one did put many states under pressure to pass their own anti-lynching statutes to forestall the need for any such federal law. In all, thirty-six states enacted specific anti-lynch laws by 1934, but they did not include Texas.⁴⁶ Texas had

⁴⁴P. O. Walter, "Proposals for a Federal Anti-Lynching Law," American Political Science Review, XXVIII (June, 1934), 436-442.

⁴⁵"Point Number Three, Anti-Lynching Proposals," Congressional Digest, XXVIII (February, 1950), 45.

⁴⁶"Frontal and Flank Attacks: Thirty-Six States Have Enacted Legislation Against Lynching," State Government, VII (March, 1934), 60-61.

passed an anti-lynching law in 1897 which provided punishment for murder by mob violence and authorized a change of venue in cases coming under its jurisdiction. The legislature may have repealed this act, but the date of repeal is unknown.⁴⁷ In a court case concerning that law, the court of civil appeals held that the act applied only to those persons who took a prisoner from an officer of the law and not those who formed an ordinary conspiracy to kill another because of malice. The court did not consider whether the act should be interpreted as defining a separate and distinct crime of "murder by mob violence" or should only provide for a change of venue in cases involving mob violence.⁴⁸ This interpretation served to emasculate the statute and no one ever faced prosecution under it. Yet that decision did not leave Texas totally without laws which would prove useful in the prevention of lynching. Texas had three laws which could be used to protect prisoners. The first statute allowed changes of venue to adjoining counties for rape cases.⁴⁹ The second provided

⁴⁷Charles S. Mangum, Jr., The Legal Status of the Negro (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940), 291.

⁴⁸Alexander v. State, 40 Tex. Cr. Rep. 395, 50 S.W. 716, cited in Mangum, Legal Status of the Negro, 291-292.

⁴⁹Tex. Ann. Code Crim. Proc. (Vernon, 1925), art. 207, cited in Ibid., 292.

guards to protect prisoners in the custody of the law.⁵⁰ The last law allowed the removal of prisoners from unsafe jails if they were threatened with mob violence.⁵¹ When used effectively, these statutes provided means for local law enforcement officials to preclude the occurrence of mob violence. Thus, while Texas did not have specific anti-lynching legislation, laws did exist which would have much the same effect.

To some observers, however, the laws, the press, and public opinion did not provide the main reasons for the decline in the number of lynchings. They argued that lynchings did not stop, they simply went underground. One report argued that "successful efforts are being made to keep lynching news away from channels of publicity in the locality where the crime occurs. The new technique seems increasingly to be to have lynching carried out by small groups and in secluded places rather than the town square."⁵² This argument received support from Walter White, the chief investigator of lynchings of the N.A.A.C.P. who said:

⁵⁰Tex. Ann. Rev. Civ. Stat. (Vernon, 1925), art. 6871, cited in Ibid., 305.

⁵¹Ibid., art. 5118.

⁵²Frederick Van Nuys, "Report on Anti-Lynching Bill, April 8, 1940," Congression Digest, XVIII (August, 1940), 209.

A Southern editor stated recently that the number of unpublished lynchings, where the lynchers have adopted a new technique for concealing their crime, is unknown, but that there are many more to come to public attention, especially in the rural areas of the South.⁵³

If lynching did go underground, that would certainly indicate at least how far the public support for lynching had slipped. Whether or not underground lynching actually occurred in Texas is unknown. There is no real evidence to support the conclusion that lynching did not really die finally.

This does not mean that other, more legal, methods of dealing with the Negro population did not replace lynching. One need only examine the records of legal executions to see that for crimes such as rape, the Negro paid with his life more often than the Anglo did. From 1924 to 1938, sixty-three white men received sentences of death for various crimes and 79 percent were executed. During the same period 119 Negroes received death sentences which were carried out in 83 percent of those cases.⁵⁴ In the case of rape, the disparity is even wider. In Texas, one of eighteen states to carry the death penalty for rape,

⁵³"Lynching Record Shows Continued Gains," Christian Century, LVII (May 29, 1940), 692.

⁵⁴Mangum, The Legal Status of the Negro, 369.

thirteen white and seventy-one Negro men died for that offense from 1930 to 1964.⁵⁵ The race of the convicted rapist apparently determined the severity of the punishment.

Furthermore, Negroes accused of the rape of white women sometimes received trials which amounted to legal lynching. In the infamous Scottsboro, Alabama, trials of nine Negro boys accused of raping two white women, the white jurors repeatedly ignored defense testimony which would have acquitted the defendants. The blackness of the accused proved sufficient evidence to warrant conviction and sentence of death.⁵⁶ Tragically, Scottsboro was not an isolated incident. In Texas, a similarly mob-controlled trial occurred during 1929. The Sheriff of Bryan, Texas, arrested a Negro who stood accused of the rape of a Brazos county school teacher and escaped with him to avoid mob violence. The mob followed them and only a promise of a speedy conviction and execution made by a leading Bryan lawyer avoided a lynching. The mob jammed the courthouse during the trial and demanded that the trial be completed that day. The court officials complied and completed the case late that night. When the jury brought in the ex-

⁵⁵U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons, National Prisoner Statistics, No. 37, Executions, 1930-1964 (April, 1964), Table 3, p. 13.

⁵⁶Dan T. Carter, Scottsboro: A Tragedy of the American South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969), 239-240).

pected verdict, the defense lawyers declined to appeal the death sentence because they feared a lynching would ensue. Within a month, the Negro was executed.⁵⁷

Finally, the decline of lynching reflected the growing realization that mob violence deprived the South of large amounts of cheap labor. As the New York Times remarked:

One reason for the lynching decline that suggests itself although its validity is not likely to be admitted in the South is that the states with large Negro populations have been disquieted and inconvenienced by the much discussed exodus of black folk to the North that something like a general realization as to the wisdom of gentler treatment of these valuable workers has been produced, for with the exodus the lynchings undoubtedly have had more than little to do.⁵⁸

Also the attitude of the white population toward the blacks began to change from one of fear to one of paternalism.⁵⁹ Again, the exodus of the Negroes had its effect because the relative number of blacks declined, thus relieving the fear of social change in many areas of the South. The changes

⁵⁷Southern Commission on the Study of Lynching, Lynchings, 52.

⁵⁸New York Times, January 2, 1925, cited in Carol Edward Shull, "Lynching and the American Negro's Progress During the 1920's" (unpublished Masters Report, University of Texas, 1969), 3-4.

⁵⁹Bruce Glasrud, "Black Texans, 1900-1930" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1969), 24.

in white attitudes toward Negroes reduced public support for lynchings, thus lynchers no longer felt totally immune from prosecution.

It is impossible to determine which factor proved most important in bringing about the end to lynchings in Texas. The influence of the press, the statements of public officials and private citizens, the improved protection of prisoners, the anti-lynch campaigns, and the shift in attitudes of the white population all contributed in some part to its decline. Since lynching did not come to an abrupt end and since it is impossible to know exactly what the people felt or thought about lynching at any one time, however, those factors may not have been the only ones which played important roles in the decline of lynching. What is clearest is that lynching, which relied on public support for its survival, died when that support ended.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Lynching represented the desperate attempts of white southerners to retain their supremacy in a changing society. The lynchers carried out their actions because they feared the Negro. The lynchers based their fears not only on the myths about Negro sexuality, but also on real economic and political motives. The Negro provided a source of cheap labor, but also could be a potential economic competitor. In the Black Belt counties, the Negro even tasted political power in the period during and immediately following Reconstruction. White society used every means at its disposal to resubjugate the Negro in the South--lynching was but one of them. The White Man's Union, the poll tax, the white primary, segregation laws, and the lynch mob are examples of the more visible forms of discrimination employed.

The composition of a typical lynch mob reflected the extent of community support for lynching. Locally prominent men often led the mob and through their influence in the community also provided the lynchers with immunity from prosecution. The actual lynchers, younger and less influential men than the leaders, provided the manpower neces-

sary to carry out the lynching. Finally, spectators, composed of a cross section of the community including women and children, encouraged the lynchers and gave the lynching a measure of respectability.

Lynching required community support for its survival. Community support protected the lynchers from interference or prosecution. The public statements of prominent citizens supported lynching and thus boosted the morale of the lynchers. Primarily, public support for lynching reflected the white man's fear of the Negro. People viewed lynching as a means of keeping the Negro "in his place"--inferior to the white man.

The use of violence to control or to prevent social change was not limited to the South. The North experienced a similar phenomenon in the 1830's in the form of anti-abolitionist mobs. Many northerners saw the activities of William Lloyd Garrison and other abolitionists as a call for the assimilation of the Negro into white society and thus as a threat to their own sense of identity.¹ Some expressed their fears violently--by dragging Garrison through the streets of Boston in 1835, by murdering abolitionist editor Elijah Lovejoy in 1837, by burning down Pennsylvania

¹Leonard L. Richards, Gentlemen of Property and Standing: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), 10, 32-33.

Hall in Philadelphia in 1838, and by other similar incidents.²

These mobs resembled later lynch mobs in structure. Rabble did not dominate these mobs; their leaders were "men of property and standing"--congressman, judges, doctors and businessmen.³ Furthermore, evidence suggests that a substantial portion of the rioters came from the ranks of commercial and professional men.⁴ These men regarded "organized anti-slavery as a threat to their elite status,"⁵ much the same as the leaders of lynch mobs regarded the progress of the Negro as a threat to white supremacy. The rest of the rank and file rioters came from the lower strata of society. They feared the assimilation of the Negro because they felt they would lose their status.⁶ They saw their future threatened and reacted accordingly--just as the southern white lynchers viewed the Negro as a threat to their position in society.

The anti-abolitionist mobs shared similar methods of

²Ibid., 3.

³Ibid., 131.

⁴Ibid., 132-133.

⁵Ibid., 155.

⁶Ibid., 155.

operation with some lynch mobs. In some cases, the leaders organized the mob in advance and coordinated their actions. This was the pattern in the Utica, New York, riot in 1835. After the town council voted to allow the Anti-Slavery Society to hold its state convention in the Utica courtroom, the anti-abolitionists held a meeting which was attended by hundreds of Utica's leading citizens. They decided to meet at the courthouse one hour before the convention was scheduled to begin. In the meantime, the town council reconsidered its decision and forced the convention to move its site. The anti-abolitionists, led by a congressman and a judge, marched into the church where the meeting was being held, and prevented the convention from continuing by shouting down the meeting. That night the mob attacked the office of a proabolitionist newspaper and scattered types, cases, and other printing materials in the streets. The rioters never faced charges for their actions--in fact they were praised by many newspapers and politicians for having done their duty.⁷ Public opinion apparently shielded the anti-abolitionist rioters as completely as it protected the lynchers from prosecution.

The fear of amalgamation also prompted some northerners to attempt to expel free Negroes from their communities. In

⁷Ibid., 88-92.

Providence, Rhode Island, a white mob ransacked the Negro quarter during 1824. During 1829, mobs in Cincinnati, Ohio, raided the Negro section and destroyed great portions of it. As a result, one half of the Negro population left the city.⁸ Similarly, anti-abolitionist mobs razed the Negro quarter of New York City during July 1834, and Cincinnati during 1841.⁹ Thus, the anti-abolitionist mobs vented their fury against Negroes.

The racial factor in lynchings was even more pronounced. Far more Negro victims met lynching than did whites. There were regional variations, however, as proportionately more blacks were lynched in the South than in any other section of the nation. In the northern and western states, white victims met lynching more often. During the period 1889 to 1918, mobs lynched 219 persons in the north--119 whites and 101 Negroes. During the same period, 156 victims met lynching in the west--144 whites and 12 Negroes. The South recorded 2,834 victims from 1889 to 1918--425 whites and 2,409 Negroes.¹⁰ In view of the greater population differences between blacks and whites in the North and West, however, black lynchings occurred

⁸Ibid., 34-35.

⁹Ibid., 118-125.

¹⁰N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 31-32.

proportionately more often than white lynchings. Negroes formed 37 percent of the population in the South in 1910, but only 2 percent in the North and less than 1 percent in the West.¹¹ Clearly, lynching was racially motivated.

There were differences between southern states, both in number of victims and in percentage of blacks lynched. Delaware had only one victim, a black man. At the other extreme, Georgia had 26 white and 360 black lynching victims. The states of the "Deep South," Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Texas, and Florida suffered lynching more often than the other states of the South, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Of the southernmost states, lynchers in Texas claimed the most white victims. From 1889 to 1918, mobs lynched seventy-two white victims in Texas. This figure was considerably higher than in any other southern state, the second highest being Louisiana with forty-nine white victims.¹² One explanation for this higher number of white lynchings might be that Texas was a transitional state--partly southern and partly frontier. The eastern portion of Texas resembled the transitional cotton-producing areas of the South in respect to

¹¹Ploski and Kaiser, The Negro Almanac, 348-349.

¹²N.A.A.C.P., Thirty Years of Lynching, 31-32.

economy, climate, and concentration of Negroes. There the lynching pattern was identical with the pattern exhibited by similar areas in the South. Mobs lynched whites primarily in Central and West Central Texas, areas which were similar to the western states. Thus, the frontier characteristics of the state would account for the large number of whites lynched, while the large number of Negro victims reflected the southern influence on the state.

The number of whites lynched in Texas included thirty-three Mexican-Americans. Mexican-American victims met lynching under circumstances similar to Anglo lynchings. Anglos and Mexican-Americans who met lynching usually faced accusations of murder. The lynchers rarely employed sadistic measures in dispatching an Anglo or a Mexican-American victim. In comparison, Negroes often met lynching for petty offenses or none at all, and often suffered death by fire, mutilation, and other horrors at the hands of the lynchers. Lynching apparently was one thing when applied to whites and quite another when used against Negroes.

The rate of the decline of lynching similarly exhibited regional variations. Lynchings in the North declined from sixty-six during 1889 to 1893 to twelve during 1914 to 1918, a drop of 82 percent in the number of lynchings. The West experienced a reduction of 89 percent in lynching, from seventy-six in the period 1889 to 1893 to nine during

1914 to 1918. The South, however, lynched 690 victims during 1889 to 1893 and 304 victims during 1914 to 1918, a decline of only 56 percent.¹³ Thus, while lynching declined rapidly in the North and West, lynchers continued their activities in the South on a large scale.

Within the South, lynching declined rapidly in some states, but continued unabated in others. Lynchers in Virginia claimed thirty-five victims during 1889 to 1893, but only four during 1914 to 1918, a drop of 89 percent. The number of victims during these periods remained the same in Georgia, which thus evidenced no decline in lynching. The only other southern states to record only a limited change in the lynching rate were Florida, with twenty-six in 1889 to 1893 and nineteen in 1914 to 1918, and Texas, with seventy-one during 1889 to 1893 and sixty during 1914 to 1918.¹⁴ Lynching declined more in all other southern states. Therefore, while lynchers claimed fewer victims in the South, they were still very active in some areas.

Lynch mobs continued to be active in Texas until 1922. During the next few years the lynching rate declined dramatically. From 1923 to 1942, four or more lynchings

¹³Ibid., 34-35.

¹⁴Ibid.

occurred in only two years, 1926 and 1930. During the other years, lynchers claimed no more than two victims each year. After 1942, no one met lynching in Texas.

Lynching ended in Texas because the public support which provided immunity for the lynchers began to evaporate. Newspapers, public officials, and private citizens openly condemned the lynchers. Law enforcement officials, conscious that their actions were closely scrutinized by the press and the public, protected their prisoners more vigilantly. On a few occasions, lynchers faced indictment by grand juries. Furthermore, the agitation for federal anti-lynch legislation raised the possibility of federal intervention against lynching. While the legislation was blocked repeatedly by southern congressmen, it nonetheless forced the states to take action to stop lynchings. The actions of the lynch mobs damaged the reputations of the states, and also caused Negroes to migrate to the North, thus depleting a great supply of cheap labor. Furthermore, racial attitudes began to change from fear to paternalism in the South. Thus, as racial tension lessened, lynching declined.

In assessing the historical impact of lynching, one must conclude that lynching represented an ultimately unsuccessful attempt to maintain ante-bellum southern society. Lynching failed because it only helped prolong the system of white supremacy in the South. In doing so, the lynchers

only postponed the day when the Negro's cry for justice would have to be answered. The end of lynching did not herald a better day for the Negro, however, as more subtle methods of discrimination replaced it. The passing of Judge Lynch left only a debt of blood that can never be repaid.

APPENDIX

- A. Lynchings by Year and by Race
- B. Chronological List of Persons Lynched in Texas
- C. Crimes for Which Lynched

APPENDIX A

LYNCHINGS BY YEAR AND BY RACE

<u>Year</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Mexican-American</u>	<u>Total</u>
1889	8	6	0	14
1890	18	0	0	18
1891	10	6	1	17
1892	10	1	0	11
1893	4	0	1	5
1894	10	2	0	12
1895	20	4	1	26
1896	4	2	0	6
1897	23	3	0	26
1898	3	0	0	3
1899	5	4	0	9
1900	3	1	0	4
1901	11	0	1	12
1902	7	0	0	7
1903	7	0	0	7
1904	3	0	0	3
1905	12	1	1	14
1906	5	0	0	5
1907	4	0	0	4

APPENDIX A--Continued

<u>Year</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Mexican-American</u>	<u>Total</u>
1908	21	0	0	21
1909	9	1	0	10
1910	5	1	1	7
1911	3	0	1	4
1912	3	0	0	3
1913	7	0	0	7
1914	4	0	0	4
1915	2	1	26	29
1916	8	1	0	9
1917	9	0	0	9
1918	10	1	0	11
1919	3	0	0	3
1920	9	1	0	10
1921	6	1	0	7
1922	17	0	0	17
1923	2	0	0	2
1924	1	0	0	1
1925	0	0	0	0
1926	4	1	0	5
1927	1	0	0	1
1928	2	0	0	2
1929	1	0	0	1
1930	4	0	0	4

APPENDIX A--Continued

<u>Year</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Mexican-American</u>	<u>Total</u>
1931	1	0	0	1
1932	1	0	0	1
1933	1	0	0	1
1934	1	0	0	1
1935	2	0	0	2
1936	1	0	0	1
1937	0	0	0	0
1938	0	0	0	0
1939	0	0	0	0
1940	0	0	0	0
1941	0	0	0	0
1942	1	0	0	1
Total	306	39	33	378

APPENDIX B

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF PERSONS LYNCHED IN TEXAS

1889

Feb.	19...	TWO NEGROES (2).....	Liberty, Texas	
			Murder
"	20...	BROWN, A.S.A. (W).....	San Saba Co.	
			Unknown offense
"	20...	SMITH, W.L. (W).....	San Saba Co.	
			Unknown offense
Apr.	15...	DRIGGS, GEO.....	Hempstead, Waller Co.	
			Rape
May	17...	UNKNOWN NEGRO.....	Millican, Brazos Co.	
			Alleged rape
July	14...	DAVIS, HENRY.....	Waco, McLennan Co.	
			Unknown
"	26...	LEWIS, GEORGE.....	Belen, Paso Co.	
			Poisoning a well
"	28...	LINDLEY, GEO.....	Greenville, Hunt Co.	
			Cause unknown
Aug.	14...	BROOKS, JAMES.....	Orange, Orange Co.	
			Rape
Dec.	14...	TWO OUTLAWS (2) (W).....	White Rock	
			Cause unknown
"	28...	O'DELL, --- (W).....	Uvalde, Uvalde Co.	
			Outlaw
"	28...	O'DELL, W.M. (W).....	Uvalde, Uvalde Co.	
			Outlaw

1890

Mar.	27...	UNKNOWN.....	Hedsville	
			Murder
Apr.	5...	UNKNOWN.....	Thornton, Limestone	
			Co.....	Rape
"	5...	WILLIAMS, ---.....	Kosse, Limestone Co.	
			Rape
"	20...	JACOBS, STEPHEN.....	Fay.....	Incendiarism
"		...GARRETTE, SIMEON.....	San Augustine, San	
			Augustine Co.	
			Attempt to kill

APPENDIX B--Continued

" 24...TEEL, JERRY.....San Augustine, San
Augustine Co.
" 24...UNKNOWN.....Attempt to kill
Cameron Station, Milan
Co.....Rape
May 12...BENNETT, EDWARD.....Hearne, Robertson Co.
June 1...BROWN, THOMAS.....Hooks Ferry, Bowie Co.
" 20...A NEGRO.....Murder
Livingston, Polk Co.
" 28...UNKNOWN.....Murder
Antlers.....Cause unknown
July 3...HENRY, PATRICK.....Nechesville.....Gambling
" 22...YOUNG, ANDY.....Red R. Co.
" 30...HAWKINS, WILLIAM.....Race prejudice
Cypress, Harris Co.
Aug. 4...BROWN, JOHN.....Theft
Navasota, Grimes Co.
" 8...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Rape
Anderson, Grimes Co.
" 14...TWO UNKNOWN NEGROES (2).....Rape
Mexia, Limestone Co.
.....Rape

1891

Jan. 1...BEALLE, CHARLES.....Lang.....Rape
Feb. 7...SALCEDA, JESUS (MA).....Knickerbocker, Tom
Green Co..Unknown cause
" 17...REBIN, THOMAS.....Douglas, Nacogdoches Co.
.....Desperado
" 24...ROWLAND, THOMAS.....Douglas, Nacogdoches Co.
.....Robbery
" 27...WILLIAMS, JASPER AND
TWO OTHERS (W).....Sea Junction
.....By vigilantes
Apr. 1...FIELD, WILLIAM (W).....Mineola, Wood Co.
.....Attempted rape
May 28...SHEPPARD, MONROE (W).....Belton, Bell Co.
.....Unknown cause
June 8...SHELBY, EVAN E (W).....Wickliffe.....Murder
" 28...HARTFIELD, WILLIAM.....Cass Co..Being troublesome
" 28...SHEPPARD, MUNN.....Cass Co..Being troublesome
July 22...JOHNSON, WILLIAM.....Henderson, Garfield Co.
.....Rape

APPENDIX B--Continued

Oct. 26...GREEN, LEO.....Linden.....Murder
 Nov. 13...TWO NEGROES (2).....Burnet.....Unknown cause
 " 22...BLACK, WILLIAM.....Moscow, Beaver Co.
Insults

1892

Jan. 29...SHIELDS, JOSEPH (W).....Thompsons, Fort Bend
 Co.....Unknown cause
 Apr. 26...A NEGRO.....Riesil, McLennan Co.
Murder
 June 10...COOK, TOBE.....Bastrop, Bastrop Co.
Rape
 " 28...WOOD, PRINCE.....Spurger, Tyler Co...Rape
 " 28...SMITH, THOMAS.....Spurger, Tyler Co...Rape
 " 28...GAINES, HENRY.....Spurger, Tyler Co...Rape
 Sept. 6...WALKER, JOHN.....Paris, Lamar Co..Rioting
 " 6...ARMOR, WILLIAM.....Paris, Lamar Co..Rioting
 " 6...RANSOM, JOHN.....Paris, Lamar Co..Rioting
 " 19...A NEGRO.....Paris, Lamar Co....Rape
 " 23...SULLIVAN, WILLIAM.....Plantersville, Grimes
 Co.....Rape

1893

Jan. 31...SMITH, HENRY.....Paris, Lamar Co...Murder
 Feb. 17...BUTLER, WILLIAM.....Hickory Creek
Race prejudice
 June 14...WILLIAMS, GEORGE.....Near Waco, McLennan
 Co.....Rape
 July 16...JAZO, M. (MA).....Near El Paso, El Paso
 Co.....Murder
 Aug. 31...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Yarborough, Grimes
 Co.....Unknown cause

1894

Jan. 7...MILLER, JUDAS (W).....Ft. Reynold
Unknown offense
 Feb. 10...DILLINGHAM, JESSIE.....Smokeyville
Train wrecking
 Apr. 14...CREWS, JACK (W).....Gainesville, Cooke Co.
Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

"	14...	BREN, ALFRED.....	Gatesville, Coryell Co.	
May	9...	UNKNOWN NEGRO.....	West Texas.	Unknown Writing letter to white woman
"	17...	SCOTT, HENRY.....	Jefferson, Marion Co.	
June	13...	HALL, LON.....	Sweet Home, Lavaca Co.	Murder
"	13...	COOK, BASCOM.....	Sweet Home, Lavaca Co.	Murder
"	29...	WILLIAMS, JOHN.....	Sulphur Springs, Hopkins Co.....	Murder
July	20...	GRIFFITH, WILLIAM.....	Woodville, Tyler Co.	
Oct.	8...	GIBSON, HENRY.....	Fairfield, Freestone Co.....	Rape Attempted rape
Dec.	20...	ALLEN, JAMES.....	Brownsville, Cameron Co.....	Arson

1895

Jan.	9...	BOYD, THOMAS (W).....	Bowie, Montague Co.	
				Alleged murder
Mar.	11...	MANION, ISAAC.....	Athens.....	Murder
Apr.	12...	CALHOUN, NELSON.....	Corsicana, Navarro Co.	
"	30...	JONES, GEORGE (INDIAN) ..	Devers, Liberty Co.	Rape Assault
May	25...	CROCKER, JOHN, WIFE AND SON (3).....	Wharton, Wharton Co.	
				Murder
June	11...	JOHNSON, WILLIAM.....	Lufkin.....	Rape
"	11...	WHITE, ALEXANDER.....	Keno.....	Murder
"	11...	CHERRY, JOHN.....	Keno.....	Murder
July	20...	PHILLIPS, MRS. ABE.....	Mant, Sanpete Co.	
				Race prejudice
"	20...	PHILLIPS, HANNAH E.....	Mant, Sanpete Co.	
				Race prejudice
"	20...	PHILLIPS, ABE, JR.....	Mant, Sanpete Co.	
				Race prejudice
"	20...	PHILLIPS, EDWARD.....	Mant, Sanpete Co.	
				Race prejudice
"	20...	JOHNSON, BENJAMIN.....	Mant, Sanpete Co.	
				Race prejudice
"	20...	TAYLOR, K. D.....	Mant, Sanpete Co	
				Race prejudice

APPENDIX B--Continued

"	23...	UNKNOWN WOMAN.....	Braham, Washington Co.	
			Race prejudice
"	29...	LOFTIN, SQUIRE.....	Lexington, Lee Co.	
			Rape
Aug.	2...	MASON, JAMES.....	Daingerfield, Morris	
			Co.....	Unknown offense
"	2...	MASON, MRS. JAMES.....	Daingerfield, Morris	
			Co.....	Unknown offense
"	12...	UNKNOWN NEGRO.....	Delta Co.	Race prejudice
"	22...	UNKNOWN NEGRO.....	Wharton, Wharton Co.	
			Murder
"	26...	COLE, JEFFERSON.....	Paris, Lamar Co.	
			Race prejudice
Oct.	14...	SUITTA, FLOANTINA (F)		
		(MA).....	Catula.....	Murder
"	29...	HILLIARD, HENRY.....	Tyler, Smith Co.	Murder
Nov.	21...	A NEGRO.....	Madison Co.	Guilty of
				no offense

1896

Feb.	20...	LEWIS, T. (W).....	Wichita Falls, Wichita	
			Co.....	Robbery and
				murder
"	29...	CRAWFORD, FOSTER (W)....	Wichita Falls, Wichita	
			Co.....	Robbery and
				murder
May	3...	BENBY, WILLIAM.....	Beaumont, Jefferson	
			Co.....	Murder
June	10...	WHITEHEAD, LOUIS.....	Bryan, Brazos Co.	Rape
"	10...	JOHNSON, GEORGE J.....	Bryan, Brazos Co.	Rape
Aug.	13...	GAY, BENJAMIN.....	Hopkins.....	Arson

1897

Jan.	25...	WASHINGTON, EUGENE.....	Bryan, Brazos Co.	Rape
Mar.	5...	UNKNOWN NEGRO.....	Elgin, Bastrop Co.	
			Burglary
Apr.	27...	WRIGHT, HAL.....	Harrison Co.	
			Robbery and arson
"	27...	WRIGHT, RUSSELL.....	Harrison Co.	
			Robbery and arson
"	--...	BROWN, ROB.....	Harrison Co.	
			Robbery and arson
"	30...	RHONE, FAYETTE.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	
			Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

"	30...	GATES, WILLIAM.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	
"	30...	THOMAS, LEWIS.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	Murder
"	30...	THOMAS, JAMES.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	Murder
"	30...	THOMAS, BENJAMIN.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	Murder
"	30...	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	Murder
"	30...	THOMAS, AARON.....	Sunnyside, Waller Co.	Murder
May	14...	COTTON, DAVID.....	Rosebud, Falls Co.	Attempted rape
"	14...	WILLIAMS, HENRY.....	Rosebud, Falls Co.	Attempted rape
"	14...	STEWART, SABLE.....	Rosebud, Falls Co.	Attempted rape
"	18...	WHITE, WILLIAM.....	San Augustine, San Augustine Co....	Murder
"	18...	WHITE, WILLIAM.....	San Augustine, San Augustine Co....	Murder
"	18...	WHITE, JOHN.....	San Augustine, San Augustine Co....	Murder
"	21...	PETER --- (W).....	Brown Co...	Cause unknown
"	23...	JONES, WILLIAM.....	Tyler, Smith Co...	Murder
Aug.	6...	WHITE ESSECK.....	Nacogdoches, Nacogdoches Co.....	Rape
"	10...	JONES REV. CAPTAIN (W)...	Paris, Lamar Co.	Elopement
"	26...	BONNER ---.....	Bellville, Austin Co.	Rape
"	26...	JOHNSON, WESLEY (W)....	Mooreville	Attempted rape
Oct.	11...	CARTER, ROBERT.....	Brenham, Washington Co.	Murder
Nov.	18...	SWEAT, THOMAS.....	Bryan, Brazos Co..	Murder

1898

Apr.	5...	GUILLEN, CARLOS.....	Brownsville, Cameron Co.....	Murder
June	6...	WASHINGTON, GEORGE.....	Wemar, Weno.....	Murder
Aug.	8...	OGG, DAN.....	Palestine, Anderson Co.....	Rape

APPENDIX B--Continued1899

May 23...HUMPHRY AND TWO
SONS, JAS. (3) (W).....Ally....Helping murderer
to escape

July 1...THOMPSON ALLIE.....Waskom, Harrison Co.
.....Rape

" 9...BRAKE, BUD (W).....Corning.....Accomplice in
murder

" 14...BROWN, ABE.....Gilead....Rape and murder

" 14...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Iola, Grimes Co....Murder

" 16...McGEE, HARRY.....Navasota, Grimes Co.
.....Murder

" 25...HAMILTON, HENRY.....Near Navasota, Grimes
Co.....Incendiarism

1900

Feb. 11...SWEENEY, JAMES (W).....Port Arthur, Jefferson
Co.....Murder

Nov. 15...THREE NEGROES (3).....Jefferson, Marion Co.
.....Attempted murder

1901

Feb. 11...CARTER, GEORGE.....Paris, Lamar Co.....Rape

Mar. 13...HENDERSON, JOHN.....Corsicana, Navarro Co.
.....Rape

Aug. 1...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Mobile, Tyler Co.
.....Insulting white woman

" 20...WILDER, ABE.....Dexter, Cooke Co..Murder

" 25...MARTINEX, FELIX (MA)....Kenedy, Karnes Co.
.....Unknown

Oct. 3...FIVE NEGROES (5).....Harrison....Quarrel over
profit sharing

" 25...GORDON, GALNER.....Quitman, Wood Co..Murder

Dec. 25...McCLINTON, J. H.....Paris, Lamar Co.
.....Unknown offense

1902

Mar. 11...BIRD, NATHAN.....Luling, Caldwell Co.
.....Unknown offense

APPENDIX B--Continued

" 11...SON OF BIRD.....Luling, Caldwell Co.
Unknown offense
 May 22...MORGAN, DUDLEY.....Long View, Gregg Co.
Criminal assault
 Sept. 4...WALKER, JESSE.....Hempstead, Waller Co.
Rape
 Oct. 4...DUNCAN, UTT.....Columbus, Colorado Co.
Attempted rape
 " 21...WESLEY, JOS.....Hempstead, Waller Co.
Rape
 " 21...BARTON, REDDISH.....Hempstead, Waller Co.
Rape

1903

Jan. 14...O'NEAL, RANSOM.....Angleton, Brazoria Co.
Murder
 " 14...TUNSTALL, CHARLES.....Angleton, Brazoria Co.
Murder
 Apr. 26...JOHNSON, HENSLEY.....Carthage, Panola Co.
Attempted rape
 May 27...UNKNOWN.....Kemp, Kaufman Co....Rape
 July 23...ALLEN, MOONY.....Beaumont, Jefferson Co.
Murder
 July 31...UNKNOWN.....Near Alto, Cherokee
 Co.....Assault
 Oct. 1...DAVIS, WALKER.....Marshall, Harrison Co.
Murder

1904

July 30...LARREMORE, JNO.....Lockhart, Caldwell Co.
Race prejudice, by
 white caps
 Aug. 31...TURNER, OSCAR.....Weimar, Colorado Co.
Attempted rape
 Sept. 1...TUCKER, OSCAR.....Weimar, Colorado Co.
Rape

1905

Feb. 16...MUNOZ, CARLOS (MA).....Near Dale, Caldwell
 Co.....Rape

APPENDIX B--Continued

" 17...JOHNSON, WM.....Smithville, Bastrop Co.
Rape
 Mar. 14...STEVENS, JULIUS.....Long View, Gregg Co.
Murderous assault
 June 20...SIMON, FORD.....Riverside, Walker Co.
Rape
 July 14...MASON, FRANK.....Golinda, Goliad Co..Rape
 " 20...GREEN, SAM.....New Braunfels, Comal Co.
Rape
 " 29...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Avery, Avalon Co....Rape
 Aug. 8...MAJORS, SANK.....Waco, McLennan Co...Rape
 " 11...WILLIAMS, THOS. (W).....Sulphur Springs, Hopkins
 Co.....Attempted rape
 " 14...WILLIAMS, THOS.....Sulphur Springs, Hopkins
 Co.....Attempted rape
 Sept. 7...DAVIS, STEPHEN.....Italy, Ellis Co.....Rape
 Nov. 11...REESE, JOHN.....Henderson, Rusk Co.
Murder
 " 11...ASKEW, ROBT.....Henderson, Rusk Co.
Murder
 " 11...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Henderson, Rusk Co.
Murder

1906

Jan. 10...HARRIS, BENJ.....Moscow, Polk Co...Murder
 Apr. 24...NEGRO.....Groesbech, Limestone
 Co.....Rape
 " 25...NEGRO.....Oakwood, Leon Co....Rape
 Sept. 15...FRAZIER, MITCHELL.....Rosebud, Falls Co.
Murderous assault
 Oct. 26...PITTS, "SLAB".....Toyah, Reeves Co.
Marrying a white
 woman

1907

July 14...WILSON, FRED.....Del Rio, Valverde Co.
Murder
 Aug. 6...HALL, THOS.....Goliad, Goliad Co.
Attempted assault
 Nov. 4...JOHNSON, ALEX.....Caneron, Milam Co.
Attempted rape
 Dec. 26...CALLAWAY, ANDERSON.....Marquez, Leon Co.
Attempted rape

APPENDIX B--Continued1908

Feb.	28...	SCOTT, CLEM.....	Conroe, Montgomery Co.	
			Attempted rape
Mar.	10...	CAMPBELL, JOHN.....	Navosota, Grimes Co.	
"	24...	UNNAMED NEGRO.....	Conroe, Montgomery Co.Murderous assault
"	24...	TWO UNNAMED NEGROES (2).....	Magnolia, Montgomery Co.Attempted rape
Apr.	9...	FIELDS, ALBERT.....	Long View, Gregg Co.Attempted rape
"	19...	DOUGLAS, JASPER.....	Atlanta, Cass Co....	Rape
May	7...	WILLIAMS JOHN.....	Naples Morris Co..	Murder
June	22...	EVANS, JERRY.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	JOHNSON, WM.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	MANUEL, WM.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	McCOY--"RABBIT BILL"....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	SPELLMAN, MOSES.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	WILLIAMS, FRANK.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	TWO UNIDENTIFIED (2)....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
"	22...	WILLIAMS, CLEVELAND.....	Hemphill, Sabine Co.Murder
July	15...	UNNAMED NEGRO.....	Beaumont, Jefferson Co.Mistaken identity
"	28...	SMITH, TAD.....	Greenboro.....	Rape
Aug.	15...	JACKSON, MOSES.....	Bellville, Austin Co.Unknown reason
Sept.	13...	NEWTON, DANIEL.....	Brodeshire.....	Murder

1909

Mar.	7...	ELLIS, ANDERSON.....	Rockwall, Rockwall Co.Rape
Apr.	27...	HODGES, JAS.....	Marshall, Harrison Co.Rape
"	30...	"CREOLE MOSE".....	Marshall, Harrison Co.Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

" 30...HILL, "PIE".....Marshall, Harrison Co.
 " 30...CHASE, MATTHEW.....Murder
 " 30...CHASE, MATTHEW.....Marshall, Harrison Co.
 " 30...CHASE, MATTHEW.....Murder
 May 28...BURNETT, THOS. (W).....Abilene, Taylor Co.
 " 28...BURNETT, THOS. (W).....Murder
 Sept. 13...UNNAMED NEGRO.....Bellamy.....Murder
 " 13...UNNAMED NEGROES (2).....Sandy Point, Brazoria
 " 13...UNNAMED NEGROES (2).....Co.....Murder
 Dec. 20...MILLS, COPE.....Rosebud, Falls Co. Murder

1910

Feb. 2...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Beaumont, Jefferson
 " 2...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Co.....Rape
 Mar. 3...BROOKS, HOLLAND.....Dallas, Dallas Co...Rape
 Apr. 5...BATES, FRANK.....Centerville, Leon Co.
 " 5...BATES, FRANK.....Murder
 June 26...JOHNSON, LEONARD.....Rusk, Cherokee Co
 " 26...JOHNSON, LEONARD.....Murder
 July 5...UNNAMED NEGRO.....Rodney....Attempted rape
 " 12...GENTRY, HENRY (W).....Belton, Bell Co.
 " 12...GENTRY, HENRY (W).....Murder and al-
 " 12...GENTRY, HENRY (W).....leged rape

(There were fifteen victims of race rioting in Texas in July, which are not included as lynchings. Race Riot in Texas growing out of a quarrel between a colored and white man.)

Nov. 8...RODRIQUEZ, ANTONIO (MA)..Rock Springs, Edwards
 " 8...RODRIQUEZ, ANTONIO (MA)..Co.....Murder

1911

June 20...MEXICAN BOY (MA).....Thorndale, Milan Co.
 " 20...MEXICAN BOY (MA).....Murder
 Aug. 12...JONES, "COMMODORE".....Farmersville, Collin
 " 12...JONES, "COMMODORE".....Co.....Insulting women
 Oct. 29...UNNAMED NEGRO.....Marshall, Harrison
 " 29...UNNAMED NEGRO.....Co.....Attempted rape
 Nov. 8...JOHNSON, RILEY.....Clarksville, Red River
 " 8...JOHNSON, RILEY.....Co.....Attempted rape

APPENDIX B--Continued

1912

Feb.	13...	SAUNDERS, GEO.....	Marshall, Harrison Co.Complicity in murder
"	13...	JACKSON, MARY.....	Marshall, Harrison Co.Complicity in murder
May	25...	DAVIS, DAN.....	Tyler, Smith Co.....Rape

1913

Jan.	17...	MONSON, HENRY.....	Paris, Lamar Co.	
			Murder
"	23...	STANLEY, RICHARD.....	Fullbright, Red River	
			Co.....	Rape
Feb.	25...	ANDERSON, ---.....	Near Marshall, Harrison	
			Co.....	Murder
"	25...	PERRY, ROBERT.....	Karnach, Harrison Co.	
			Horse stealing
June	4...	UNNAMED NEGRO.....	Beaumont, Jefferson Co.	
			Murderous assault
"	5...	GALLOWAY, RICHARD.....	Newton Co...	Race trouble
Sept.	21...	DAVIS, WILLIAM.....	Franklin, Robertson	
			Co.....	Murder

1914

Jan.	8...	LEE, DAVID.....	Jefferson, Marion Co.Murderous assault
Mar.	13...	WILLIAMS, WILLIAM.....	Hearne, Robertson Co..Murder
June	7...	ROBERTSON, WILLIAM.....	Navasota, Grimes Co.Murder
Oct.	17...	DURFEE, JOSEPH.....	Angleton, Brazoria Co.Murder

1915

May 9...UNIDENTIFIED NEGRO.....Big Sandy, Upshur Co.
.....Murder
July 29...MUNZ, ADOLFO (MA).....Brownsville, Cameron
Co.....Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

Aug. 20...SIX MEXICANS (6).....San Benito, Cameron
 Co..Pillage and murder
 " 24...SLOVAK, JOHN (W).....Shiner, Lavaca Co.
Wife beating
 " 29...RICHMOND, KING.....Sulphur Springs, Hopkins
 Co.....Murder
 Sept. 3...THREE MEXICANS (3).....Murder
 " 14...SIX MEXICANS (6).....San Benito and Edenburg,
 Co.....Banditry
 Oct. 10...TEN MEXICANS (10).....Near Brownsville,
 Cameron Co.....Train-
 wrecking and murder

1916

Jan. 24...MAXFIELD, W.J. (W).....Boston, Bowie Co..Murder
 May 5...DIXON, THOMAS.....Hempstead, Waller Co.
Rape
 " 15...JESS, WASHINGTON.....Waco, McLennan Co.
Rape and murder
 June 20...LERMA, JERONIMO.....Brownsville, Cameron
 Co..Murderous assault
 Aug. 7...BROWN, STEPHEN.....Seymour, Baylor Co.
Murder
 " 19...LANG, EDWARD.....Rice, Navarro Co.
Murder
 Oct. 5...SPENCER, WILLIAM.....Graceton, Upshur Co.
Alleged murder
 Nov. 5...JOHNSON, JOSEPH.....Bay City, Matagorda Co.
Murder
 " 29...THOMAS, BUCK.....Clarksville, Red River
 Co..Murderous assault

1917

June 22...HARPER, BENJAMIN.....Courtney, Grimes Co.
Murder
 " 23...HAYS, ELIJAH.....Reisel....Striking white
 woman
 " 25...SAWYER, CHARLES.....Galveston, Galveston
 Co.....Rape
 " 29...JEFFERSON, ROBT.....Temple....Attempted rape
 July 3...GUIDRY, GILBERT.....Orange....Attempted rape

APPENDIX B--Continued

" 23...UNNAMED.....Elysian Fields..Entering
white woman's room
Augs. 22...JONES, CHARLES.....Near Marshall, Harrison
Co.....Attempted rape
Sept. 3...JENNINGS, CHARLES.....Beaumont...Cause unknown
" 21...SMITH, BERT.....Goose Creek, Harris Co.
.....Attempted rape

1918

May 27...GOOLSIE, KIRBY.....Beaumont, Jefferson Co.
..Attacking white girl
June 4...CABANISS, SARAH.....(Alleged
" 4...CABANISS, PETE.....(threat
" 4...CABANISS, CUTE.....Huntsville, (by Geo.
" 4...CABANISS, TENOLA.....Walker Co..(Cabaniss
" 4...CABANISS, THOMAS.....(to white
" 4...CABANISS, BESSIE.....(man
" 4...VALENTINE, EDW.....Sanderson, Terrell Co.
.....Murder
July 27...BROWN, GENE.....Benhur, Terrell Co.
.....Assault on white
woman
Sept. 18...O'NEAL, ABE.....Buff Lake, Terrell Co.
.....Shooting white man
Nov. 14...SHIPMAN, CHARLES.....Ft. Bend Co.
.....Disagreement with
white man

1919

Jan. 20...WILLIAMS, BRAGG.....Hillsboro, Hill Co.
.....Murder
June 17...WALTERS, LEMUEL.....Longview, Harrison Co.
July 24...JENNINGS, CHILTON.....Gilmer, Upshur Co...Rape

1920

May 8...ARLINE, CHARLES.....Woodville, Tyler Co.
.....Assault
June 30...GILES, WASHINGTON.....Damon Mound.....Murder
" 30...GILES, EZRA.....Damon Mound.....Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

"	30...	GORDON, JODIE.....	Damon Mound.....	Murder
"	30...	ANDERSON, ELIJAH.....	Damon Mound.....	Murder
July	6...	ARTHUR, HERMAN.....	Paris, Lamar Co...	Murder
"	6...	ARTHUR, IRVING.....	Paris, Lamar Co...	Murder
Aug.	2...	DANIELS, LIGE.....	Center, Shelby Co...	Rape
Sept.	16...	BEASLEY, OSCAR.....	Angleton, Brazoria Co.	
Dec.	23...	VICKERY, THOMAS W. (W)...	Ft. Worth, Tarrant Co.	
			Murder

1921

Aug.	15...	WINN, ALEX.....	Datura	
Oct.	12...	McNEELEY, W.....	Leesburg.....	Rape
Nov.	26...	CADE, HENRY.....	Sour Lake	
Nov.	30...	MUTORE, ROBERT.....	Ballinger, Runnels Co.	
			Rape
Dec.	11...	ROUSE, FRED.....	Ft. Worth	
			Attempted murder
Dec.	11...	NEWSON, LONNIE.....	Gladewater, Upshur Co.	
Dec.	14...	HACKNEY, CURLEY (W).....	Waco, McLennan Co...	Rape

1922

Feb.	2...	DUARTE, MANUEL.....	Cameron Co.	
Feb.	14...	NORMAN, P.....	Texarcana, Bowie Co.	
			Race prejudice
May	6...	CURRY, SNAP.....	Kirvin.....	Rape
"	6...	VARNEY, J.H.....	Kirvin.....	Rape
"	6...	JONES, MOSE.....	Kirvin.....	Rape
May	8...	CORNISH, TOM.....	Kirvin.....	Rape
May	17...	EARLY, THOMAS.....	Conroe, Montgomery Co.	
			Attempted rape
May	19...	OWENS, HALLIN.....	Texarcana, Bowie Co.	
			Murder
May	20...	WINTERS, JOE.....	Conroe, Montgomery Co.	
			Rape
May	20...	BOZIER, MOSE.....	Allentown, Colorado Co.	
			Rape
May	23...	WILSON, GILBERT.....	Bryan, Washington Co.	
			Theft
May	26...	THOMAS, JESSE.....	Waco, McLennan Co...	Rape
June	23...	LEWIS, WARREN.....	New Dacus.....	Rape
Sept.	7...	JOHNSON, O.J.....	Newton, Newton Co.	
			Murder

APPENDIX B--Continued

Sept --...EVERETT, GROVER C.....Abilene, Taylor Co.
Nov. 11...ZARATE, ELIAS V.....
Dec. 11...GAY, GEORGE.....Streetman.....Rape

1923

```

Jan.  --...SMITH, J.....Bishop
July   3...BULLOCK, JESSE.....Schulenberg, Fayette
                                           Co.....Rape

```

1924

June 7...UNKNOWN NEGRO.....Crockett, Houston Co.

1925

None

1926

Mar.	--...	UNKNOWN WHITE MAN			
Mar.	--...	WILKES, FRANK	Orange	
Nov.	10...	EVANS, SCOT	Houston...	Race prejudice
"	10...	BROWN, ROBERT	Houston...	Race prejudice
"	10...	WIFE OF BROWN	Houston...	Race prejudice

1927

Feb. 1...PAYNE, TOM.....Willis, Montgomery Co.
.....Attempted murder

1928

May	21...	EVINS, BUDDY.....	Center, Shelby Co.
June	20...	POWELL, ROBERT.....	Houston.....Murder

1929

Sept. 1...WILLIAMS, CLEVELAND.....Calvert, Robertson Co.

APPENDIX B--Continued

Nov. 19...RATLIFF, MARSHALL (W)...Eastland.....Murder

1930

May 9...HUGHES, GEORGE.....Sherman, Grayson Co.
Rape
 May 16...JOHNSON, GEORGE.....Honey Grove, Fannin
 Co.....Murder
 June 18...ROAN, BILL.....Bryan, Washington Co.
 June 28...ROBERTSON, JACK.....Round Rock, Williamson
 Co.

1931

Dec. 20...EDWARDS, ISAIAH.....Conroe, Montgomery Co.

1932

Apr. 1...TILLIS, DAVE.....Crockett, Houston Co.

1933

Dec. 8...GREGORY, DAVID.....Kountze, Hardin Co.
Murder

1934

June 21...GRIGGS, SON.....Kirbyville, Jasper Co.

1935

Nov. 13...MITCHELL, BENNY.....Columbus, Colorado
 Co.....Rape
 Nov. 13...COLLINS, ERNEST.....Columbus, Colorado
 Co.....Rape

1936

Jan. 16...GRAY, MACE.....Carthage, Panola Co.

APPENDIX B--Continued1937

None

1938

None

1939

None

1940

None

1941

None

1942

July 13...VINSON W.....Texarcana, Bowie Co.
.....Rape

APPENDIX C

CRIMES FOR WHICH LYNCHED

<u>Crime</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Anglo</u>	<u>Mexican-American</u>
Murder	33% (94)	41.6% (15)	72.7% (24)
Rape	25 (73)	2.7 (1)	3 (1)
Attempted Rape	7 (20)	8 (3)	---
Attempted Murder	4.8 (13)	---	---
Assault	2.4 (7)	---	---
Theft	2.4 (7)	---	---
Race Preju- dice	4.5 (12)	---	---
Miscellaneous	15 (39)	24.3 (9)	18.3 (6)
No Offense	.7 (2)	---	---
Unknown	5.6 (16)	22 (8)	6 (2)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Government Documents

Texas. Adjutant General--Report. 1889-1891, 1896, 1900-1912, 1915-1916, 1937-1938.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of the Census. Compendium of the Eleventh Census, 1890, I, Population. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1892.

_____. Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, VI, Agriculture, pt. 2, Crops and Irrigation. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1902.

_____. Twelfth Census of the United States, 1900, I, Population, pt. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1901.

_____. Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census, 1890. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1895.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons. National Prisoner Statistics, No. 37, Executions, 1930-1964. April, 1964.

Newspapers

Austin American. 1921-1942.

Austin Weekly Record. September 17, 1887.

Dallas Morning News. 1889-1934.

El Paso Times. 1920-1935.

Galveston Daily News. 1894-1935.

Houston Post. September 7, 1892.

Longview Times-Clarion. March 16, 1905

Matagorda County News. November 7, 1916.

New York Times. 1919-1942.

San Antonio Express. 1919-1927.

Waco Daily Times-Herald. August 10, 1905; May 9-16, 1916.

Secondary Sources

Books

Banks, Melvin James. The Pursuit of Equality: The Movement for First Class Citizenship Among Negroes in Texas, 1920-1950. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1962.

Blair, E. L. Early History of Grimes County. Austin: By the Author, 1930.

Carter, Dan T. Scottsboro: A Tragedy of the American South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Chadbourn, James Harmon. Lynching and the Law. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933.

Cutler, J. Elbert. Lynch-Law: An Investigation Into the History of Lynching in the United States. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1905.

Estes, Mary Elisabeth. "An Historical Survey of Lynchings in Oklahoma and Texas." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1942.

The Facts in the Case of the Horrible Murder of Little Myrtle Vance and its Fearful Expiation at Paris, Texas, February 1, 1893. Paris, Texas: P. L. James, (c. 1893).

Frazier, Thomas R., ed. Afro-American History: Primary Sources. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1970.

Glasrud, Bruce. "Black Texans, 1900-1930." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1969.

Graham, Hugh Davis and Gurr, Ted Robert, eds. The History of Violence in America. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

- Grebler, Leo; Moore, Joan W.; and Guzman, Ralph C. The Mexican-American People. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- Hofstadter, Richard, ed. American Violence. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1970.
- Johnson, James Weldon. Along This Way. New York: The Viking Press, 1933.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Looney, Wesley Hall. "The Texas Rangers in a Turbulent Era." Unpublished Master's thesis, Texas Tech University, 1971.
- Mangum, Charles S., Jr. The Legal Status of the Negro. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1940.
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Thirty Years of Lynching in the United States, 1889-1918. New York: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 1919.
- Nolen, Claude H. The Negro's Image in the South. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.
- Ploski, Harry A., and Kaiser, Ernest, eds. The Negro Almanac. New York: Bellwether Publishing Company, 1971.
- Raper, Arthur F. The Tragedy of Lynching. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933.
- Rice, Lawrence D. The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1971.
- Richards, Leonard L. Gentlemen of Property and Standing--Anti-Abolitionist Mobs in Jacksonian America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Richardson, Rupert Norval. Texas. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.
- Shay, Frank. Judge Lynch, His First Hundred Years. New York: I. Washburn, Inc., (c. 1938).

Schull, Carol Edward. "Lynching and the American Negro's Progress During the 1920's." Unpublished Master's Report, University of Texas, 1969.

Southern Commission on the Study of Lynching. Lynchings and What They Mean. Atlanta: The Commission, 1931.

Wells, Ida. On Lynching. New York: Arno Press, 1969.

White, Walter. Rope and Faggot: A Biography of Judge Lynch. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1929.

Articles

Baenziger, Ann Paxton. "The Texas State Police During Reconstruction: A Re-examination." Southwestern Historical Quarterly, LXXII (April, 1969), 470-491.

Bleekley, L. E. "Negro Outrage No Excuse for Lynching." Forum, XVI (November, 1893), 300-302.

Cabell, Bruce W. "Lynch Law in the South." North American Review, CLV (September, 1892), 379-381.

Flower, B. O. "The Burning of Negroes in the South: A Protest and a Warning." Arena, VII (April, 1893), 630-640.

Frazier, E. Franklin. "The Pathology of Race Prejudice." Forum, LXXVII (May, 1927), 856-862.

"Frontal and Flank Attacks: Thirty-Six States Have Enacted Legislation Against Lynching." State Government, VII (March, 1934), 60-61.

Godkin, E. L. "Southern Lynching." Nation, LVII (November 2, 1893), 322-323.

Goodwyn, Lawrence. "Populist Dreams and Negro Rights: East Texas as a Case Study." American Historical Review, LXXVI (December, 1971), 1435-1456.

Haygood, Atticus G. "The Black Shadow in the South." Forum, XVI (October, 1893), 167-175.

Johnson, James Weldon. "Lynching, America's National Disgrace." Current History, XVIII (January, 1924), 596-601.

"Lynching Record Shows Continued Gains." Christian Century, LVII (May 29, 1940), 692.

Page, Thomas Nelson. "The Lynching of Negroes--Its Causes and Its Prevention." North American Review, CLXXVII (January, 1964), 33-48.

"Point No. 3. Anti-Lynching Proposals." Congressional Digest, XXVIII (February, 1950), 45.

Somerville, Henderson M. "Some Cooperating Causes of Negro Lynching." North American Review, CLXXVII (October, 1903), 39-41.

Stewart, Herbert L. "The Causistry of Lynch Law." Nation, CIII (August 24, 1916), 173-174.

VanHeche, M. T. "Lynching or the Law." State Government, VII (March, 1934), 58-59.

VanNuys, Frederick. "Report on Anti-Lynching Bill." Congressional Digest, XVIII (August, 1940), 208-210.

Walter, P. O. "Proposals for a Federal Anti-Lynching Law." American Political Science Review, XXVIII (June, 1934), 436-442.

