

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7907713

TAYLOR, JEROME GREGG, JR.
PERSONAL VIOLENCE AS A THEME: NOTABLE
INCIDENTS OF UPPER CLASS VIOLENCE IN
NINETEENTH CENTURY TENNESSEE, A TEACHING
GUIDE.

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY, D.A., 1978

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

JEROME GREGG TAYLOR, Jr.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PERSONAL VIOLENCE AS A THEME: NOTABLE
INCIDENTS OF UPPER CLASS VIOLENCE IN
NINETEENTH CENTURY TENNESSEE, A
TEACHING GUIDE

Jerome G. Taylor, Jr.

A dissertation presented to the
Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Arts

December, 1978

PERSONAL VIOLENCE AS A THEME: NOTABLE
INCIDENTS OF UPPER CLASS VIOLENCE IN
NINETEENTH CENTURY TENNESSEE, A
TEACHING GUIDE

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

Walter L. Taylor

Major Professor

John Harris

Committee Member

Jerry H. Brothman

Committee Member

Jack J. Turner

Committee Member

William J. Windham

Head of the Department of History

Robert C. Allen

Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

PERSONAL VIOLENCE AS A THEME: NOTABLE
INCIDENTS OF UPPER CLASS VIOLENCE IN
NINETEENTH CENTURY TENNESSEE, A
TEACHING GUIDE

by Jerome G. Taylor, Jr.

This dissertation is directed primarily to teachers of undergraduate history courses who seek a better understanding of the most notable incidents of upper class violence in nineteenth century Tennessee. The problems are a lack of reliable information about the various individual incidents and a tendency to treat them as mere unconnected bloody anecdotes, rather than as a theme in the state's history. In no sense is this study an attempt to test a thesis about the causes of upper class violence, although appropriate models and conclusions have been suggested. Further, this dissertation offers a review of the relevant historical and scientific literature and a content analysis of selected American history survey textbooks.

The sources examined include both primary and secondary materials. The primary sources were the personal papers of the men involved, contemporary newspaper accounts, and court records. For the most part, these are found in

the Tennessee State Library and Archives in Nashville, although the McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville-Knox County Public Library, and Special Collections of the University of Tennessee Library, Knoxville, have valuable resources. Secondary sources included general surveys, biographies, periodicals, theses, and dissertations.

This paper concludes that there are patterns and similarities among the various incidents. For the most part, the participants were strong and aggressive personalities who, frequently, had engaged in physical violence prior to the incident examined. In several cases, the violence was preceded by a failure of some sort in their careers which may have affected their inhibitions against aggression. The violence appears to have occurred most frequently among politicians and journalists, and yet it was not "political violence" in the sense of being violence aimed at attempting to effect political action. For the most part, the violence occurred in the more urban areas of the state, and in Nashville in particular. The participants were often middle-aged (forty was the median age), rather than fool-hardy young men trying to make a name for themselves.

A lingering frontier attitude toward personal violence appears to be an important consideration. Twelve of the fourteen incidents took place before the end of the Civil War, during a time when, by several measures,

Jerome G. Taylor, Jr.

Tennesseans did not often question the right of men to settle their private disputes violently. As time passed, the public attitude of disapproval hardened, and the practice became much less frequent. Judicial actions became more likely, and the press condemned "gentlemen of property and standing" who shot each other. Tennesseans seemed to be progressing beyond a frontier attitude as time passed. This paper also suggests a possible relationship between the frontier practice of carrying firearms and physical violence.

It is felt that these incidents represent a theme in nineteenth century Tennessee history. Time and again during the 120 years this study covers, men responded to roughly parallel situations with similar responses. A public deprecation of man's reputation was followed by a formal or informal challenge; the armed men then confronted each other, most frequently on the streets, and shot it out. The pattern varied little from Andrew Jackson's first encounter in 1788 to Edward Ward Carmack's last one in 1908.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his deep appreciation to Dr. Robert L. Taylor, who first suggested the topic, and who, to the end, was patient and helpful in his guidance. His comments and insights were invaluable. Dr. Jerry Brookshire, Dr. Jack Turner, Dr. John Harris, Dr. Fred Rolater, and Dr. Harold Whiteside have provided perspectives and judgment which helped this writer more than he can express.

Appreciation is also extended to Miss Lori Hamilton, Mrs. Doris McCammon, Mrs. Mary Newman, and Mrs. Brenda Elliott for their assistance in typing the draft. Miss Janet Caruth and Mr. Byung Moo Lee of the Cleveland State Community College Library, Mr. John Dotson of Special Collections, the University of Tennessee Library, Knoxville, and especially the entire staff of the Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, have directed the writer's attention to source materials and helped him acquire access to them.

Special thanks are extended to Mrs. Wilma Grant who typed the final draft. Her knowledge and expertise in typing dissertations saved the writer much time and effort.

The writer affectionately dedicates this paper to his wife, Sally, and his two peerless boys, Gregg and Read. Their long-suffering forbearance made the completion of this paper possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	v
Chapter	
I. A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATING TO VIOLENCE AND AGGRESSION	1
II. ANDREW JACKSON: INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE TO 1806	36
III. ANDREW JACKSON: INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE FROM 1806 TO 1813	74
IV. POLITICIANS, SOLDIERS, AND ENTREPRENEURS	110
V. JOURNALISTS	162
VI. CONCLUSIONS	209
APPENDIX	222
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	284

INTRODUCTION

Over half a century ago, in his Reflections on Violence, the French philosopher Georges Sorel wrote that "the problems of violence still remain very obscure." Since his time, and especially recently, violence has become an important topic of scholarly and public concern. Several reasons for this have been suggested by the American philosopher Jerome A. Shaffer. First, there are the shocking incidents of violence such as the assassinations of the Kennedys and Martin Luther King, Jr., the Mylai massacre, and the killings on the Kent State University and Jackson State College campuses; second, there are growing public doubts about institutionalized violence such as the death penalty; and, third, there is the belief by some in the efficacy and even necessity of violence to bring about desired social change. America is headed, Shaffer feels, toward a national debate on violence.¹ If scholarly production on the topic is any guide, the debate has already begun. Historian Milton M. Klein, in a 1973 article titled

¹Jerome A. Shaffer, ed., Violence: Award Winning Essays in the Council for Philosophical Studies Competition (New York: David McKay Co., 1971), p. 2.

"The Face of Violence in America: A Historical Perspective," has noted that in 1968 only ten books on violence were published in the United States, whereas by 1972 the number published had risen to sixty-seven.²

Yet in the face of this apparent cornucopia of knowledge, both Klein and the late Richard Hofstadter of Columbia University have denigrated the contributions of their fellow historians. Hofstadter has found that ". . . we have a remarkable lack of memory where (domestic) violence is concerned and have left most of our excesses a part of our buried history. . . . Shirked by our historians, the subject has been repressed in the national consciousness."³ Klein added that "history textbooks . . . reflect a blandness, a softening of the outer extremes in an effort at middle-of-the-road balance, which leaves the violent episodes of our history buried under the mountain of words describing our more peaceful evolution to greatness."⁴

²Milton M. Klein, "The Face of Violence in America: A Historical Perspective," Social Education 37 (October 1973):540.

³Richard Hofstadter, "Reflections on Violence in the United States," in Richard Hofstadter and Michael Wallace, eds., American Violence: A Documentary History (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1970), p. 3.

⁴Klein, "The Face of Violence in America: A Historical Perspective," p. 541.

If what these men have said is true, then the teacher of American history certainly needs to be aware of it. A content analysis of ten American history survey textbooks reveals that, for the most part, violence has been "buried," in terms of both the number of incidents discussed and the amount of space allotted to the subject. An explanation of the analysis, as well as charts for each text and one which summarizes the findings, can be found in the appendix.

The goal of this dissertation is to provide the teacher of undergraduate college students with a clearer understanding of violence generally and of upper class violence in nineteenth century Tennessee in particular. The first chapter will survey the various models and explanations of violence which have been suggested by historians and social scientists. Subsequent chapters will examine notable incidents of upper class violence in Tennessee, demonstrating that they have been so prevalent and important that they constitute a neglected theme in the state's history, and providing reliable, detailed accounts of these incidents which will be helpful to the classroom teacher in conveying this theme. In no sense is this study to be considered a test of a thesis about the causes of upper class violence, although the appropriateness of the

models and other conclusions will be suggested, particularly in the final chapter.

Before beginning it is necessary to define what is meant by "notable incidents of upper class violence." To determine "notable incidents" two criteria will be employed on an either/or basis. The incident itself must appear in one of the standard surveys of Tennessee history,⁵ which would include such affrays as Jackson versus Sevier (1803), Dickinson (1806), and the Bentons (1813); Houston's duel with General White (1826); and the Cooper-Carmack killing (1908); or one of the participants in the violence must be notable enough to be included in one of the surveys for some other reason. Examples of this would include Nathan Bedford Forrest who killed A. Wills Gould (1863) and Joseph A. Mabry who took part in the murder of Thomas O'Conner (1882) in which he himself was killed.

"Upper class" is an illusive concept. It will be used in this dissertation to denote men of standing and influence within the community. Broadly, the term is used in the same sense as the connotation of the title of Leonard

⁵Philip M. Hamer, ed., Tennessee: A History, 1673-1932, 4 vols. (New York: American Historical Society, 1933); Stanley J. Folmsbee, Robert E. Corlew, and Enoch L. Mitchell, History of Tennessee, 4 vols. (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1960); and Robert E. Corlew, Stanley J. Folmsbee, and Enoch L. Mitchell, Tennessee: A Short History (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972).

L. Richard's "Gentlemen of Property and Standing":
Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America (1970).⁶

Occupationally, Sidney H. Aronson's classification will be used as a guide for inclusion. It lists as "high-ranking" such occupations as banker, army officer, lawyer, landed gentry, and merchant. This dissertation will also include editors. Aronson considers them "middle-ranking" but notes that their status was rising during the period as a result of the division of labor in publishing which separated the artisan printer from the writer-editor.⁷ In any event, there should be little question that editors were men of influence in the community.

"Violence" will be regarded as, and limited to, physical encounters between men armed with deadly weapons. The violence must be of a personal nature rather than by any kind of mob or large group. Although the participation of third or fourth persons will be permitted, their presence must be more or less tangential.

⁶Leonard L. Richards, "Gentlemen of Property and Standing": Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).

⁷Sidney H. Aronson, Status and Kinship in the Higher Civil Service: Standards of Selection in the Administrations of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), pp. 88-93.

CHAPTER I

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE RELATING TO VIOLENCE AND AGGRESSION

The first goal of this dissertation is to acquaint the classroom teacher with the major explanations of violence and aggression which have been offered by historians and social scientists. Later chapters will present case studies of selected incidents of upper class violence in Tennessee; therefore, this chapter will first consider the historical explanations of southern and upper class violence, then examine the major theories of aggression offered by the social sciences.¹ The ultimate purpose is an historical examination of the Tennessee case studies which employs those theories of the social sciences which seem best able to explain them.

The topic of upper class southern violence is a subsumption of at least two questions: first, what were the

¹On the enduring question of whether history is an art or a science, historian Boyd C. Shafer has written: "Historical study may be sui generis, neither art nor science. It is both. . . ." Quoted in Joseph S. Roucek, ed., The Teaching of History (New York: Philosophical Library, 1967), p. 136.

causes of southern violence generally, and, second, what were, more specifically, the causes of that gentlemanly combat most obviously manifest as the duel or pseudo duel?² These questions are not clearly discrete, yet it seems that, with the exception of poverty and ignorance and with the addition of the romantic code of chivalry, those factors that caused southern violence also caused gentlemanly violence.

The historical treatment of southern violence falls into three chronological categories: before 1960 when the majority of works found indigenous causes; 1961-1969 when writers began to detect northern causes; and since 1969 when the appearance of the work of Sheldon Hackney stimulated more catholic and scientific efforts to explain the phenomenon. Throughout all these categories of study one notices a remarkable optimism. Nowhere is violence attributed to the evilness of human nature or to instinctual drives; in all cases man is violent because of external forces or conditions. As Michael Wallace points out, Americans tend to forget violence, gloss over it, or excuse it as a temporary irrational aberration, whereas European scholars are beginning to consider it as purposive and

²"Pseudo duel" is the apt term used by H. C. Brearley, in "The Pattern of Violence," in Culture of the South, ed. W. T. Couch (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), pp. 687-88. One man sends word to another to "watch out" and/or "leave the country." They then arm themselves and shoot it out at the first chance meeting.

rational.³ In any event, one does discern an American consensus on the ultimate causes of violence as well as on the nature of man.

It must be emphasized at the outset that this paper does not purport to be a quantitative or a comparative study of violence. The writer does not wish to suggest that the South was the most violent area in the world or even in the country; in fact, as Richard Hofstadter has written, American violence has been urban in nature, and riots have been its most important form.⁴ This paper does seek next to identify the factors which historians have used to explain southern and upper class violence and later to describe and analyze several incidents of the phenomenon in Tennessee.

The most consistently offered explanation of both violence and duelling is the frontier and its attendant

³Michael Wallace, "The Uses of Violence in American History," The American Scholar 40 (Winter 1970-71):81.

⁴Richard Hofstadter, "Reflections on Violence in the United States," in Richard Hofstadter and Michael Wallace, eds., American Violence: A Documentary History (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1970), pp. 12-13. He also points out that "the greatest and most calculating of killers is the national state, and this is true not only in international wars, but in domestic conflicts." He notes that "the casualties of Stalin's terror . . . are estimated at about twenty million" and that the "Nazis' genocidal mania" claimed "six million or more Jewish victims." *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

conditions.⁵ At times historians refer to simply "the frontier"; in other places one finds references to particular aspects of southern life that strongly imply a frontier environment.⁶ The latter group includes such things as the threat of Indians,⁷ the lack of a satisfactory system of institutionalized law and order,⁸ a strong sense

⁵For an excellent analysis of how frontier violence has been pictured in literature, see Richard Slotkin, Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860 (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973); for a similar treatment of duelling, see Guy A. Cardwell, "The Duel in the Old South: Crux of a Concept," The South Atlantic Quarterly 66 (Winter 1961):50-69.

⁶Charles S. Sydnor, "The Southerner and the Laws," The Journal of Southern History 6 (February 1940):14; Thomas D. Clark, The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and Middle West (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1939; reprint ed., Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964), p. 193; W. J. Cash, The Mind of the South (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), pp. 42-43; John Hope Franklin, The Militant South, 1800-1861 (New York: Beacon Press, 1964), p. 25; Sheldon Hackney, "Southern Violence," in The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, eds. Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 505; Marcus Cunliffe, Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865 (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1968), p. 358; Joe B. Frantz, "The Frontier Tradition: An Invitation to Violence," Violence in America, eds. Graham and Gurr, passim; and Arthur F. Howington, "Violence in Alabama: A Study of Late Ante-Bellum Montgomery," The Alabama Review 27 (July 1974):231.

⁷Franklin, Militant South, p. 66.

⁸John Drayton, A View of South Carolina as Respects Her Natural and Civil Concerns (Charleston: W. P. Young, 1802; reprint ed., Spartanburg, S.C.: The Reprint Co., 1972), p. 221.

of individualism,⁹ the wearing of weapons,¹⁰ the necessity of bravery and physical courage,¹¹ or simply the experiences of everyday life.¹² Another view of frontier violence is presented by W. Eugene Hollon who has recently written that "the frontier deserves no more credit or blame for American violence than does Cain for killing his brother Abel which began the whole process."¹³ His contention is that the violence of the frontier was merely a manifestation of the general American proclivity for violence and was not itself a cause of violence.

Whether the frontier was a cause or a showcase of American violence, the violence there was nevertheless real. An examination of the U.S. Census Office, Mortality Statistics of the Seventh Census, 1850, shows that the percentage of those dying who died by guns was more than 100 times greater in the Minnesota territory than in Maine or

⁹Cash, Mind of the South, p. 31.

¹⁰Philip D. Jordan, "The Wearing of Weapons in the Western Country," The Filson Club Historical Quarterly 42 (July 1968):206-209; Rollin G. Osterweis, Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1964), p. 97.

¹¹Frank E. Vandiver, "The Southerner as Extremist," in The Idea of the South: Pursuit of a Central Theme, ed. Frank E. Vandiver (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 44.

¹²Franklin, Militant South, p. 3.

¹³W. Eugene Hollon, Frontier Violence: Another Look (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 215.

Vermont (.034 versus .0003). The twelve states and territories with the highest percentages dying by the gun were all located either west of the Mississippi or south of the Mason-Dixon line. Contrariwise, with the exceptions of Virginia and Maryland, none of the sixteen least likely places to get killed was in either of those places.¹⁴

The second most popular explanation is also a many faceted one: the plantation system, and often, concurrently, slavery and the Negro. For several historians the existence of the plantation system was responsible for the continuance of frontier conditions in the South even after the frontier period had technically passed.¹⁵ Because of the plantation system, violence was given a renewed lease on life. Also, because of the plantation system Negro slavery became the force it did in the South. Although W. J. Cash has written of the romantic and hedonistic influence of the Negro on the southern white that encouraged a rough and tumble, "hell-of-a-fellow" attitude,¹⁶ most historians agree with John Hope Franklin's contention that the peculiar institution tended

¹⁴U.S. Census Office, Mortality Statistics of the Seventh Census of the United States, 1850.

¹⁵Cash, Mind of the South, pp. 42-43.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 49-51.

to create a tyranny in the South and had much more serious effects on violence than Cash implies.¹⁷

Plantations perpetuated frontier conditions, gave their owners a sense of power, nurtured myths of chivalry and the code of honor (relevant especially to gentlemen), and were largely responsible for the importation of Africans and the development of a social, economic, and cultural way of life based, at the top at least, on slavery. It is most likely, therefore, that in the plantation culture one finds the sine qua non of southern violence and the duel.

In the pre-1960 category there remain only a few less frequently discussed factors. Cash and Brearley felt that the experience of Reconstruction, in effect, strengthened the frontier aspects of southern life by causing a breakdown of the legitimate institutional legal procedures and forcing a return to a "every man for himself" attitude.¹⁸ John T. Graves advocated a poverty and ignorance explanation¹⁹ and, presaging a later argument,

¹⁷Franklin, Militant South, pp. 66-70; Vandiver, "The Southerner as Extremist," p. 44; Brearley, "The Pattern of Violence," p. 692; Wallace, "The Uses of Violence," p. 83; Francis B. Simkins, A History of the South, 3rd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), p. 135; and John Sheldon Reed, "To Live--and Die--in Dixie: A Contribution to the Study of Southern Violence," Political Science Quarterly 86 (September 1971):430.

¹⁸Cash, Mind of the South, p. 113; Brearley, "The Pattern of Violence," pp. 689, 692.

¹⁹John Temple Graves, The Fighting South (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1943), pp. 6-7.

Clement Eaton said that the chief cause of mob violence was the strong popular excitement caused by the antislavery controversy.²⁰

Between 1960 and 1969 when Sheldon Hackney's "Southern Violence" appeared, Eaton, Vandiver, and Hackney began to indicate that northern "aggression" contributed to southern militancy. The anti-slave crusade aroused "violent resentment" in the South according to Eaton.²¹ Vandiver saw the development of an "offensive-defensive mechanism" that began with the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions and grew, in the defense of slavery, to become the most constant theme of southern history.²² Southerners became accustomed to responding vigorously and violently to threats. Hackney agrees that the South developed a "traditional defensive mentality . . . a sense of persecution."²³ Under these conditions violence should not come as a surprise.

Hackney's article, "Southern Violence," is not definitive, but, as John S. Reed has written, it is "by far the most sophisticated treatment of the topic to date."²⁴ Hackney is concerned with two things--the causes of southern

²⁰Clement Eaton, The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), p. 354.

²¹Ibid., p. 36.

²²Vandiver, "The Southerner as Extremist," pp. 46-47.

²³Sheldon Hackney, "The South as a Counterculture," American Scholar 42 (Spring 1973):286.

²⁴Reed, "To Live--and Die--in Dixie," p. 429.

violence and, more to the point, the curious proclivity of southerners to commit homicide rather than suicide. Why, he wants to know, do high murder and low suicide rates constitute a distinctly southern pattern of violence?²⁵ He considers eleven theories and variations on them and either rejects them altogether or dismisses them as being of little predictive value.²⁶

Among the theories which he rejects and his reasons, in brief, are: (1) the high rates of violence among Negroes who are so prevalent in the South--but, if the Negro is statistically subtracted, the white rates are still above the national norm; (2) the large proportion of lower status occupations--no, it is not class structure; (3) agricultural nature of the South--no, rural districts are less violent than urban ones; (4) poverty--poverty alone can not explain homicide rates; (5) the process of modernization--no, statistical analysis will not bear this out; (6) Durkheim's theory of anomie, a feeling of normlessness and estrangement--no, the South is too homogeneous; and (7) the opposite theory of Lewis Coser that the closer the relationships

²⁵Hackney, "Southern Violence," Violence in America, eds. Graham and Gurr, passim. Freud would probably explain that southern Eros must be stronger than Thanatos.

²⁶Rightly, Hackney does not even consider Bertelson's contention that southerners were sometimes violent in order to prove that they are not lazy. David Bertelson, The Lazy South (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 109-10.

the greater the violence--no, closer relationships make violence more intense, not more frequent.

Hackney confronts the frustration-aggression hypothesis (which will be discussed later in the chapter) but will not accept it because it can not predict whether a frustrated person will vent his frustrations on himself (suicide) or on others (homicide). The habit of carrying guns is, he feels, a chicken-or-the-egg question and not really very useful. He rejects Cash's Negro notions (hedonism and romanticism) but finds merit in his idea that the frontier and the presence of the Negro mean something; he is also impressed with the idea that southern violence might be best explained historically, as Cash suggests. Hackney has thus completed the circle.

The contrary thesis to the one of white domination of black is Franz Fanon's idea of subserviance, of the South as an oppressed colonial region; and so southern violence is but yet another manifestation of the familiar pattern of colonials "taking it out" on their fellow colonials.²⁷ While Hackney seems to believe that this explanation is valid for true colonial peoples in Africa or Asia, it does not hold up in North-South relations because the cultural conflict was not great enough to produce the usual loss of self-esteem, disruption of the processes of socialization, and the cycle of self-crippling behavior.

²⁷Hackney, "Southern Violence," pp. 399-400.

The most promising avenue of exploration for the causes of southern violence is that which concentrates on the southern world view. Hackney states that a siege mentality has developed. This view "defines the social, political, and physical environment as hostile and casts the white southerner in the role of the passive victim of malevolent forces."²⁸ This negative outlook is the result of the un-American southern experiences of guilt, defeat, and poverty, as C. Vann Woodward explained, and, contemporaneously, child-rearing practices that cause the children to have a paranoidal perception of the environment.²⁹ It is, then, the historian and the psychologist who must join forces if the unique pattern of southern violence is to be explained.

A sociologist, John Sheldon Reed, has come forth with a recent contribution. He wants to determine if the South's lag in urbanization, industrialization, or education is responsible for the "peculiarly southern disposition to use force. . . ." ³⁰ Employing a "test-factor standardization" which statistically removes these factors, he finds that they can not stand as causal factors. He also finds that southerners are more likely to own guns and that,

²⁸Ibid., p. 401.

²⁹Ibid., p. 400.

³⁰Reed, "To Live--and Die--in Dixie," p. 430.

in 1946 at least, the use of corporal punishment on children was more widespread in the South than elsewhere.³¹

It is not certain that we are reaching the point where a scholar may soon be able to write "Quod erat demonstrandum" and so conclude the search for the causes of southern violence. In fact, we may be just entering a whole new phase of the search. Yet, if the realms to be explored can be agreed upon, we may well be drawing closer to the consensus.

That within a given general environment different classes of people might behave differently is not a new idea. In the fourth century B.C. Aristotle wrote:

Now in every state there are three elements: one class is very rich, another very poor, and a third is mean. . . . But he who greatly excels in beauty, strength, birth or wealth, or on the other hand who is very poor, or very weak . . . finds it difficult to follow rational principle. Of these two the one sort grow into violent and great criminals, the others into rogues and petty rascals. And two sorts of offenses correspond to them, the one committed from violence, the other from roguery. . . . (For the rich) the evil begins at home; for when they are boys, by reason of the luxury in which they are brought up, they never learn, even at school, the habit of obedience.³²

³¹Ibid., pp. 441, 433-36.

³²Aristotle, The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. Richard McKeon, Politics (New York: Random House, 1941), p. 1220.

More recently Eugene Genovese has referred to the "world outlooks of ruling classes. . . ."33

One peculiar attribute of the upper class was the duel or pseudo duel. The explanations for this have been several, but, as with violence in general, there appears to be a common ground of agreement--the plantation system. Its perpetuation of frontier conditions, lawlessness, individualism, and the chivalric code of honor lies at the heart of most of the theories. If this may be granted, attention can be turned to the origins of the code itself.

Charles S. Sydnor wrote that the practice of dueling was the result of frontier conditions, certain (undefined) characteristics of the planters themselves, and, especially, the contribution of European heritages. Citing the works of others, he found five European contributions: first, the ideas of the social organization of the seventeenth and eighteenth century English gentry who were brought into Virginia and the Carolinas; second, contacts with the military punctilio of the British and French officers during the Revolution; third, remembrance of the chivalric ballads; fourth, the romantic novels, especially those of Sir Walter Scott; and, fifth, the efforts by the planters to emulate the manners of their legendary aristocratic European

³³Eugene D. Genovese, "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South," in In Red and Black: Marxian Explorations in Southern and Afro-American History (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 338.

ancestors.³⁴ Evidently, these "original" explanations have stood the test of time since Clement Eaton saw fit to reiterate them in basically the same form in 1961,³⁵ and Daniel Boorstin again in 1965.³⁶

Rollin G. Osterweis elaborates on the theme of chivalry and romanticism and, while recognizing that local conditions would modify the practice somewhat, found that the interplay of the chivalric ideas and the cult of honor helped produce duelling. Duelling was thus one manifestation of southern romanticism (he also saw the hand of "Bonapartist exiles" in it).³⁷ Brearley and Franklin concur that it was a part of a bigger theme; and they describe duelling as an outgrowth of a "feudal spirit" which was created by the "system."³⁸

It remains only to mention the chief causes of duels or, stated differently, the functions they performed.

³⁴Sydnor, "The Southerner and the Laws," pp. 13-14; there is near universal agreement on the European origins. See, for instance, Thomas Perkins Abernethy, "Social Relations and Political Control in the Old Southwest," The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 16 (March 1930):530-31.

³⁵Clement Eaton, The Growth of Southern Civilization, 1790-1860 (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), p. 275.

³⁶Daniel J. Boorstin, The Americans: The National Experience (New York: Random House, 1965), pp. 206-212.

³⁷Osterweis, Romanticism and Nationalism, p. 97.

³⁸Brearley, "The Pattern of Violence," pp. 685-86; Franklin, Militant South, pp. 63-64, 66.

Certainly, many people saw (and see) only evil in the practice, yet for John Drayton

. . . to this [the duel] may be ascribed the many forebearings, which take place between individuals, rather than resort to the last extremity; and hence, the public papers do not teem with mutual slander and provocation against persons to the disgrace of the parties concerned and the general amusement of the public at large. . . .³⁹

He is probably correct that the threat of a challenge to combat served as an effective deterrent to a would-be slanderer, yet this hardly exonerates the practice. Many a duel was fought over a trivial incident.⁴⁰

In its most idealized form the institution of dueling did what Drayton implied--it protected the honor and good name of the gentleman and his family. Francis B. Simkins has written that duels and shooting affrays were "largely promoted by the extreme sensitiveness which southern men felt toward the character of their women."⁴¹ Less flattering is Franklin's thesis that the duel served to draw a behavioral distinction between the would-be gentry and others.⁴² Cardwell looks more to "unbridled political

³⁹Drayton, A View of South Carolina, p. 221.

⁴⁰Cardwell, "The Duel in the Old South," p. 67. Cardwell presents the best account of the justifications for the duel. He also offers a few explanations of his own: a Freudian view with the weapon as a punishing sign of masculinity, a form of ritual killing associated with primitive ceremonies, and the duel as a thoroughly masculine symbol of dominance and control.

⁴¹Simkins, A History of the South, p. 146.

⁴²Franklin, Militant South, p. 44.

argument" as the primary cause of the more important duels.⁴³

Dueling need not be belabored. As mentioned previously, in spite of several specified arguments, the general climate of opinion among historians is clear enough regarding personal combat. It was the result of frontier lawlessness, combined with plantation society and the example of European practice. It was practiced predominately by the generation of the Revolution and the one which followed. Dueling had faded away by the Civil War but the pseudo duel lingered on into the twentieth century.

Social scientists have struggled explicitly with a question which most historians have handled implicitly: the question of the quality of human nature.⁴⁴ Specifically, theorists of violence have been greatly concerned with whether aggression is an instinct, and is thus biologically mandated in all men, or whether it is merely a learned behavior response, in which case it is a non-universal product of society and culture. Between these poles is the once popular frustration-aggression hypothesis which holds that aggression is a "possibly innate" response to frustration.

⁴³Cardwell, "The Duel in the Old South," p. 52.

⁴⁴Most historians seem to agree with Wilhelm Dilthey's comment that "man does not have a nature; man has a history." Oron J. Hale, The Great Illusion, 1900-1914 (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 105.

The near-universal point of departure for modern scholars investigating violence is the Freudian concept of the "death wish" or death instinct.⁴⁵ Put simply, Freud believed that the goal of all human life is the reduction of tension and excitation or, in other words, to be at rest. To achieve this end, there are two instincts which are in constant competition: Eros, the life instinct, which can be satisfied with sexual gratification, and Thanatos, the death instinct, which seeks suicide.⁴⁶ The Ego and Superego exist to regulate the expression of these instincts; however, human behavior is affected significantly by biological factors.⁴⁷

Prior to the First World War Freud had not paid much attention to aggression, and indeed his early views were related to the contemporary ideas of frustration and

⁴⁵Leonard Berkowitz, Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 3-11; Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson, eds., The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group and International Analyses (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), pp. xiii, 10-21.

⁴⁶Sigmund Freud, Beyond the Pleasure Principle, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1961), p. 47.

⁴⁷That Freud was first trained as a physician then turned to psychoanalysis in part explains why "his theories of personality are closely tied to bodily functions and human physiology." Lawrence S. Wrightsman, Social Psychology in the Seventies (Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1972), p. 162.

aggression.⁴⁸ The horrors of the war convinced him that human violence must flow from a deeper well. In his famous 1932 correspondence with Albert Einstein, Freud took a Hobbesian view of human nature writing that "it is a general principle, then, that conflicts of interest between men are settled by the use of violence."⁴⁹ As civilization develops the violence (Macht) of the individual is subsumed and controlled by the community, at which point, apparently, individual violence ceases to be a major problem. But man's "instinct for hatred and destruction"⁵⁰ must still be expressed in some way. One possibility would be through violence against oneself, that is, suicide; but, as noted before, the competing instinct of Eros will not normally permit this. The other outlet would be violence against one's neighbor, but the laws of the community will not permit that. A possible result is that the collective Thanatos may build up to a crescendo that finally bursts into a mass orgy of war and destruction.

⁴⁸His views on aggressive behavior were constantly in flux, but it is likely that his final judgment was that it is generated by the irrational, unhealthy id. Neo-Freudians place the source in the more rational ego and thereby make aggression a positive behavior. Ibid.

⁴⁹Sigmund Freud, Collected Papers, ed. James Strachey, vol. 5: "Why War?," Miscellaneous Papers, 1888-1938 (New York: Basic Books, 1959), p. 274.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 280. Freud felt that aggression can be sublimated and displaced into such things as sports, sarcasm, and fantasy.

Society can no more eliminate the death instinct than it can eliminate the sexual instinct. There is, however, an indirect method for combating collective aggression: simply extend the emotional ties of the community to include all men.⁵¹ World government is thus the answer for the humanitarians and pacifists concerned with war. For the historian concerned with the problem of individual violence Freud suggests that the solution lies in the development of civilization and laws. The less civilized the state, the greater the internal, individual violence; the more civilized the state, the greater the likelihood of war. It appears that because of man's atavistic antecedents he must choose between Scylla and Charybdis. Perhaps because this theory is so woeful, modern psychologists are eager to disagree with it, which "of all Freud's speculations . . . is the one most removed from facts."⁵²

The popularity of such recent books as Robert Ardrey, African Genesis (1961) and The Territorial Imperative (1966), Konrad Lorenz, On Aggression (1966), and Desmond Morris, The Naked Ape (1967) and The Human Zoo (1969) shows that the instinctual view of human behavior is

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 283-84.

⁵²Berkowitz, Aggression, p. 11.

alive and well on Main Street, if not in academe.⁵³ The most legitimate scholar in this group is the ethologist Konrad Lorenz who, as Freud before him, believes aggression to be a non-learned biological instinct inherited from man's animal origins.

His On Aggression insists that man must be constantly aware of his evolutionary origins if he hopes to contend with his "abjectly stupid and undesirable . . . behavior. . . ." ⁵⁴ Lorenz defines aggression as "the fighting instinct in beast and man which is directed against members of the same species," ⁵⁵ that is, intraspecific aggression.

Like Freud, Lorenz does not consider aggression to be ipso facto undesirable. In fact, aggression is a rather benign instinct that fulfills a species-preserving and species-enhancing function. Its most important role is territorial: animals will drive away other members of their species to protect their own domain. This guarantees that an area does not become overpopulated and unable to support

⁵³The works of Ardrey and Lorenz are taken to task in Peter M. Driver, "Toward An Ethology of Human Conflict: A Review," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 11 (September 1967):361-74. A full-scale assault on the ethologists is in Ashley Montagu, ed., Man and Aggression, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

⁵⁴Konrad Lorenz, On Aggression, trans. Marjorie Kerr Wilson, 10th ed. (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), p. 229.

⁵⁵Ibid.

the species which would result in that species perishing altogether.⁵⁶

Lorenz believes that another of the enhancing functions of aggression is the familiar Darwinian concept of sexual selection. Intra-specific fights encourage the mating of the fittest with the fittest and so, presumably, insure the production of fit offspring. A third useful attribute of aggression is its relation to the brood instinct or the protection of the young by the parents from those that might harm them.⁵⁷ Lorenz offers other preservative benefits of intra-specific aggression, but they need not be of concern here. What is important is that intra-specific aggression is a universal instinct in animals. For the "lower" animals it functions to preserve the species. This has not been the case with man.

Whereas almost all animals will kill animals of other species (usually for food), Lorenz holds that man will kill members of his own species. This is because man lacks the built-in inhibitors that protect predatory animals from destroying their own species. "Originally," animals with the ability to kill their own kind quickly were "given" or developed inhibitions against doing so.⁵⁸ These, of course, were to prevent their self-annihilation and the animals have

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 28.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 40.

⁵⁸The bear and wolf are examples.

kept these inhibitions. When these animals engage in intra-specific contests, they are fighting to determine dominance; and, once that has been decided, the vanquished will yield and retreat, but is not killed. Lorenz argues that this is because of "various psychological mechanisms of behavior whose function it is to prevent the injury and killing of members of the same species."⁵⁹ Men do not possess these inhibitions because men, like doves, can not kill each other quickly. So there is always the possibility of escape for the weaker in any contest. Man's troubles developed during the Early Stone Age, when, for about forty thousand years, man was developing tools, weapons, and social organizations that enabled him to overcome the dangers of starving, freezing, and being eaten by animals. Before the Early Stone Age, these dangers represented nature's way of selecting the fittest, but by then, since virtually all men could survive, another factor had to be used to determine fitness. Because men had not developed instinctual prohibitions against killing one another, "an evil intra-specific selection must have set in,"⁶⁰ and wars became the determining factor with the concomitant development of "warrior virtues" as necessary, sufficient, and ideal attributes for survival.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 54.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 39.

Human aggression is thus a benign instinct gone mad. Lorenz does not insist that that is all there is. On the contrary, he insists that "the same human faculties which supplied man with tools and with power dangerous to himself, also gave him the means to prevent their misuse: rational responsibility."⁶¹ Elsewhere Lorenz appears to be hedging on his determinism when he writes that "it is safe to assume that the first Cain, after having stricken a fellow member of his horde with a pebble tool, was deeply concerned about the consequences of his action."⁶² For some reason man has developed "indispensable cultural rites and social norms"⁶³ that help inhibit self-destruction. Although these inhibitions have obviously failed to eliminate aggression entirely, they have kept it somewhat in check.

One very important distinction between the concepts of Freud and Lorenz is the notion of an external stimulus. Whereas Freud implies that aggressive impulses build up and up until a breaking point is reached internally, Lorenz and the ethologists require that an external "trigger" or cue be present before the aggression will occur.⁶⁴ Although Lorenz will not admit it, he is approaching a concept similar to the frustration-aggression hypothesis.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 231-32.

⁶²Ibid., p. 241.

⁶³Ibid., p. 256.

⁶⁴Wrightsman, Social Psychology, p. 163.

For the future Lorenz offers four preventive measures to limit aggression and stave off the disintegration of society. First is "know thyself," to wit, he suggests the development of an applied science of human behavior which would explain its subject matter for all to see. Second is the study of sublimation, or the ways in which society can channel aggressive energies into useful directions. Third, and again he seems to be hedging, he advocates getting to know and understand individual members of different nations and ideologies. If we are dealing with instincts, then this would not appear to be of much help. Fourth, and most important, is to take the younger generation in hand, explain to them by example the worth of social traditions. The goal is dampening militant enthusiasm which Lorenz sees as the greatest danger humanity faces.⁶⁵

In sum, On Aggression dictates that intra-specific aggression is a controllable instinct which is triggered by certain stimuli, many of which (territorial, sexual, and domestic) appear to be defensive in nature. Aggression becomes offensive when the individual identifies with a group and allows himself to be swept away by militant enthusiasm.

For many years authorities suggested that violence is the result of aggression, which, in turn, is the result

⁶⁵Lorenz, On Aggression, pp. 267-68.

of frustration.⁶⁶ This means, basically, that aggression is to be seen as a stimulus-response (S-R) reaction; frustration is the stimulus and aggression is the response. Aggression is not seen as an instinct; it is merely a behavioral reaction. The frustration-aggression hypothesis is not a new idea; as has been noted, Freud had a similar notion before World War I but abandoned it. For all intents and purposes this hypothesis came to public attention in 1939 with the publication of Frustration and Aggression by John Dollard et al. The basic postulate of their study is that:

. . . aggression is always a consequence of frustration [italics theirs]. More specifically the proposition is that the occurrence of aggressive behavior always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, that the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression.⁶⁷

Naturally, these are rather sweeping statements which need to be clarified and defined. The authors do so by defining "a frustration as an interference with the

⁶⁶"The bulk of human aggression can be traced to frustration. . . ." Elton B. McNeil, "Psychology and Aggression," The Journal of Conflict Resolution 3 (September 1959):202; Berkowitz, Aggression, p. 26; R. A. Hinde, Biological Bases of Human Behaviour (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 276; J. P. Scott, Aggression (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 89; Peter A. Corning, "The Biological Bases of Behavior and Some Implications for Political Science," World Politics 23 (April 1971): 345-46; and Donald H. Horowitz, "Direct, Displaced, and Cumulative Ethnic Aggression," Comparative Politics 6 (November 1973):1.

⁶⁷John Dollard, Leonard W. Doob, Neal E. Miller, O. H. Mower, and Robert S. Sears, Frustration and Aggression (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), p. 1.

occurrence of an instigated goal-response at its proper time in the behavior sequence."⁶⁸ Aggression is an act whose goal is to injure an organism (or its surrogate); it is also defined as that response which follows frustration.⁶⁹

Before proceeding further, Dollard et al. state that these principles are "tentative and cannot pretend to deal with all the factors related to aggression. . . . [It is] an attempt to pose a problem . . . [not] a final answer to the problem."⁷⁰

The first of these principles is that the greater the amount of frustration, the greater the instigation to aggression. The amount of frustration varies according to three factors: (1) the strength of instigation to the frustrated response--for example, a dog that is hungry will become more frustrated (angry) when a plate of food is withdrawn than will a dog that is satiated; (2) the degree of interference with the frustrated response--for example, one is angrier when someone is thirty minutes late to a meeting than when one is three minutes late; and (3) the number of frustrated response-sequences--one berates a student who has made only a slight mistake not because of that one mistake but because this is the eighty-fifth

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 7, 11.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 11.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 27-28.

student who has made it, having said nothing to the previous students.⁷¹

On the other side of the coin, man is inhibited from aggressive actions mainly by the strength of the punishment he can anticipate. It is significant that "anticipation of failure is equivalent to anticipation of punishment."⁷² In general, if the amount of frustration is constant while the anticipation of punishment increases, then aggression is less likely to occur. If punishment is constant yet frustration increases, then aggression is more likely to occur.⁷³

Regarding the important question of how and against whom aggression will be carried out, Dollard et al. have four principles. The first is that the strongest instigation to aggression is against the source of the frustration, and the instigations become weaker against less direct frustrators. Second, one becomes even more frustrated if his frustration can not be vented directly upon its perceived source; it becomes a frustrated-frustration and will likely be displaced (a Freudian term) and expressed in modified terms. Third, frustration can lead to self-punishment if one holds himself responsible for the frustration and restrains himself from direct aggression.

⁷¹Ibid., pp. 28-38.

⁷²Ibid., p. 34.

⁷³Ibid., p. 38.

Finally, they hold the catharsis theory to be valid--any act of aggression reduces the instigation to all other acts of aggression, in other words, letting off steam.⁷⁴

Although modifications of the hypothesis of Dollard et al. have been offered,⁷⁵ the foremost expert on aggression, Leonard Berkowitz, supports the "essential validity of the Dollard, et al., formulation. . . ." ⁷⁶ It would be going too far afield to discuss the many reservations that psychologists have suggested; suffice it to say that it is no longer accepted that all aggression is the result of frustration. Further, Berkowitz points out that between the frustration and the aggression there are two intervening variables that are most important: anger and interpretation. The essence of Berkowitz's contention is that frustration produces anger and, depending upon the proper stimuli and prior learning (i.e., interpretation), the anger will produce aggression. These intervening variables make it much more possible that the aggression will not be taken out on the direct cause of the aggression

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 39-54.

⁷⁵An excellent brief summary of the modifications can be found in James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., Contending Theories of International Relations (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971), pp. 214-16; see, also, Berkowitz, Aggression, pp. 26-50, especially pp. 48-50.

⁷⁶Berkowitz, Aggression, p. 46.

but will be displaced or "scape goated" onto someone or something else.⁷⁷

It may be helpful to conclude with a brief comparison of the various theories of aggression discussed up to this point. Freud and Lorenz see violence-aggression as a primal instinct and, although they say it can be controlled, it is part of human nature. The frustration-aggression theorists feel that violence-aggression is social rather than biological and that it exists only when stimulated from outside the organism. It is doubtful that they would contend that violence can thus be totally eliminated, but they do analyze the conditions which cause aggression both at the individual and the group level.

The social learning school is the third major school of thought on aggression, and it rejects the concept of any sort of biologically-mandated or instinct-oriented explanation for violence and holds instead that the "study of the psychological and physiological causes of aggression shows that the primary stimulation which leads to fighting comes from the outside [*italics mine*]. In the highly social surroundings of human beings most of these external stimuli come from other members of the society."⁷⁸

⁷⁷International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, s.v. "Aggression," by Leonard Berkowitz, is an excellent summary of these ideas.

⁷⁸Scott, Aggression, p. 89.

The basic question that the social learning school raises about the instinct school and, to some extent, the frustration-aggression school is quite simple. They reason that, if aggression is an instinct, then it must by definition be common to all men and cultures. If, on the other hand, non-aggressive cultures can be discovered, then aggression can not be considered as innate or instinctual.

In 1932, Freud wrote that

. . . we are told that in certain happy regions of the earth, where nature provides in abundance everything that man requires, there are races whose life is passed in tranquility and who know neither compulsion nor aggressiveness. I can scarcely believe it and I should be glad to hear more of these fortunate beings.⁷⁹

Three years later the anthropologist Margaret Mead published her study of the Arapesh tribe of New Guinea, and Freud was thus duly informed that there were indeed "fortunate beings" whose culture was non-aggressive. Other anthropologists followed with other studies to show a number of tribes and cultures that were virtually aggression-free.⁸⁰ The point the anthropologists are making is that culture is a very important determinant of what forms behavior takes.

It is neither possible nor necessary for the student of history to resolve the question of the origin of man's aggression. Political scientist Ted Robert Gurr's statement that "the capacity, but not a need, for violence appears to

⁷⁹Freud, "Why War?", p. 283.

⁸⁰Wrightsmann, Social Psychology, pp. 173-74; Scott, Aggression, pp. 100-01.

be biologically inherent in man"⁸¹ ought to suffice. For it is certain that society has experienced violence and merely to write it all off as the expression of biological needs would not be very useful. The goal must be to identify the characteristics of the personalities and violent situations in which the personalities found themselves and to identify the "climate of opinion" and general conditions of Tennessee and the South which made violence possible.

To this end, an excellent analysis of the multiple causes of aggressive acts is suggested by Megargee and Hokanson's The Dynamics of Aggression.⁸² They have drawn together the work of several scholars and rendered a tripartite diagnosis of an aggressive act: the instigation to aggression, the inhibitions against aggression, and external stimulus factors.

Instigation to aggression simply means "what causes aggression to occur." Three studies are offered which suggest different things. First, it is shown that family background and the punitive environment of the home can affect subsequent levels of aggressive behavior.⁸³ Another

⁸¹Ted Robert Gurr, Why Men Rebel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 317.

⁸²Megargee and Hokanson, Dynamics of Aggression, pp. 39-142. Unless otherwise noted, the following articles are reprints appearing in this book.

⁸³William McCord, Joan McCord, and Allan Howard, "Familial Correlates of Aggression in Nondelinquent Male Children," *ibid.*, p. 60.

study relates the frustration-aggression hypothesis to the general economic conditions of the times. Data covering forty-nine years, from 1882 to 1930, revealed that "during periods of depression the number of lynchings is high; during prosperity the number of lynchings declines."⁸⁴ The frustration of "bad times" leads to displaced aggression (against Negroes mostly). A third paper attacks the catharsis theory of Freud and Lorenz which holds that an act of aggression is a tension-reducing thing which, when performed, will reduce the likelihood of subsequent aggression (letting off steam). Hokanson contends that the opposite is true. In a family or culture where violence is encouraged and is successful in removing a frustration one of the things which can be expected is "that the likelihood of future violence will be enhanced."⁸⁵ In sum, these papers convey the idea that a man's family background, the economic conditions of the day, and the culture's "climate of opinion" regarding violence will all affect the probability of aggression.

The second aspect of aggression concerns the inhibitions against it. Once a person has been frustrated or in some way provoked, "the major factor determining

⁸⁴Carl I. Hovland and Robert R. Sears, "Minor Studies of Aggression: Correlation of Lynching with Economic Indices," *ibid.*, p. 73.

⁸⁵Jack E. Hokanson, "Psychophysiological Evaluation of the Catharsis Hypothesis," *ibid.*, p. 85.

whether or not an aggressive act takes place is the nature and strength of the inhibitions. . . ."86 The origin of inhibitions is in childhood. Bandura and Walters' study of aggressive, anti-social adolescent boys agreed with an earlier theory of Freud's: boys who are aggressive show "significantly less identification with their fathers"87 than non-aggressive boys. Apparently, boys develop their inhibitions against aggression through a close relationship with their father. When that relationship does not occur, the "internalization of parental values [is] not completely achieved"88 and anti-social aggressive behavior is much more probable. Bandura and Walters also contend that the same type of child is produced if the parents are hostile toward each other and/or tend to discipline their children by ridicule, physical punishment, and deprivation of privileges. Concerning the techniques by which children learn to become non-aggressive, a study by Brown and Elliott shows that the hope of heaven is as strong as the fear of hell; that is, the rewarding of non-aggressive responses is as effective a deterrent as punishing aggressive ones.89

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 87.

⁸⁷Albert Bandura and Richard H. Walters, "Adolescent Aggression," *ibid.*, p. 99.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 100.

⁸⁹Paul Brown and Rogers Elliott, "Control of Aggression in a Nursery School Class," *ibid.*, pp. 101-07.

Whatever the exact causes, child-rearing practices and the home environment seem to have an important effect on aggressive behavior.

The third factor in aggression, according to Megargee and Hokanson's analysis, lies outside the individual and the development of his personal behavior patterns: the external stimulus factors. Two important, if controversial, points have been made. The question of the effect of seeing violence is first dealt with. While some have said that seeing violence has cathartic effect and so lessens the probability of the observer being violent himself, Richard H. Walters' report on laboratory studies of children "indicates that the presentation of violent models in real life or in fantasy productions may both provide observers with opportunities to learn new ways of expressing aggression and also provide cues that aggression can be socially accepted."⁹⁰ While this falls far short of saying one is what one sees, it does imply that, for children at least, an environment of violence rewarded or even unpunished, is conducive to more violence.

One last environmental factor demands to be recognized: it is the presence of guns. Berkowitz has pointed to the very important factor that much aggression and violence is impulsive, rather than planned and

⁹⁰Richard H. Walters, "Implications of Laboratory Studies of Aggression for the Control and Regulation of Violence," *ibid.*, p. 131.

purposeful. He feels three conditions are necessary for aggression: frustration, a cue (something that presumably elicits the aggressive response) and low inhibitions against violence.⁹¹ Berkowitz wanted to determine the cue value of guns. Would equally angry people react more violently if guns were present, than if guns were not present? In experiments on groups of college-age men, he found that guns did have a cue value. The gun is a cue to aggression and "even a casual sight of a gun can sometimes stimulate aggressive behavior."⁹² In other words, when men are angry they are more likely to be violent when guns are present (even if they are not used) than when guns are not present.

The message of the majority of social scientists seems to be that the causes of violence lie in the environment or external conditions and, also, within the individual. The next chapter on Andrew Jackson's early years will explore how external conditions may affect the individual.

⁹¹Leonard Berkowitz and Anthony LePage, "Weapons as Aggression-Eliciting Stimuli," *ibid.*, p. 134; and Leonard Berkowitz, "Impulse, Aggression and the Gun," Psychology Today 2 (September 1968):19-20.

⁹²Berkowitz, "Impulse, Aggression and the Gun," p. 19.

CHAPTER II

ANDREW JACKSON: INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE TO 1806

Andrew Jackson is Tennessee's most famous son¹ and one of her more contentious. He was proclaimed "the Dean of American Duelists,"² and his opponents never tired of painting him as a frontier ruffian and even murderer.³

¹A 1931 poll of the general public by the Nashville Banner showed that Jackson was regarded as the greatest Tennessean. It is interesting that four more of the ten greatest (John Sevier, 2nd; Nathan Bedford Forrest, 4th; Sam Houston, 5th; and Edward Ward Carmack, 7th) are subjects of this dissertation, as are William Carroll and Felix Zollicoffer who finished in the top twenty-five. A 1976 Banner poll of some two thousand members of the Tennessee Historical Society saw Jackson still first with Sevier, Forrest, and Houston, though slipping somewhat, still in the top ten. Carmack and Zollicoffer were dropped altogether, while Carroll remained in the top twenty-five. Sandy Seawright, "Ten 'Greatest Tennesseans'--A Reappraisal," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 35 (Summer 1976):222-23.

²Unpublished typescript, William Henry McRaven Papers, Manuscript Section, Tennessee State Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee. Hereafter, the Tennessee State Library and Archives will be referred to as TSLA.

³Robert V. Remini, The Election of Andrew Jackson (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1963), p. 129; William S. Hoffmann, Andrew Jackson and North Carolina Politics (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 23; and Edward Pessen, Jacksonian America: Society, Personality, and Politics, rev. ed. (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1978), p. 166.

James L. Armstrong's famous 1828 campaign broadside was titled, Reminiscences, Or an Extract from the Catalogue of General Jackson's "Juvenile Indiscretions" Between the Ages of 26 and 60,⁴ which claimed the Old Hero had participated in nearly one hundred fights, duels, and other altercations during his lifetime. Although the actual "catalogue" listed but fourteen incidents, Jackson's early and somewhat unsympathetic biographer James Parton was willing to stipulate Armstrong's larger figure of one hundred, since he felt that it was not necessary to "rake over the ashes of all these extinct quarrels."⁵ This writer agrees.

The point is clear enough: Jackson was a man noted throughout his life for a remarkably violent temperament. On occasions he would lash out verbally at those who frustrated him; sometimes he lashed out physically.⁶ He showed "a tense natural temperament"⁷ which his opponents feared and of which his friends were duly chary. The question of why he was the way he was sometimes arises, but

⁴Quoted in James Parton, The Life of Andrew Jackson, 3 vols. (New York: Mason Bros., 1859-61), 1:265.

⁵Ibid., p. 266.

⁶Glyndon G. Van Deusen, The Jacksonian Era: 1828-1848, The New American Nation Series (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), pp. 30, 45.

⁷John Spencer Bassett, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Co., 1916; reprint ed. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1967), p. 702.

unfortunately the historian can not give a precise answer to this question.

Students seeking clues to Jackson's personality and its development may be cautiously directed to certain aspects of his early years which are suggestive. Jackson was descended from Scotch-Irish stock; his father died shortly before Andy was born, his strong mother raised him in relatives' homes, and he was a pugnacious lad who left his home to seek an uncertain future in the hinterlands of what was to become Tennessee. A great deal of theorizing can, and has, been done with these facts. The Englishman Parton made the most of Jackson's ethnic identity⁸ and blamed his "North-of-Ireland" stock for being partially responsible for Jackson's being "a fighting man, and little more."⁹

Psychologists, as previously mentioned, have connected absent fathers with aggressive boys in many cases.¹⁰ Andy was certainly an aggressive young boy, but this does not necessarily mean that he was an aggressive

⁸Robert Kelley, "Ideology and Political Culture from Jefferson to Nixon," American Historical Review 82 (June 1977):n. 21.

⁹Parton, Jackson, 1:5, 3:695.

¹⁰William McCord, Joan McCord, and Allan Howard, "Familial Correlates of Aggression in Nondelinquent Male Children," in The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group and International Analysis (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); Albert Bandura and Richard H. Walters, "Adolescent Aggression," in Dynamics of Aggression.

adult because his father had died. Some historians have pointed to his "Spartan mother" Elizabeth and how this strong and pious woman spent the long winter nights telling her sons stories of Irish heroism, "impressing upon them . . . to expend their lives . . . defending . . . the natural right of man."¹¹ Jackson may well have taken his mother's final words to heart when she advised him never to sue in court for slander but to "settle them cases yourself"; he often did settle those cases himself.¹²

Andrew Jackson was a man of many parts whose interesting childhood on the Waxhaw frontier probably impressed much upon him. The problem, however, is the lack of a sufficiently large amount of reliable information about his early days. In truth, the student of history can neither confirm nor deny the certainty of childhood experiences on personality development and adult behavior. For heuristic purposes, this paper will make note of any unusual circumstances in the early years of its subjects and a further evaluation will be offered in the concluding chapter.

¹¹John Reid and John Henry Eaton, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Philadelphia: M. Carey and Son, 1817), p. 10.

¹²There are several versions of her exact words but they all carry the same meaning. The variations are given in Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), pp. 44, 325.

A final prefatory point on Jackson's personality: Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has marshaled evidence enough to state that Jackson actually had "superb self-control" and that his temperament was actually not a real problem.¹³ Knowing his reputation for violence, Jackson feigned his rages to suit his purposes. Although Schlesinger was referring to his presidential years, it seems that even during his career in Tennessee Jackson usually had a check on himself. If one considers a rage as being a situation in which one's emotions get the better of one's will, then Jackson's violence was almost never done in a rage and was seldom the result of one.¹⁴

The following study of Andrew Jackson's explosive behavior on the field and in the streets shows certain patterns and suggests areas for inquiry in the subsequent case studies. Traditionally, historians have sought to rationalize the causes of war and rebellion in terms of long range, intermediate, and immediate factors; a similar course may be charted for personal violence. Long-term causes may be considered as general community attitudes, and the personality traits and, where possible, familial background of the participants. Jackson had a keenly developed sense

¹³Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Age of Jackson (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1945), pp. 40-41.

¹⁴A rage seems to be part of his confrontations with Sevier and William Maclin and perhaps related to that with Waightstill Avery.

of personal honor and quickly rose to defend it. His temper was famously short and, although Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has noted that Jackson was capable of affecting rages to suit his purposes, Jackson was nevertheless indisputably quick to anger. This should be considered as significant. While one's family background and early home life can not be causally linked to aggressive behavior as an adult, the presence of a strong, devout mother and an absent father will be noted when they exist.

Intermediate causes of aggression will be noted since the subject's psychogenic well-being may have been adversely affected by a recent reverse such as a business failure or a lost election. Did the violence come as "a bolt from out of the blue," or were there preliminary destabilizing events? In Jackson's case, could these have been lost militia elections, business failures and the loss of his home, and an aborted military campaign? Is this a pattern? Also, Jackson was something of a believer in the dark forces of conspiracy and often saw "his enemies" lurking in the shadows of those who provoked him. Sevier was behind his defeat for the major-generalship, the McNairys were behind Dickinson, Dickinson behind Swann, and the Erwins and McNairys behind the Bentons. Such a perception might well cause an over-reaction to an otherwise forgivable transgression.

The immediate causes of aggression can be neatly tucked into the framework of the revised frustration-aggression analysis. If reducing it all to a formula makes it seem too ordinary, then the motives and methods of Jackson still remain singular. He did not seem to fight for money, or position, or women; possibly he fought for what Abraham Maslow has called esteem needs: the need for achievement, strength, competence, reputation, and status or prestige. He fought for those things which class-conscious gentlemen cherish most. The method of combat was never covert or stealthy; it was either the elaborately formalized duel, or it was openly done on the streets. It may be that with these last two points of motive and method that the violence of the upper class distinguishes itself from the violence of subaltern groups.

On at least seven separate occasions between 1788 and 1813, Andrew Jackson jeopardized his life to defend his reputation. Although he more frequently fought in the streets, he twice went to the duelling grounds to punish the "slanders, puppys and cowardly tale bearers." The net result was one man killed, several wounded, more than one exchange of bloody oaths, and a crowd of observers left roaring with laughter. Despite the diversity of outcomes, there is at least one constant factor in all the incidents-- Jackson would brook no insults to his honor.

Andrew Jackson held honor more sacred than life. He wrote to Senator William Cocke in 1789: ". . . my reputation is dearer to me than life. . . ." ¹⁵ Thirty-four years later he told the Reverend Joshua Danforth,

The slanderer is worse than the murderer for the murderer only took away life and left the good character to descend as the good heritage to his children, instead of having him a living monument of disgrace and detailing infamy on his children. ¹⁶

Jackson may be accused by some of being politically unprincipled, but few would accuse him of lacking a high sense of personal honor.

The first man to challenge the mature Jackson's sense of honor was Waightstill Avery in 1788. In order to appreciate better the resultant duel, it is necessary to review the events of the preceding few years. After the death of his mother in 1781, the young Jackson seemed to drift, first to the trade of saddling for six months then to school briefly. The death of his grandfather in Ireland brought the fifteen-year-old boy a comfortable inheritance, and he set off for Charleston to collect it. The money that could have been invested in land or further formal education was, instead, soon lost on the easy temptations of high living and horse racing. He spent it

¹⁵Jackson to Cocke, 25 June 1798, John Spencer Bassett, ed., Correspondence of Andrew Jackson, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1926-35), 1:49.

¹⁶Jackson's written account of a conversation with Danforth, 20 April 1832, Emil Hurja Collection, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

all and went into debt. Only a providential roll of the dice enabled him to pay off his debts and return to the Waxhaws on his own horse rather than on shanks' mare.¹⁷

The legacy he took with him from Charleston was a budding resolve to become a gentleman. Although the matrons of Charleston society probably had not admitted him into their drawing rooms, he had associated with the young gentlemen, and, tradition has it, he began to adopt their fine manners.¹⁸ Now he had a goal. He would become one of them.

Whatever his motivation, the young Jackson soon thereafter decided upon a career of law. Still, life did not go easily for him, as his request to read law with the prominent North Carolina attorney Waightstill Avery of Morganton was rejected.¹⁹ Failing here he was accepted in Salisbury by Spruce Macay.²⁰ During his stay there he acquired the reputation of being "the most roaring, rollicking, game-cocking, card-playing, mischievous fellow that ever lived in Salisbury."²¹ Jackson later recalled,

¹⁷Marquis James, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1938), pp. 31-34.

¹⁸Bassett, Jackson, p. 11.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 12.

²⁰James, Jackson, p. 33.

²¹Parton, Jackson, 1:104; Bassett, Jackson, p. 21; and James, Jackson, p. 34.

"Yes . . . I was but a raw lad then. . . ." ²² He changed law tutors, finished his studies under John Stokes, and was thereafter admitted to practice law in North Carolina in 1787.

Success, if not a less refined form of the good life, continued to elude him. He set up his first practice in Martinsville but was forced to supplement his legal fees by tending store and acting as constable. ²³ Then his opportunity appeared. His former classmate at Spruce Macay's, John McNairy, had just been appointed by the North Carolina legislature to be the judge of the Superior Court of the newly-created Mero district (consisting of Davidson, Sumner, and Tennessee counties along the Cumberland River), and McNairy agreed to appoint his friend to be the attorney-general. ²⁴ Jackson must have appreciated the situation for what it was, his chance to start anew and establish his reputation. In the Mero district he could achieve the success and position he coveted. ²⁵ In April, 1788, McNairy and Jackson, the latter carrying two pistols,

²²Archibald Henderson, "Jackson's Loose Living Common Sin of His Period, But Records Show That He Has Been Much Libelled," Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, 17 October 1926.

²³Bassett, Jackson, pp. 12-13; James, Jackson, pp. 37-38.

²⁴James, Jackson, p. 800.

²⁵Harriette Simpson Arnow, Seedtime on the Cumberland (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960), pp. 248-49.

a rifle, half a dozen books, and his hunting dogs, began their trek over the Blue Ridge Mountains and into the hinterlands.²⁶ How very important this must have been to the young journeyman and lawyer. His future lay in front of him, and he would not fail.

On their passage west the two men stopped off for a time in Jonesborough, in upper east Tennessee.²⁷ It was here, in the Superior Court, that Andrew Jackson issued his first formal challenge to duel. A recent biographer has implied that this affair with Waightstill Avery was at least partially contrived by Jackson as part of his larger plan to establish himself as a gentleman.²⁸ Perhaps Jackson was reasoning syllogistically: only gentlemen fight duels; if Andrew Jackson fights a duel, Andrew Jackson is a gentleman. This writer prefers a simpler concept: the frustration-aggression hypothesis.

The hypothesis and especially its later clarifications were discussed in Chapter I, but a recapitulation may be helpful. Frustration, or the interruption of an on-going goal sequence, always produces an instigation to aggression. Aggression will be dependent upon the relative strength of

²⁶James, Jackson, pp. 41-45.

²⁷Hereafter the modern spelling of Jonesboro will be used. It was changed in the 1870s.

²⁸James C. Curtis, Andrew Jackson and the Search for Vindication (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976), pp. 16-18.

instigation and the inhibitions against aggression. An illustration of the relative strength of instigation is that "withdrawal of food from a hungry dog should produce more growling and baring of teeth than similar withdrawal from a satiated dog."²⁹ This principal, applied to Andrew Jackson, would read: "Insults to the reputation of an unestablished but aspiring gentleman should produce more aggression than similar denigrations against an established and secure gentleman." The most important inhibitor is the fear of punishment, so that, unless someone is so angry that he "throw[s] caution to the winds," there is a positive correlation between the strength of the inhibition and the amount of punishment expected. There would seem to be two forms of punishment for the duelist: physical injury or death and social disapprobation. It has already been noted that Jackson held honor more sacred than life, and the incidence of dueling among gentlemen who suffered neither rejection by their peers nor the sanctions of law probably negated in his mind any fear of this second form of punishment. Thus, with his inhibitions at a minimum, a strong frustration might well produce aggression.

²⁹This summary is from John Dollard, Leonard W. Doob, Neal E. Miller, O. H. Mower, and Robert S. Sears, Frustration and Aggression (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), pp. 22-32.

The source of his frustration was Waightstill Avery, a man who represented everything that Jackson was not, yet sought to be. Avery had been born in Connecticut and educated at Princeton. As a signer of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence and a frequent member of North Carolina's General Assembly, he became a founding father of his state and a bastion of its establishment.³⁰ Could it have been that the twenty-one-year-old Jackson was trying desperately to impress the older man, and symbolically the establishment which he represented, that he, Jackson, was worthy of them, a new but earnest gentleman? If so, one can understand his frustration that day in court.

Although there is a general consensus as to what happened between the two men, there is also disagreement. Jackson's papers in the Nashville archives contain a copy of the challenge which is of questionable authenticity and a few newspaper clippings from later days; furthermore, his published correspondence adds little. Parton's account is based on a letter from Avery's son which gives a partial and sometimes inaccurate depiction; James's rendition is based on a source that nowhere refers to the material James cites;

³⁰ John Strother to John Gray Blount, 16 August 1801, William H. Masterson, ed., The John Gray Blount Papers, 3 vols. (Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1952-65), 3:482; John H. Wheeler, Historical Sketches of North Carolina, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo and Co., 1851), 1:56-57, 2:70.

and Allison's Dropped Stitches, which is supported by the recollections of eyewitnesses, is illogical. Perhaps it was for these reasons that Bassett omits the duel. The following is based on consensus with the more important exceptions noted.

Jackson's lack of education and experience left him little match for Avery in the courtroom. Among the half dozen books Jackson had carried with him was a copy of Matthew Bacon's Abridgement of the Law, and about the best he could do was to make halting and sometimes inaccurate references to "the learned Bacon."³¹ Avery became annoyed with the young counselor and began to use very sarcastic language which held Jackson's knowledge of the law in disrepute.³² Jackson may have considered the comments as a challenge to his incipient reputation. He lashed back, "I may not know as much law as there is in Bacon but I know enough not to take illegal fees!"³³ Avery exclaimed, "It's false as hell!" Jackson tore off a leaf of Bacon and issued

³¹Mary Johnson Avery, "Andrew Jackson's First Duel," Holland's The Magazine of the South (November 1932), clipping in Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA. Unfortunately, there is no available record of the trial itself.

³²Avery's son, Isaac T. Avery, wrote, in a letter to Parton, "My father rather exultingly ridiculed some legal position taken by Jackson; using, as he afterwards admitted, language more sarcastic than was called for." Parton, Jackson, 1:162.

³³Apparently, Avery had charged a fee to which he had not been fully entitled, but he had returned it. James, Jackson, p. 46.

the challenge of honor. This was 11 August 1788, and a copy of this note does not exist.

In court the next day when Avery made no acknowledgement of the previous day's challenge, Jackson made another:

Sir: When a man's feelings and charactor are injured he ought to seek a speedy redress; you recd. a few lines from me yesterday and undoubtedly you understood me. My charactor you have injured; and further you have Insulted me in the presence of a court and a large audianc. I therefore call upon you as a gentleman to give me satisfaction for the Same; and I further call upon you to give Me an answer immediately without Equivocation and I hope you can do without dinner until the business done; for it is consistant with the charactor of a gentleman when he Injures a man to make a speedy reparation; therefore I hope you will not fail in meeting me this day. from yr obt st

P S this Evening after court adjourned³⁴

Avery now had no choice but to have his second, John Adair, arrange for a meeting that evening at sunset. The above mentioned letter from Avery's son is instructive:

My father was no duelist; in fact he was opposed to the principle; but, with his antecedents, in the age and country, to have declined would have been to have lost caste. [emphasis added]³⁵

A gentleman's duty was clear, and there were no alternatives at that time with that man.

³⁴Jackson to Avery, 12 August 1788, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:5.

³⁵Avery to Parton, Jackson, 1:162; Avery wrote that his account of the duel had been verified by John Adair and Jackson, but he has the duel being fought on 11 August rather than 12 August. He also implies that the men were trying to kill each other on the grounds, which they most probably were not, and he omits any reference to the final exchange of "Bacon."

The duel itself provided a bit of comic relief. The frustration of Jackson and the honor of Avery were apparently satisfied by merely meeting at the appointed spot, firing into the air and shaking hands. Avery, however, had a final twit. He approached Jackson saying that he had feared mortally wounding him, and he knew that in that event Jackson would not want to die without his beloved Bacon. Avery presented him with a side of cured bacon. The crowd roared.³⁶ Many years later, when he was reminded of the incident, Jackson was able to join the laughter.³⁷

Andrew Jackson had thus fought his first duel. The frustration-aggression hypothesis helps to clarify why. His "on-going goal sequence" was his desire to establish himself as a gentleman, and Waightstill Avery's sharp tongue and courtroom barbs frustrated that goal sequence. The established gentleman was not treating him with the respect Jackson probably felt he should have received as a peer. This produced the instigation to aggression which was strong enough to outweigh his inhibitions. He fought, and, by the fight, demonstrated that he was a man to be reckoned with.

³⁶The account in John Allison, Dropped Stitches in Tennessee History (Nashville: Marshall and Cruce Co., 1897), pp. 114-15, has Jackson presenting the bacon to Avery, but this does not seem logical in view of the preceding events in court. He also has them duelling on 11 August.

³⁷Parton, Jackson, 1:126.

There are two further points that need to be noted about the duel. Although the eminent historian Vernon L. Parrington has depicted Jackson as "fundamentally realistic" and possessed of "few romantic characteristics," when it came to his reputation, Jackson was a romantic who defended his good name (even when he did not yet possess one) with his life.³⁸ Second, subsequent events demonstrate the lack of societal sanctions against the frontier duelist. Three months later he was appointed attorney-general of the Mero District, and the appointment was confirmed the next year by the legislature.³⁹

During the fifteen years between the duel with Avery and the quarrel with Sevier, Jackson won his reputation. In Nashville, he quickly established himself as an effective public prosecutor, and his private law practice flourished as he forcefully defended the interests of the moneylenders and merchants.⁴⁰ Although he had arrived in middle Tennessee too late to be qualified or considered as a "founding father" of that region,⁴¹ he did begin to hold

³⁸Vernon Louis Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought, 3 vols. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958), 1:147.

³⁹The appointment had, of course, already been promised by McNairy. James, Jackson, p. 800.

⁴⁰James, Jackson, pp. 47-48; Bassett, Jackson, pp. 16-17; and Robert V. Remini, Andrew Jackson (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966), pp. 29-30.

⁴¹Arnow, Seedtime on the Cumberland, pp. 334-35; Bassett, Jackson, p. 17.

important political positions by the mid-1790s. The metamorphosis of the Waxhaw roughneck into the Nashville gentleman moved apace. He represented Davidson County in Tennessee's Constitutional Convention of 1796 and was Tennessee's first congressman. He then was sent to the United States Senate, where he spent about a year before returning home to be a judge on the state Superior Court from 1798 to 1804.⁴²

The conditions in Nashville at the beginning of the nineteenth century were well suited for an aggressive young lawyer like Andrew Jackson. Anita S. Goodstein has recently noted that from 1780 to 1800 "the frontier village of Nashville" looked for leadership based on the traditional pioneer virtues of physical courage, endurance, and a talent to survive.⁴³ Indian raids had accustomed its population of between three and four hundred to violence. The courts of the town protected private property to the extent that horse thieves were punished savagely with thirty-seven lashes on the bare back; yet the physically violent crime of assault and battery rarely brought a punishment greater than a penny

⁴²J. G. M. Ramsey, The Annals of Tennessee to the End of the Eighteenth Century (Charleston, S.C.: Walker and Jones, 1853; reprint ed., Knoxville: East Tennessee Historical Society, 1967), pp. 650, 676, 699; Joshua W. Caldwell, Sketches of the Bench and Bar of Tennessee (Knoxville: Ogden Bros. & Co., 1898), p. 17.

⁴³Anita S. Goodstein, "Leadership on the Nashville Frontier, 1780-1800," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 35 (Summer 1976):175.

fine.⁴⁴ The courageous young public prosecutor, "the epitome of the man of action,"⁴⁵ saw both his purse and his position grow large in this environment.

Jackson's romantic defense of his good name increased geometrically when the good name of his beloved wife Rachel was called into question.⁴⁶ The story of her marriages is familiar.⁴⁷ When he first moved to Nashville he boarded in the home of the widow of the founder of Nashville, John Donelson, and it was there that he met and fell in love with his youngest daughter, Rachel. Rachel Donelson Robards was married but estranged from her husband, Lewis, who was living in Kentucky.⁴⁸ Lewis and Rachel at least twice tried to reconcile their differences. In the first instance, he came to Nashville but became jealous of Jackson and, when

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 177-78, 190, 197.

⁴⁵Cruce Stark, "The Historical Irrelevance of Heroes: Henry Adams's Andrew Jackson," American Literature 46 (May 1974):173.

⁴⁶It has been suggested that it was a characteristic of the southern highlander to defend his family to "the last drop of his blood." Horace Kephart, Our Southern Highlanders (New York: Macmillan Co., 1926), p. 387. Apparently, this characteristic extended beyond the highlands.

⁴⁷Bassett, Jackson, pp. 17-20; James, Jackson, pp. 48-74; Remini, Jackson, pp. 28-33; Curtis, Jackson, pp. 25-28; Rogin, Fathers and Children, pp. 59-63; and, most recently, Harriet Chappell Owsley, "The Marriages of Rachel Donelson," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 36 (Winter 1977): 479-92. Although there are some disagreements among the sources, for the purposes here they need not be detailed.

⁴⁸At that time what is now Kentucky was part of the state of Virginia.

the two men fell out, Robards returned to Kentucky. In the second instance, Rachel went to him in Kentucky only to quarrel and leave. Escorted by Jackson, she returned to the home of her sister.

Jackson continued to play a large role in this untidy affair when news arrived that Robards was once again coming to the Tennessee country to reclaim his wife. At the pleading of others, Jackson agreed to accompany the trading party that Rachel had asked to join in its passage to Natchez. The three hundred mile journey safely completed, he returned to Nashville. According to Bassett, a few months later news arrived that Robards had been granted a divorce by the Virginia legislature, and Jackson again traveled to Natchez, this time to make Rachel his wife.⁴⁹

All was well for the next two years as the Jacksons, following their return from Natchez, made their home at his plantation, "Hunter's Hill," near Nashville. Then, in December 1793, they learned that Robards's request for a divorce had been denied by the legislature, and that he had only been given permission to sue in court for it, which he had not done. Apparently, Robards had led the people in Nashville to believe that he had been granted the divorce, but he held up his suit until September 1793, when the court ruled that "Rachel Robards, hath deserted the plaintiff, Lewis Robards, and hath, and doth, still live in adultery

⁴⁹Bassett, Jackson, pp. 18-19.

[sic] with another man. It is therefore considered by the court that the marriage . . . be dissolved."⁵⁰ The devastating effect of this news on Rachel and Andrew was probably magnified by their mutual awareness that they shared at least part of the blame. On the urgings of his friend John Coffee, Jackson and Rachel submitted to a second marriage ceremony in January 1794.

Clearly as a practicing attorney and officer of the court, Andrew Jackson should have had the professional competence and good judgment to determine whether or not Robards had been granted a divorce by the Virginia legislature. But even more he may have been nagged by doubts that he let his heart get the better of his head. He confided to John Coffee that he felt guilty for "having innocently and unintentionally been the cause of . . . [her] loss of peace and happiness."⁵¹ It does not require the training of a psychologist to suggest that these lingering uncertainties may well have contributed to Jackson's extreme defensiveness.

It is part of Tennessee folklore that, for the defense of his wife's name, Jackson kept a pistol in perfect working condition for over thirty years. While this was or

⁵⁰Divorce of Lewis and Rachel Robards, Mercer County, Kentucky, Court of Quarter Sessions Book, 1792-1796, p. 105, cited by Owsley, "Marriages of Rachel Donelson," p. 487.

⁵¹James, Jackson, p. 65.

may not be true in the literal sense, figuratively it was so; even after Rachel's death his passionate defense of her good name and of the reputations of ladies generally was displaced onto Peggy Eaton.⁵² As he would brook no insult to his honor, he would brook none to Rachel's. The first man to discover the depth of Jackson's passion was John Sevier.

The name and deeds of John Sevier loom large in the early history of ultramontane North Carolina and Tennessee. Sevier was the leader of thirty-five attacks on the Indians, a hero at the Battle of King's Mountain, a father of the stillborn State of Franklin, six times governor of Tennessee, and three times elected to the United States House of Representatives.⁵³

The feud and flare-ups between these two men are part of Tennessee legend. A biographer of Jackson has written that, "the difficulty between these men was that, temperamentally, they were too much alike. Where either sat was the head of the table."⁵⁴ This is true as far as it goes.

⁵²Pessen, Jacksonian American, pp. 288-89.

⁵³Robert H. White, ed., Messages of the Governors of Tennessee, 1796-1821, 8 vols. (Nashville, Tennessee Historical Commission, 1952), 1:1-2.

⁵⁴James, Jackson, p. 88.

The genesis of the Jackson-Sevier feud is disputed by the biographers, but it seems clear that it began in 1796 and that their personal malevolence grew from political rivalries. Although the party of Jefferson dominated early Tennessee politics, that party was divided between the followers of William Blount and those of John Sevier, and the two factions competed with each other for officers at the state and local levels. The better organized and more aristocratic Blount was more influential in what is now middle Tennessee, while the more popular "man of the people" Sevier was unbeatable in east Tennessee.⁵⁵ When Jackson settled in Nashville he was geographically in Blount's realm, and when he allied himself with the merchants and bankers he grew philosophically closer to Blount. The alliance of the two was perhaps consummated in 1791 when Blount, as governor of the Southwest Territory, appointed Jackson to be attorney-general of the Mero District and then gave him his first military position as judge-advocate of the Davidson County regiment.⁵⁶ In this benign manner was laid the groundwork for one of the most famous quarrels in the history of Tennessee.

⁵⁵Thomas Perkins Abernethy, From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee: A Study in Frontier Democracy (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932; reprint ed., Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1967), p. 88.

⁵⁶Ramsey, Annals of Tennessee, pp. 541-43; "Journal of Governor Blount," American Historical Magazine, II, 234, 237, quoted in Abernethy, From Frontier to Plantation, p. 127.

The biographers of the two men have continued the disagreement that flared up in Knoxville in October 1803. Sevier's principal biographer contends that it was mostly a political struggle, having its origins in Jackson's opposition to Sevier's gubernatorial race in 1796;⁵⁷ while Jackson's biographers place the blame squarely on Sevier, charging him with the malfeasance and fraud in office and declaring that Jackson's exposure of his duplicity led to the troubles.

In spite of the differences of emphasis and interpretation, a clear sequence of events can be delineated. The initial spark came when Sevier was elected Tennessee's first governor in 1796 and ran into opposition in Davidson County. While it is not known exactly who opposed him, Andrew Jackson may well have done so.⁵⁸ In any event, the governor was determined to strengthen his friends in the area and, when elections were held for militia officers, Sevier acted. There were two separate elections involved in this affair, and there has been some confusion about them.

In October, the field officers of the Mero District militia were to elect their brigadier general; Sevier favored a Colonel Ford, although a majority of the

⁵⁷Carl S. Driver, John Sevier: Pioneer of the Old Southwest (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932), pp. 168-70.

⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 117, 123.

constituent officers supported Colonel James Winchester.⁵⁹ With the election apparently going against his favored candidate, Sevier sent some blank officers' commissions to Major General James Robertson to be handed out to persons who would vote for Ford.⁶⁰ Jackson was present at the election and denounced the governor's action as unconstitutional, whereupon an agent of Sevier read a personal letter from the governor to which Jackson took offense.⁶¹ This, in combination with the election of the next month, set the tinder smoldering.

This combustible situation was pushed closer to the flash point the next month when Jackson himself stood for election as major general of the militia, and Sevier supported his opponent George Conway who defeated Jackson. Biographer Bassett erroneously states that the blank commissions were sent to influence this election to defeat Jackson. Governor Sevier's Executive Journal clearly shows, however, that the commissions were sent to help Robertson influence the election for brigadier general, not major

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 123.

⁶⁰Sevier to Robertson, 4 October 1796, Samuel Cole Williams, ed., "The Executive Journal of Governor John Sevier," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 1 (1929):120-21.

⁶¹Jackson to Sevier, 8 May 1797, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:32-33.

general.⁶² This, plus Jackson's letter to Sevier in which he wrote that he "was present at the Election as a private Citizen . . .," indicates to this writer that the interference occurred in October.⁶³ This is, of course, of small significance. What does matter is that by the exchange both men had wounded the pride and attacked the honor of the other. Sevier began to view Jackson as his "enemy" who wished to "injure [his] reputation," which, Sevier wrote to Jackson, "is my only treasure . . . the greatest pleasure of my declining years."⁶⁴ Jackson, too, was offended at the governor's depicting him as "a poor pitiful petty fogging lawyer." Their tempers ran hot for several months. At the time, Jackson was serving in Philadelphia as a United States Senator, but after his return to Tennessee the men's correspondence shows that both were eager for a reconciliation.⁶⁵ It appears as if each realized that matters had gotten carried too far and the speed with which they reassured each other of their friendship indicates that no permanent damage had been done. In fact, sixteen months later Sevier appointed Jackson to the Superior Court of Law

⁶²Sevier to Robertson, 4 October 1796, Williams, "Journal of Sevier," pp. 120-21.

⁶³Jackson to Sevier, 8 May 1797, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:33.

⁶⁴Sevier to Jackson, 8 May 1797, *ibid.*, 1:31-32.

⁶⁵Jackson to Sevier, 10 May 1797; Sevier to Jackson, 11 May 1797, *ibid.*, 1:35-36.

and Equity.⁶⁶ Because of this modus vivendi, some historians have chosen to ignore the matter and date the beginning of their feud later. This writer believes that they are leaving some important background material unnoticed.

The permanent rupture in relations between the two was guaranteed when Jackson delivered to Governor Archibald Roane information that Sevier and others had participated in a scheme to defraud the state of North Carolina of land amounting to approximately one-fifth the entire area of Tennessee. Jackson had learned of the plot when he was in Philadelphia in 1797 and turned the information over to Governor Samuel Ashe of North Carolina where it caused the Secretary of State James Glasgow to resign his office. The details of what Sevier was accused of having done go beyond this paper but several sources provide information for the interested student.⁶⁷

Jackson did not disclose his suspicions to Governor Roane until the hour was right. In 1802, Jackson and Sevier were contesting for the major generalship of the recently

⁶⁶Sevier to Jackson, 29 August 1798, W. W. Clayton, History of Davidson County, Tennessee (Philadelphia: J. W. Lewis, 1880), p. 141.

⁶⁷Jackson's biographers are convinced of Sevier's fraud, but Sevier's biographer wrote that "no conclusion as to his guilt is possible." Driver, Sevier, p. 167. Abernethy concluded that "there is not a flaw in the evidence. . . ." From Frontier to Plantation, p. 174. See, also, White, Messages of the Governors, 1:161-71.

deceased General Conway. When the election by the field officers ended in a seventeen-to-seventeen draw, Jackson took the information to Roane who forthwith broke the tie in Jackson's favor.⁶⁸ The matter did not end here. The governor informed the legislature of the schemes and used the allegations as a campaign theme when Roane and Sevier ran for governor in 1803. The popularity of Nolichucky Jack was too great, however, and he easily defeated Roane in spite of the charges.

During the campaign, Jackson had been very active on Roane's behalf and had published several letters attacking Sevier.⁶⁹ If there were ever any doubt in Sevier's mind as to Jackson's loyalties, it was now gone. Jackson was his enemy. With Jackson's attacks on his honesty still ringing in his ears, Sevier was in the streets of Knoxville when Jackson happened by. This was 1 October 1803, and Judge Jackson had just, figuratively at least, taken off his robes as Superior Court judge and walked into the street in front of the court house where Governor Sevier was berating Representative William Martin.⁷⁰ A crowd gathered around this assembly of braying notables, and each became all the

⁶⁸James, Jackson, pp. 90-91.

⁶⁹White, Messages of the Governors, 1:164-65.

⁷⁰Martin was a member of the legislative committee investigating the charges against Sevier. White, Messages of the Governors, 1:173.

more determined to face the other down.⁷¹ After Sevier had "ransacked the vocabulary of vulgarity for insulting and blackguard expressions"⁷² and dared Jackson to challenge him, Jackson took offense, saying that the services he had rendered to the state made him above such insults and language. Sevier roared, "Services? I know of no services you have rendered . . . except taking a trip to Natchez with another man's wife!" A description in Parton puts it most colorfully: "An unearthly light invaded the blue eyes of Andrew Jackson. The crowd stood as if transfixed. Sevier drew his sword. 'Great God!' cried Jackson 'Do you mention her sacred name?'"⁷³ The governor had committed the unpardonable sin and, had Jackson been more heavily armed, those words might well have been Nolichucky Jack's last.

The next day, October 2, 1803, Jackson challenged Sevier in no uncertain terms:

The ungentlemanly expressions, and gasgonading conduct of yours . . . was in true character of yourself, and unmask you to the world, and plainly shews that they were ebullitions of a base mind goated with the stubborn proof of fraud . . . But Sir the voice of the people has made you a Governor, this alone makes you

⁷¹The most complete narrative of the affair is Driver, Sevier, pp. 176-89.

⁷²Jackson to Sevier, 9 October 1803, Bassett Correspondence, 1:74.

⁷³Isaac T. Avery to Parton, Parton, Jackson, 1:164.

worthy of my notice. . . . For the office I have respect.⁷⁴

The note continues that its bearer would arrange a time and place for the "interview," and "my friend and myself will be armed with pistols--you cannot mistake me or my meaning."

Sevier's reply seems to be almost in jest as he parroted the words of his challenger:

Your ungentlemanly and gasgonading conduct of yesterday, and indeed of all other times, heretofore, have unmasked yourself to me and to the world. The voice of the Assembly has made you a Judge and this alone has made you worthy of my notice . . . to the office I have respect. . . . I shall wait on you with pleasure at any time and place not within the State of Tennessee, attended by my friend with pistols, presuming you know nothing about the use of any other arms. . . . You cannot mistake me or my meaning.⁷⁵

Sevier's refusal to meet in Tennessee was well advised considering that both men held positions of honor and trust in the state. It was also well advised as a delaying action, because it is clear that Jackson wanted to fight immediately and that Sevier was not so determined.⁷⁶ The governor had nothing to gain by the "interview," whereas the judge was furious enough not to care. Of course, if Jackson

⁷⁴Jackson to Sevier, 2 October 1803, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:71; unsigned certificate of Amos Kendall, 2 October 1803, J. K. Winn Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁷⁵Sevier to Jackson, 3 October 1803, John Sevier Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; Clayton, Davidson County, p. 142.

⁷⁶Jackson's messenger, Mr. A. White, had to call on Sevier several times before Sevier would reply. Jackson to Sevier, 3 October 1803, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:71.

had been absolutely determined to kill him, he would have gone to the Executive Residence and killed the governor. Jackson, therefore, was being something of the gamesman--the game was to inflict as much damage on Sevier's reputation as possible. Once he learned that Sevier would fight only in Georgia, Virginia, or North Carolina, Jackson insisted that the confrontation must be held in Knoxville or in the Indian country.⁷⁷ By refusing to agree upon venue, both men were delaying.

Jackson's response to Sevier's condition for an out-of-state meeting was that it was "a mere subterfuge; your attack was in the town of Knoxville, in the town of Knoxville did you take the name of a lady into your polluted lips . . . and now sir in the neighborhood of Knoxville you shall atone for it or I will publish you as a coward and a poltroon."⁷⁸ Jackson continued that "if it will obviate your squeemish fears, I will set out immediately to the nearest part of the Indian boundary line. . . . To travel to Georgia, Virginia or North Carolina, is a proposition . . . to evade the thing entirely." Jackson then firmed up his challenge: "I am therefore compelled to be explicit; you

⁷⁷Jackson was conceding to the Indians greater sovereignty over their land than he would later in his reaction to *Worcester v. Georgia*.

⁷⁸Jackson to Sevier, 3 October 1803, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:71.

must meet me between this and four o'clock, this afternoon . . . or I will publish you as a coward and poltroon. I shall expect an answer in the space of one hour. . . ."79

The governor replied: "Your letter of this day is before me and I am happy to find you so accommodating. My friend will agree upon the time and place of rendezvous."⁸⁰ In spite of Jackson's explicit challenge and Sevier's apparently willing response, Sevier was still delaying. He instructed his intermediary in the affair, a Captain Sparks, that the rendezvous should not be scheduled before 8 October.⁸¹ Jackson still wanted to fight and wrote Sevier six days later that unless he responded within two hours that he had reserved space in the Knoxville Gazette for the next day to publish him as a coward.

Sevier replied with condemnation and further evasion; Jackson responded with another call to meet. Sevier again wrote accusing him of "cowardly evasion" and of being "a pitiful poltroon and coward." He closed: "I shall not receive another letter from you, as I deem you a coward."⁸² With the knowledge that he could now comply with Sevier's

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Sevier to Jackson, 3 October 1803, Clayton, Davidson County, p. 143.

⁸¹Jackson to Sevier, 9 October 1803, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:74.

⁸²Sevier to Jackson, 10 October 1803, Sevier Papers, TSLA; Clayton, Davidson County, pp. 144-45.

request to meet in another state, Jackson made the last exchange, in which he agreed to meet Sevier in Virginia. On this final note Jackson attached a memorandum that Sevier had refused to accept it, although the messenger told the governor of its contents.⁸³ Jackson now published the promised attack on Sevier:

FOR THE PUBLIC

Those of the Honorable members of the Legislature and other citizens who were present on the first day of this instant in the town of Knoxville will recollect the ungentlemanly and unprovoked attack made by his Excellency John Sevier, Governor of the State of Tennessee, on me--How he panted for combat when armed with a cutless and I with a cain--His Excellency in perfect Health, I just recovering from a severe illness! They will also recollect his Gasconading Expressions and his repeated darings for me to invite him to the field of Honor.

To all whom shall see these presents Greetings--Know ye that I, Andrew Jackson, do pronounce, Publish, and declare to the world, that his Excellency John Sevier, Esq., Governor, Captain-General and Commander-in-chief of the Land and Naval forces of the State of Tennessee is a base coward and poltroon--he will basely insult but has not the courage to repair the Wound.⁸⁴

Andrew Jackson

Their pens now fell silent. Five days later the men chanced upon one another near Southwest Point. Sevier's diary makes it clear that he was there on official business, but why Jackson was there is not certain.⁸⁵ In any event,

⁸³Jackson to Sevier, 11 October 1803, Clayton, Davidson County, p. 145.

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Sevier's Diary, 16 October 1803, Driver, Sevier, p. 182.

their fateful collision produced more cacophony than casualties.

The events of that Sunday morning, 16 October 1803, were later garbled as the anonymous supporters of each man later wrote accounts and interpretations of the encounter.⁸⁶ A reasonably accurate scenario, however, can be constructed based on the only authenticated eyewitness reports. Sevier was accompanied by his son Washington, Andrew Greer, and John Hunter; Jackson's only companion was Dr. Thomas J. Van Dyke.⁸⁷ The two parties chanced upon one another on the road near Kingston and stopped. Greer relates that at this point Jackson dismounted, drew his pistol, and moved toward Sevier who had by then dismounted. They stood cursing each other, and the governor "damned Jackson to fire away." They calmed down and put away their arms, whereupon Jackson threatened to cane Sevier. Jackson's gestures scared Sevier's horse which ran away leaving the governor "naked." Jackson then redrew his pistol, and Sevier sought the protection of a tree and manfully continued to curse the general. Washington Sevier drew on Jackson, and Dr. Van Dyke drew upon Washington. At this point the retaliative

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 183.

⁸⁷Affadavit of Andrew Greer, 23 October 1803, American Historical Magazine 5 (July 1900):208-09; Van Dyke's account, Tennessee Gazette, 21 December 1803, quoted in Driver, Sevier, pp. 183-85; and Clayton, Davidson County, p. 146, which has Sevier accompanied by "about twenty persons."

capability of each side was great enough to deter the other from making a first strike, and the crisis passed.

Dr. Van Dyke told the story somewhat differently, agreeing on the major sequence of events but depicting the governor as the aggressor. It was Sevier, not Jackson, who first drew his pistol and dismounted and, when the judge responded in a similar manner, the governor sought arboreal protection. When Sevier steadfastly refused to come from behind the tree and fight according to the code of honor, the men remounted. After a bout of oaths Jackson drew his arms, Sevier dismounted and set his horse free. The mounted judge chased the governor around the group of men a few times and that terminated the danger to life and limb. As was noted before, it is not now possible to determine which of the accounts is the more accurate, and indeed it should not be necessary to quibble between them. If the criteria include simplicity and logic, then this writer leans toward Greer's rendition; Dr. Van Dyke's is too complex.

In any event, Greer and Dr. Van Dyke agree on the denouement. Both picture the disengaged antagonists departing in opposite directions, verbally abusing and insulting each other as loudly as possible and for as long as the other could hear. If the final scene of Jackson's duel with Avery left the observers laughing, the affair with Sevier on the road to Kingston has left posterity richer in low comedy.

Jackson was to suffer one final paroxysm as a result of the embroilment with Sevier, and the frustration-aggression hypothesis seems relevant. Since the instigation to aggression becomes progressively weaker as the source of the frustration becomes more indirect, one would expect Jackson to be less aggressive toward a person he associated with Sevier than he was toward Sevier himself.⁸⁸ Such was the case with William Maclin.⁸⁹ Maclin had acted as Sevier's agent in carrying some of the governor's notes to Jackson, thereby associating himself with the governor. When Jackson learned that Maclin had delivered an anonymous article to the Knoxville Gazette which espoused the Sevier line,⁹⁰ Jackson paid him a visit. The judge took Major Howell Tatum along as a witness and Tatum later certified the events which transpired.⁹¹ Maclin readily admitted that he had delivered the article for Sevier but denied having written it or knowing who had written it. When Jackson called him a rascal or a damned rascal (Tatum could not recall which), Maclin said he was no more one than Jackson,

⁸⁸Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mower, and Sears, Frustration and Aggression, pp. 39-41.

⁸⁹Maclin was, at that time, Secretary of State of Tennessee.

⁹⁰Nashville Gazette and Mero-District Advertiser, 25 November 1803.

⁹¹Certificate of Major Howell Tatum, Winn Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; reproduced in Clayton, Davidson County, p. 146.

whereupon Jackson hit him with his cane. Maclin retreated seven or eight yards, Jackson drew his sword from the case, and Maclin threw a brickbat and ran. Jackson pursued hotly and threw his scabbard. The two men then squared off verbally for a few moments, and the incident passed.⁹²

It is most probable that in this affair with the Secretary of State Jackson originally intended only to berate the man but, when Maclin accused him of being as big a rascal as himself, the judge lost his temper, or at least pretended to lose it, and lashed out physically. He certainly never intended to kill Maclin, as he probably never intended to kill Avery or Sevier. It must also be noted that in all three of these cases Jackson was not the original provocateur but was more or less willingly responding to the actions of another. Perhaps he over-responded in the defense of his good name and Rachel's but, if he did, the judgment of this writer is that it was, in the words of Tennyson, "half a sin."

This chapter has pointed to several interesting aspects of Jackson's formative years on the Waxhaw frontier which may have influenced his later behavior. Perhaps because of his early years, it seems that he was anxious, perhaps even defensive, when he challenged Avery to duel. In all three of the incidents discussed here, Avery, Sevier,

⁹²None of Jackson's major biographers mention this affair with Maclin, although Rogin refers to it.

and Maclin, Jackson gave the appearance of being adversely affected by his temper, perhaps to the point of rage. In the later incidents he will have better self-control, and the violence will appear to be more calculated. In all three cases it was Jackson who initiated the physical aspect of the confrontation, although he was responding to what he perceived to be sufficient provocations, which, in the first two incidents, were insults. The third incident was more of a spontaneous combustion. If one might excuse Jackson from those early transgressions because of his youthful temper and the circumstances of the cases, his later violence is more difficult to fathom.

CHAPTER III

ANDREW JACKSON: INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE FROM 1806 TO 1813

The duel between Jackson and Charles Dickinson is considered the most important duel ever fought in Kentucky and among the most important ever fought anywhere in America.¹ In addition to its general fame, historian John Ward has written, "Of the many incidents . . . that provided material for the glorification of the man of iron will, the most notorious was, perhaps, Andrew Jackson's famous duel with Charles Dickinson."² Indeed, Jackson did show more steely courage encountering Dickinson than in his other embroilments, because here he acted not in the passion of the moment but with an almost cool detachment as he set out to still a tormenter who would not be quieted in any other

¹J. Winston Coleman, Jr., Famous Kentucky Duels: The Code of Honor in the Bluegrass State (Frankfort: Roberts Printing Co., 1953), p. 15; Ben C. Truman, The Field of Honor: Being A Complete and Comprehensive History of Duelling in all Countries (New York: Ford, Howard, and Hulbert, 1884), p. 280; and Robert Baldick, The Duel: A History of Duelling (London: Chapman & Hall, 1965), p. 122.

²John William Ward, Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 163.

way. One can observe in the matter with Dickinson both the brighter and darker sides of Jackson's nature. His courage, strength and directness, his sense of honor, his calmness in the face of great difficulty, and his grim determination to carry an unpleasant task to its completion are admirable, while his lack of restraint, refusal to accept criticism, readiness to resort to violence, and his generally suspicious, narrow, and vindictive attitude are repugnant.³ The duel tells a lot about the man; and, fortunately, we know a lot about the duel.

The story has been told often. The details surrounding the horse race between Truxton and Ploughboy, the eight hundred dollar misunderstanding concerning the forfeit money, the caning of Thomas Swann, the exchanges between Jackson and Dickinson, and, finally, the duel and its aftermath are covered in various sources.⁴ An important

³John Spencer Bassett, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Co., 1916; reprint ed. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1967), pp. 700-06; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Age of Jackson (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1945), pp. 37-40; and Edward Pessen, Jacksonian America: Society, Personality, and Politics, rev. ed. (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1978), pp. 321-22.

⁴Modern accounts are based almost entirely on the material in John Spencer Bassett, ed., Correspondence of Andrew Jackson, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1926-35), 1:122-49; James Parton, The Life of Andrew Jackson, 3 vols. (New York: Mason Bros., 1859-61), 1:265-306; and Tennessee Gazette, 17 May, 19 July, and 9 August 1806. Nashville Impartial Review, 1, 15, and 22 February, 15 March, 24 and 31 May, and 21 and 28 June 1806, provide some further information. All of Jackson's modern biographies carry accounts, the most detailed is Marquis

prologue to the entire affair which has not received sufficient consideration is Jackson's weakened financial situation and the possible effects that such a condition might have had on him. The common sense observation that people are more likely to be frustrated and aggressive when they are getting less out of life than they think they deserve has been developed into academic usage as the concept of "relative deprivation" (RD). This concept has been used since the 1940s and one of its current exponents, political scientist Ted Robert Gurr, has stated that the potential for violence is strongly influenced by feelings of relative deprivation. Since "an individual's point of reference [how well he feels he should be doing] may be his own past condition,"⁵ a person who has experienced financial setbacks is more likely to be frustrated and hence aggressive than he might otherwise be.⁶ Perhaps Jackson's financial hard times help explain why he was willing to go to the duelling grounds with the "best pistol shot" in Tennessee.

James, The Life of Andrew Jackson (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1938), pp. 105-19. The following collections are all of use and may be found in the Manuscript Section, TSLA: The Jackson Papers; Winn Papers; Bettie M. Donelson Papers; Moses Fisk Papers; Emil Edward Hurja Collection; Figuers Collection; and the Tennessee Historical Society, Miscellaneous Collection.

⁵Ted Robert Gurr, Why Men Rebel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), p. 25.

⁶"The primary source . . . for violence appears to be the frustration-aggression mechanism." Ibid., p. 36.

A review of Jackson's fortunes is in order. The first "serious misfortune"⁷ to befall him occurred in the autumn of 1797 when the Philadelphia merchant David Allison, to whom Jackson and John Overton had sold 28,810 acres of land in exchange for a series of notes valued at ten thousand dollars, defaulted on the notes which Jackson had already used to buy supplies for his mercantile establishment and Jackson was held liable to merchants in Philadelphia. To raise the cash to save his credit (and personal honor) Jackson was forced to exchange the store for land and sell it. The financial complications continued, and Jackson resigned his seat in the United States Senate to return home to extricate himself from the burden of debt.⁸ The first evidence that he was feeling the strain is manifested in his exchanges with and challenge to Senator William Cocke.⁹ Although this matter passed, the financial problems lingered on, and new troubles were added.

⁷Thomas Perkins Abernethy, From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee: A Study in Frontier Democracy (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932; reprint ed., Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1967), p. 166.

⁸Ibid., p. 167.

⁹Jackson to Cocke, 9 November 1797 and 24 June 1798, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:40, 48.

By 1804, his fortunes were "on the brink."¹⁰ He resigned his seat on the Superior Court,¹¹ sold off most of his property (including slaves), and finally sold his beautiful plantation, Hunter's Hill, writing, "I [have] turned myself out of house and home . . . purely to meet my engagements."¹² He and Rachel moved into a block house on the Hermitage property and, in a way, began all over again. Being the extraordinary man that he was, Jackson may have been unaffected by all this. It is difficult to believe, however, that his nerves and reserve were not strained along with his purse.

The road that led eventually to the duelling grounds on the Red River in Kentucky began at the horse track near Stone's River at Clover Bottom in Nashville. Horse racing had long been an important diversion for Jackson, and it is possible that his setbacks in the larger world of finance led him to take even greater comfort in an activity in which he felt easily competent. In any event, he purchased the famed Virginia stallion, Truxton, and offered to race him.

¹⁰James, Jackson, p. 98.

¹¹It has been suggested that he resigned from the bench because he hoped to be appointed Governor of Louisiana Territory; his failure to gain the appointment would be an added frustration. S. G. Heiskell, Andrew Jackson and Early Tennessee History, 3 vols. (Nashville: Ambrose Printing Co., 1918), 1:305.

¹²Jackson to Edward Ward, 7 May 1805, cited in James, Jackson, p. 98.

He raced, won, and established a reputation as a formidable foe--a reputation that was quickly challenged by another horseman of some renown, Captain Joseph Erwin, owner of Ploughboy.

The race between Truxton and Ploughboy was scheduled for the fall races at Clover Bottom for two out of three two mile heats, two thousand dollars to the winner, and an eight hundred dollar forfeit. When Ploughboy went lame before the race, Erwin paid the forfeit as agreed.¹³ A misunderstanding developed regarding the notes which were to be accepted as payment of the forfeit. The shortage of cash and the plentitude of notes in circulation in Tennessee had led the two interested parties, Captain Erwin and his son-in-law Charles Dickinson, on the one hand, and Jackson, Major W. P. Anderson, a Major Verrell, and a Captain Pryor, on the other, to agree in advance on a schedule of notes which would be mutually acceptable in payment of the wager or forfeit. When it actually came time to pay the forfeit, a minor disagreement arose regarding precisely which notes from the schedule were to be tendered, but the issue was resolved to the mutual satisfaction of all parties, and they took their leave in peace.¹⁴ Unfortunately, the matter was

¹³Parton, Jackson, 1:267-68.

¹⁴Joseph Erwin to Jackson, 4 January 1806, Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

not to be so easily settled, and what followed was as unnecessary as it was tragic.

A friend of Jackson, Patton Anderson, was relating the events of the payment and slanted the facts to make it appear as if Erwin and Dickinson had attempted to foist off some unscheduled notes on the Jackson group. When word of this reached Dickinson, he asked a young attorney in Nashville, Thomas Swann, to find out what was being said. Swann carried out his assignment, even speaking to Jackson, and returned to Dickinson, apparently with a garbled version of what he had heard. Dickinson then approached Jackson and demanded clarification of the story he had been told, whereupon Jackson said that whoever told him that (the Swann report) "was a damned lyar!"¹⁵ When Swann learned of Jackson's insult, he wrote a note protesting being referred to with such words.¹⁶ Jackson sought to soothe Swann by writing "if incautiously I inflict a wound, I always hasten to remove it; if offense is taken where none is offered or intended, it gives me no pain."¹⁷ But his cooler head boiled over a few lines later.

. . . The base poltroon and cowardly tale-bearer, will always act in the background. You can apply [that] to Mr. Dickinson. . . . I write it for his eye. . . .
When the conversation dropt between Mr. D. and myself,

¹⁵Statement by Thomas Swann, Impartial Review, 1 February 1806, quoted in Bassett, Correspondence, 1:22-23.

¹⁶Swann to Jackson, 3 January 1806, *ibid.*, 1:123.

¹⁷Jackson to Swann, 7 January 1806, *ibid.*, 1:124.

I tho't it was at an end. As he wishes to blow the coal, I am ready to light it to a blaze, that it may be consumed at once, and finally extinguished. . . . Should any thing herein contained give Mr. Dickinson the spleen, I will furnish him with an anodine. . . .¹⁸

Jackson was trying to assuage Swann and perhaps intimidate Dickinson; but Swann would not be assuaged, and Dickinson would not be intimidated. There are two roads which lead from this note, and, while the matter with Dickinson is of greater importance, Swann's way needs to be quickly trod.

Thomas Swann, a young lawyer in Nashville, newly arrived from Virginia, has not been dealt with kindly by Jackson's biographers. He has been depicted as something of a meddlesome, social-climbing young twit whose major contribution was to make himself officious.¹⁹ Perhaps Swann viewed the troubles between Jackson and Dickinson as a vehicle in which he could get some public notice for himself, or perhaps he was just as anxious to establish his reputation as Jackson had been in 1788 in Jonesboro. In any event, Jackson had no desire to fight Swann but Swann had a great desire to fight Jackson in a gentleman's duel. To this end he wrote Jackson

Think not that I am to be intimidated by your threats. No power terrestrial shall prevent the settled purpose of my soul. . . . The torrent of obusive language with which you have assailed me is such [that I] now demand

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹W. W. Clayton, History of Davidson County, Tennessee (Philadelphia: J. W. Lewis, 1880), p. 147.

of you that reparation which one gentleman is entitled to receive of another. My friend the bearer of this is authorised to make complete arrangements in the field of honor.²⁰

Jackson refused to respond to this note but told its bearer, Nathaniel McNairy, a younger brother of John McNairy, that he had not meant any of his harsh words for Swann, and that Swann "could not by any possible fair construction make them apply to [himself]."²¹ Jackson then told McNairy that he would be in town the next day.

On the next day, 13 January 1806, Jackson and John Coffee did go into Nashville, and they stopped by Winn's Tavern where they expected to have a confrontation with Swann.²² A few moments after their arrival Swann walked into the room, and Jackson rose to the challenger, striking him "a very severe blow" with his cane which staggered Swann. As Jackson backed up and prepared to strike again, he stumbled backwards over some chairs and would have fallen

²⁰Swann to Jackson, 12 January 1806, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:139.

²¹Statement of Swann, 1 February 1806(?), *ibid.*, 1:125-26. It is possible that there was a Bacchus factor involved in Jackson's harshness to Swann. In the above statement Swann accuses him of having spent the afternoon drinking before riding to town with Coffee; also, Jackson and John Verrell shortly thereafter "took the pledge," with the first man to have a drink agreeing to buy the other a suit of clothes. "Jackson's pledge not to drink ardent spirits," 24 January 1806, *ibid.*, 1:122.

²²The several descriptions of the events offered by Swann and bystanders do not disagree on any matters of importance. Swann's Statement, 1 February; Coffee's Statement, 5 February; and Statement of Thomas Augustine Claiborne, 1 February 1806, *ibid.*, 1:126, 129-32, 133-34.

into the fireplace had not some bystanders stopped his fall. Swann stuck his hand into his coat as if to draw a pistol, but Jackson produced his own handgun more quickly and was prepared to shoot it out. As in the incident with Sevier at Southwest Point, Jackson had gotten his gun to the ready more quickly than his opponent but did not use the advantage to kill. With probable death as the consequence of further movement, Swann withdrew his hand protesting that he had come in peace to seek an accommodation and then left the room. Although Swann would continue to press Jackson for the duel, even to the extent of producing certificates attesting to his status as a gentleman,²³ Jackson condescendingly let it be known that he would meet him "in any situation except that of a gentleman . . . [or] he would meet any gentleman of equal standing with himself who would espouse Mr. Swann's cause. . . ." ²⁴ Jackson was washing his hands of Swann and putting on his gloves for the primary antagonist, Charles Dickinson, whom he suspected of being behind the troubles with Swann.²⁵

²³Nashville Impartial Review, 24 May 1806, quoted in *ibid.*, 1:138.

²⁴Statement of John Purdy, 3 January 1806, *ibid.*, 1:132.

²⁵John Coffee and Nathaniel McNairy fought a duel, probably as a spin-off of the Jackson-Dickinson affair. Parton, Jackson, 1:286-89; Statement of Andrew Jackson, 8 February 1806, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:137.

Charles Dickinson is familiar to students of Tennessee history and has already been mentioned in this paper, but a further introduction is in order. He was born in Caroline County, Maryland, in 1778, into a leading family of that area. He later went to Richmond, Virginia, where he read law with John Marshall and then moved to Nashville in 1801. In Nashville, he established himself as a rather fashionable and successful young lawyer. He married into the locally-prominent Erwin family. His father-in-law Captain Joseph Erwin was an old acquaintance and frequent track rival of Jackson.²⁶ As has been shown, it was an incident of the race track that led Jackson and Dickinson to duel, but there may have been another source of their disagreement.

Most accounts of the events leading to the duel mention that Dickinson had, on two occasions before the incident at the track, made insulting remarks about Rachel. They note that Jackson had confronted Dickinson, and Dickinson had apologized for the remarks which he claimed were made under the influence of alcohol. Actually, it is difficult to establish that the conventional wisdom is correct. Nowhere in the correspondence between the two men does either make mention of it, nor do either even allude to

²⁶All of Jackson's major biographers carry sketches of Dickinson. Also, see Wirt Armstrong Cate, "'Peach Blossom' and the Jackson-Dickinson Duel," Nashville Banner, 12 April 1955.

it. Recall that in the Sevier affair Jackson had frequently damned him for "taking the name of a lady into [his] polluted lips." He never accused Dickinson of this and, while this does not prove that Dickinson did not insult Rachel, it does call into question precisely what source historians have used as evidence. Most do not cite a primary source, and those who do refer directly or indirectly to Parton. Parton's source is itself an extrapolation from a conversation he had with General Sam Houston. Houston told Parton that Jackson had gone to Captain Erwin and asked him to control his son-in-law saying, "I wish no quarrel with him, he is being used by my enemies in Nashville, who are urging him to pick a quarrel with me. Advise him to stop in time."²⁷ Upon that statement rests the case for those who have made Dickinson the drunken defamer.

This writer does not seek to acquit Dickinson of the charges because they help explain why Jackson reacted as violently as he did to what otherwise was a trivial incident. There is an interesting piece of circumstantial evidence that indicates culpability on Dickinson's part at an early point in the development of the affair. In an unpublished letter to Jackson, John Hoggatt claims to have been present at a conversation between Erwin and Dickinson on 25 December 1805, in which the two were discussing the

²⁷Parton, Jackson, 1:269.

troubles between Dickinson and Jackson, and Erwin noted that a duel would likely have to be fought. Dickinson assured his father-in-law that he would not flinch if it came to a duel but felt that Jackson would refuse to fight. Erwin then replied that "By God" he thought Dickinson could kill Jackson because Dickinson was the better shot.²⁸ The timing of the conversation is of great importance because it occurred three days before the meeting of the three men in Nashville at which they apparently ironed out their disagreements. It is, therefore, chronologically possible that the eight hundred dollar misunderstanding was the cause of the conversation of 25 December but, by itself, that does not seem sufficient to evoke such emotions. It seems probable that there was an additional irritant, and it is conceivable that the irritant may have been Dickinson's unsavory remarks but, at best, the evidence is highly conjectural. In this writer's opinion, the facts neither compel nor even strongly suggest the conclusion that Dickinson was the slanderer Jackson's biographers have made him out to be.²⁹

The exchanges between Jackson and Dickinson are also curious. Contrary to the impression given by Parton and

²⁸Hoggett to Jackson, 24 January 1806, Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

²⁹Interestingly, Bassett's biography of Jackson does not suggest that Dickinson had made the slanders.

James, a close study of the notes suggests that Jackson, not Dickinson, was the primary instigator of the duel. When Jackson wrote on 7 January that Dickinson was a "base poltroon and cowardly tale-bearer . . . and should [this] give Mr. Dickinson the spleen, I will furnish him with an anodine . . .," Dickinson penned his response,³⁰ gave it to a friend to be published when Jackson returned to town, and left for New Orleans on 11 January.³¹ In his absence several things happened.

On February 1, Nashville's founding father, General James Robertson, wrote Jackson counseling restraint and urging him to "avoid . . . a duel."³² James notes that in this letter the "old gentleman had the delicacy not to mention Rachel." Perhaps there was nothing to mention. Jackson ignored Robertson's advice when he scalded Dickinson a week later as "a worthless, drunken, blackguard scoundrel."³³ Dickinson was out of town when this appeared in the press; but when his father-in-law read Jackson's message, he responded and included a letter which Dickinson

³⁰Dickinson to Jackson, 10 January 1806, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:128-29.

³¹Swann to Erwin, 16 June 1806, Nashville Impartial Review, 21 June 1806, *ibid.*, 1:148.

³²Robertson to Jackson, 1 February 1806, quoted in James, Jackson, p. 110.

³³Jackson to Thomas Eastin, printer of the Nashville Impartial Review, 8 February 1806, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:138.

had left with him. This letter was obviously meant as a rejoinder to Jackson's correspondence of 7 January. It said, in part,

. . . as to the word coward, I think it is as applicable to yourself as any one I know, and I shall be very glad when an opportunity serves to know in what manner you give anodynes, and hope you will take in payment, one of my most moderate Cathartick.

He closed, "Yours at Command, Charles Dickinson."³⁴

While the readers of the Nashville Impartial Review may have been getting the impression that Dickinson's head was the cooler of the two, the long awaited race between Truxton and Ploughboy was finally run on 3 April. Jackson described the crowd as "the largest concourse of people I ever saw assembled, unless in an army."³⁵ The contest was doubly dramatic because, in addition to its being a bad-blood, grudge match, Truxton had a "serious hurt in his thigh." Jackson refused to forfeit, and Truxton won the match, winning "the last heat under a hard bearing rain . . ."; and, as Jackson put it, "thus ends the fate of ploughboy." But another fate, Atropos, had not yet been heard from.

³⁴Dickinson to Jackson, 13 February 1806, Nashville Impartial Review, 22 February 1806, *ibid.*, 1:140. Erwin's cover letter states that this was part of the previously mentioned 10 January letter which, for an unknown reason, Eastin had not published when he had published the first half in January.

³⁵Jackson to John Hutchings, 7 April 1806, *ibid.*, 1:111-12. The description of the race is taken from this letter which Jackson erroneously dated 1805.

Dickinson arrived back in Nashville on 20 May full of energy; ten days later he would be dead. In the interim he was busy. This was his first opportunity to respond to Jackson's blistering attack of 8 February, and he did so without delay. Parton and James provide the anecdotes for those first few days after his return. On 21 May Dickinson wrote his reply to the 8 February message and gave it to the editor of the Nashville Impartial Review to be published 24 May. On 22 May, Thomas Overton³⁶ read it and told Jackson: "It's a piece that can't be passed over. General, you must challenge." Jackson then went to the newspaper office, read it for himself, and challenged Dickinson.³⁷

The offending missive is actually little more than a "you're one, too," statement. The first four of the five paragraphs are bland; the final one is not (referring to the 8 February letter):

Another part of his publication of the same date, is as follows. "He [alluding to Mr. Swann] has acted the puppet and lying valit, for a worthless, drunken, black-guard scoundrel," etc etc. Should Andrew Jackson have intended these epithets for me [emphasis added], I declair him (notwithstanding he is a major general of the militia of Mero District) to be a worthless scoundrel "a poltroon and a coward," a man who, by frivolous and evasive pretexts, avoided giving the satisfaction, which was due to a gentleman whom he had injured. This had prevented me from calling on him in the manner I should other wise have done; for I am well convinced, that he is too great a coward to administer

³⁶Thomas was the brother of Jackson's friend John Overton.

³⁷Parton, Jackson, 1:289-91; James, Jackson, p. 113.

any of those anodynes he promised me in his letter to Mr. Swann. His excuse I anticipate that his anodynes have been in such demand, since I left Tennessee, that he is out of the necessary ingredients to mix them. I expect to leave Nashville the first of next week for Maryland.

Yours etc
Charles Dickinson³⁸

If Dickinson's intent was to provoke Jackson into challenging him, he succeeded. If, however, his intent was to respond to Jackson's name-calling in a like manner, then he underestimated his man. It seems most probable that, in poker terminology, he was calling Jackson and upping the stakes somewhat. Jackson had earlier insulted and offered to fight Dickinson; and now Dickinson was returning the insult, saying that Jackson was too great a coward to administer any of those "anodynes" he had promised.

Whatever Dickinson's intent, Jackson responded with a formal challenge which gave three reasons for the call. First, Dickinson's "conduct and expressions" relative to him "of late" had been insulting; second, Dickinson had disturbed his quiet by "industriously" exciting Thomas Swann; and, third, the "very insulting letter" of 10 January.³⁹ This bill of particulars made no allusions to any slanders on Rachel.

Dickinson accepted Jackson's challenge the day it was offered. After brief negotiations during which Dickinson

³⁸Dickinson to Jackson, 21 May 1806, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:142-43.

³⁹Jackson to Dickinson, 23 May 1806, *ibid.*, 1:143-45.

was asking for a delay, their seconds, Hanson Catlet for Dickinson and Thomas Overton for Jackson, made the arrangements: the weapons, Jackson's brace of nine inch barrel pistols with Dickinson getting first choice; the time, Friday, 30 June 1806, at seven o'clock in the morning; the place, about forty miles north of Nashville in Logan County, Kentucky, at Harrison's Mills where the middle fork of the Red River crosses into Tennessee; the procedure, the men facing each other with their pistols held perpendicularly and, on command, firing when they pleased; and, the distance, twenty-four feet.⁴⁰

It has been rumored, and confirmed to James's satisfaction, that Dickinson was offering wagers on the streets of Nashville that he would kill Jackson.⁴¹ It is known that Dickinson was the better marksman of the two. It was, therefore, necessary to devise a strategem, and it was decided Jackson would wear a loose-fitting coat to deceive Dickinson's aim; and, also, he would hold his fire until his quicker opponent had fired and then take his own shot

⁴⁰Agreements of Catlet and Overton, 23 and 24 May 1806, *ibid.*, 1:145; clipping, "General Jackson's Duel with Dickinson," *Harper's Weekly*, 8 January 1859, pp. 21-22, in Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁴¹James, Jackson, p. 15.

unhurriedly.⁴² He was, of course, betting his life that this would work.

On the ride to Kentucky, Jackson discussed his plans with Overton, who was well versed in the finer points of the art. The stories that Dickinson preceded him on the road and left examples of his superior marksmanship behind, such as silver dollars with the centers shot out, are persistent but unconfirmed by any members of either party.⁴³ Around eight o'clock in the evening of 29 June, Jackson's party arrived at Miller's Tavern in Kentucky and spent the night. Dickinson's party stayed a few miles down the road at William Harrison's establishment.

On the dawning of 30 June, the two groups met on the bank of the Red River. Dickinson's man won the toss for choice of position; therefore, Overton was to give the command to fire. Once the men took their positions, Overton asked if they were ready and, after they answered in the affirmative, he cried, "Fire!" Dickinson did so immediately, hitting Jackson in the breastbone and breaking

⁴²It is generally conceded that the idea of a loose-fitting coat was Overton's, whereas Jackson decided on the delayed fire strategy himself. James C. Curtis, Andrew Jackson and the Search for Vindication (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976), p. 36; Parton, Jackson, 1:289; Clayton, Davidson County, p. 148; Bassett, Jackson; press clippings, Nashville Banner, 8 January 1897, Bettie M. Donelson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; and John Trotwood Moore, "Andrew Jackson's Duel in a New Light," New York Times, 15 March 1925, Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁴³James, Jackson, p. 115.

two ribs. Jackson clutched his chest but did not fall. Thinking he had missed, Dickinson moved from the line but was ordered back; he returned and folded his arms to await Jackson's shot. Jackson squeezed the trigger, but the pistol stopped at half-cock. He re-cocked the weapon and shot Dickinson mortally; he would die at nine o'clock that evening. When Overton noticed that his man had been hit, it is said that Jackson commented, "Oh, I believe that he pinked me, but I don't want those people [Dickinson's group] to know."⁴⁴ Another part of the legend has it that Jackson said that he would have returned Dickinson's shot even if he had shot him through the brain.⁴⁵

Those who lionize Jackson's behavior on the field that day may well be making a virtue of necessity, and there were many in Nashville following the duel who saw little virtue in what Jackson had done. In response to a petition with seventy-two names, the 7 June 1806 issue of the Nashville Impartial Review was published with a black border to signify the mourning of Charles Dickinson. A subsequent issue carried letters from Thomas Swann and Captain Erwin denouncing Jackson. Erwin was especially critical of the re-cocking of Jackson's pistol, and he argued since the men had not agreed in writing that a snap was not to be

⁴⁴Parton, Jackson, 1:300; James, Jackson, p. 118.

⁴⁵James, Jackson, p. 118.

considered as a fire then Jackson had violated the rules.⁴⁶ If this were true then Jackson would be guilty of a very serious breach in the gentleman's code, but Bassett comments that tradition has it that, when his pistol stopped at half-cock, Jackson showed it to the seconds; and they ruled that he was entitled to another fire.⁴⁷ This is partially confirmed by Hanson Catlet's statement that "the affair of honor . . . was conducted agreeably to what was agreed upon, so far as any agreements were made,"⁴⁸ although this does not preclude Erwin's contention.

The moral question of Jackson's having killed an effectively defenseless man is perhaps a more serious charge. Don C. Seitz, a student of American duels, has written that, when some duelists' pistols stopped at half-cock, they would have had mercy, but "there was no mercy in Jackson's soul"; he later refers to Jackson as "savage."⁴⁹ John Trotwood Moore permits Jackson to defend himself by quoting the general: "I would never have killed him if I had not felt that I was mortally wounded myself. But believing this, I believe now I would have lived long enuf

⁴⁶Nashville Impartial Review, 21 June 1806.

⁴⁷Bassett, Jackson, p. 64.

⁴⁸Statement of Catlet, 20 June 1806, Figuers Collection, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁴⁹Don C. Seitz, Famous American Duels: With Some Account of the Causes that Led up to Them and the Men Engaged (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1929), pp. 154-55.

to kill him if he had shot me through the heart."⁵⁰
 Unfortunately, this statement is not found elsewhere and, even if it were, Jackson would still stand accused of an infamous act; in fact, Bassett said: "It was little less than murder."⁵¹ Evaluating the public reaction to the duel, Parton wrote that "it is certain that at no time between the years 1806 and 1812, could General Jackson have been elected to any office in Tennessee that required a majority of the voters of the whole state."⁵²

Between his duel with Dickinson and his embroilment with the Bentons, Jackson was indicted by the Davidson County grand jury for assault and battery with the intent to kill one Samuel Jackson.⁵³ Two things are known about Samuel Jackson: it was he who overheard Patton Anderson's garbled rendition of the payment of the forfeit and carried the story to Dickinson, and it was he to whom Swann made an unsolicited offer of a two hundred dollar loan.⁵⁴ Although Swann reneged on the offer, it does suggest the possibility of a curious conspiracy: was the money meant as

⁵⁰Moore, "Jackson's Duel."

⁵¹Bassett, Jackson, p. 64.

⁵²Parton, Jackson, 1:305.

⁵³The State v. Andrew Jackson, 9 November 1807, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:182.

⁵⁴Statement by Thomas Swann, 1 February 1806; Statement of Robert Butler, 3 February 1806, *ibid.*, 1:122, 133.

a reward for past services rendered, or might it have been an inducement to secure Anderson's cooperation in the future? No matter; the famous "Coffin Hand Bill," which, of course, must be taken with a large measure of salt, described the encounter for which Andrew Jackson was indicted thusly--Andrew was berating Samuel on the streets of Nashville and, when the latter stooped to pick up a rock, the former drew his sword from its cane and ran it through the entirety of Samuel's body, entering in the back and exiting at his breast. The handbill remarks that Andrew Jackson was acquitted because he and his friends were able to convince the trial jury that he had acted in self-defense.⁵⁵

Just as the Allison debts and the sale of his plantation at Hunter's Hill may have generally tintured Jackson's temperament during the time proceeding the Dickinson duel, so, too, he may have been suffering from another bout of generalized frustration because of the failure of his division of Tennessee volunteers to be given an opportunity to fight and gain honor on its expedition to Natchez in early 1813. Jackson had invested a great deal of time, and some of his own money, in raising a division of troops which he hoped to lead in the conquest of west Florida. Their mission, however, was aborted in Natchez when Jackson received orders from the War Department that

⁵⁵"Coffin Hand Bill," *ibid.*, 3:463-64.

their services would not be needed after all. He was told to disband his 2,070 men on the spot, turn over all his government property to his bitter rival General James Wilkerson, and get back to Nashville the best way he could. Jackson decided to do none of those things and instead led his men home, paying part of the expenses himself. What a trip for a man who was so anxious to do combat that he had agreed to fight even if he were given only the rank of sergeant!⁵⁶ He had won the respect of his men and the nickname "Old Hickory" but not military glory.⁵⁷

The journey had been frustrating for other members of the expedition. Colonel Thomas Hart Benton had quarrelled with and later challenged Quarter-Master William B. Lewis,⁵⁸ and several of the officers were angry with the Brigade-Inspector, William Carroll, to whom Jackson had apparently shown favor.⁵⁹ When the party arrived back in Nashville,

⁵⁶Jackson to Governor Willie Blount, 11 November 1812, *ibid.*, 1:238.

⁵⁷Bassett, Jackson, pp. 77-87.

⁵⁸The two men exchanged insults and charges in every issue of the Clarion and Tennessee Gazette from 9 February through 27 April 1813; Benton challenged, but Lewis demurred.

⁵⁹Jackson to W. B. Lewis, 4 March 1813, quoted in James, Jackson, p. 151; Curtis, Jackson, p. 47.

Lieutenant Littleton Johnson⁶⁰ challenged Carroll but was refused the duel.⁶¹

Johnson challenged again, this time with Thomas Hart Benton's younger brother Jesse acting as his friend. Carroll again refused Johnson but made it clear to Benton that, "if he would volunteer in his [Johnson's] behalf, he [Benton] should be accommodated with a meeting."⁶² When Carroll sought Jackson's advice, Jackson tried to dissuade him from fighting; but, when he could not do so, he agreed to serve as Carroll's second and coach.

Since Benton technically was the challenger, Carroll "according to the universal law of honor . . . had the right to choose his mode, time and place of fighting . . .,"⁶³ and

⁶⁰Johnson was a friend of the Bentons; he had been used by Thomas Hart Benton to carry his challenge to Lewis. William N. Chambers, "The Thwarted Warrior: The Last Years of Thomas Hart Benton in Tennessee, 1812-1815," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 22 (1950):30.

⁶¹Accounts of the Carroll-Benton duel are usually found with accounts of the Jackson-Benton affair, and they are all based on material found in Bassett, Correspondence, 1:308-19, 3:266-67; Parton, Jackson, 1:386-98. Benton's biographies add nothing of substance. William M. Meigs, The Life of Thomas Hart Benton (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1904); William Nisbet Chambers, Old Bullion Benton: Senator from the West (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956); Elbert B. Smith, "Now Defend Yourself, You Damned Rascal!," American Heritage 9 (February 1958):44-47, 106; and idem, Magnificent Missourian: The Life of Thomas Hart Benton (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1958).

⁶²The best source of information regarding the Carroll-Benton duel is a letter from Carroll to Andrew J. Donelson, 4 October 1824, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:311-12.

⁶³Jackson to Thomas Hart Benton, July 1813, *ibid.*, 1:314.

he used his options well. To compensate for Benton's better marksmanship, Carroll dictated that the distance be ten feet and that the men should stand with their backs to each other and, on the command, wheel around and fire. Benton was not informed in advance of either of these conditions, and Jackson saw to it that Carroll practiced in the mode. The time was set at six o'clock in the morning, 14 June, and the place, apparently, in or near Nashville, Tennessee's, statutory proscriptions notwithstanding.

The duel was consummated in accord with these rules. Perhaps Carroll was following Jackson's advice or example when he let Benton fire first; the shot inflicted a slight wound on his left thumb. As Carroll fired, Benton, for an unknown reason, stooped or squatted over causing "a portion of his frame, that was always prominent, to be more prominent still."⁶⁴ Carroll's bullet inflicted a long and raking wound across Benton's hip which "did far more injury to the spirit than to the flesh."⁶⁵ Benton's conduct and the comical nature of the wound became a standing joke around Tennessee for several years and, more than a decade later, Jackson would refer to "the redoubtable hero, of squating memory, Jesse Benton. . . ."⁶⁶

⁶⁴Parton, Jackson, 1:388.

⁶⁵James, Jackson, p. 152.

⁶⁶Jackson to John Coffee, 23 September 1824, Bassett, Correspondence, 3:266.

Jesse's tale of sorrows traveled quickly to brother Thomas who, ironically, had been in Washington at the time of the duel, successfully presenting Jackson's financial claims arising from the Natchez expedition to the government.⁶⁷ In fact, the relationship between the two men had heretofore been a close and friendly one. But the Benton blood ran hot and thick, and Thomas was disturbed by the role played by his erstwhile commander.

There are some interesting parallels between these once and future friends. While there is obvious hyperbole in Harnett T. Kane's statement that Thomas Hart Benton "drew duels the way a blue serge suit draws lint . . .,"⁶⁸ he had, in the words of William Nisbet Chambers, a "trigger-touchy sense of personal honor."⁶⁹ In a schoolyard quarrel at the age of fifteen, Thomas had drawn a pistol on a boy who had called him a "damned rascal."⁷⁰ Like Jackson, Benton had been born and raised in the Carolinas, descended from Scotch-Irish (and English) stock and grew of age in a home dominated, as he later recalled, by a strong and pious

⁶⁷With equal fervor and success, Benton pursued a commission in the regular army for himself. Benton to Jackson, 15 June 1813, *ibid.*, 1:308; Chambers, "Thwarted Warrior," pp. 32-33.

⁶⁸Harnett T. Kane, Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1951), p. 184.

⁶⁹Chambers, Old Bullion Benton, p. xiii.

⁷⁰Smith, Magnificent Missourian, p. 19.

mother.⁷¹ His lawyer and militia-inspector father was often absent from their home and died when Thomas was eight, after losing a five year bout with consumption. His mother, Ann Gooch Benton, was a devout Episcopalian, and after her husband's death she managed their large household of eight children. There are descriptions of her as "a woman of force" and "the chief influence in the home education of Benton."⁷²

Apparently, she was similar to Elizabeth Jackson, and it is likely that their notable sons were strongly influenced by them. It is at least possible that both men were aggressive, in part, because of their absent fathers, because they internalized the ambitions and iron wills of their mothers, and because they were raised in large families where they may have developed their high senses of personal honor or worth in order to maintain identities.

It is certain that both men would rise to defend their loved ones: Jackson had done so in the case of Rachel, and now Thomas Hart Benton did so in the case of Jesse. When news of the duel reached him, he was shocked that Jackson had so actively participated in Carroll's behalf, and Benton responded with some "ill natured

⁷¹Chambers, Old Bullion Benton, pp. 11-12.

⁷²Theodore Roosevelt, Thomas Hart Benton (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914), p. 24; Meigs, Benton, p. 18; Chambers, Old Bullion Benton, p. 12; and Smith, Magnificent Missourian, p. 18.

expressions"⁷³ about the general. Stories were bandied about until finally Jackson wrote to him, asking what his intentions were.⁷⁴ Benton replied immediately, listing the reasons he felt Jackson had acted unwisely and unfairly in the late unpleasantness, and he closed his letter saying that he had not threatened Jackson nor would he, and he had not published against him, nor would he; but,

. . . at the same time the terror of your pistols is not to seal up my lips. What I believe to be true, I shall speak; and if for this I am called to account, it must even be so. I shall neither seek, nor decline, a duel with you.⁷⁵

Jackson responded with the admonition that "it is the character of the man of honor . . . not to quarrel and brawl like a fish woman."⁷⁶ He justified his own conduct in the duel and reiterated his charge that Benton was maligning him and should either apologize or "demand . . . satisfaction."⁷⁷ Benton did neither, choosing rather to hold his peace in Franklin. Since Jackson had threatened to

⁷³Andrew Hynes to Jackson, 16 July 1813, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:309-10.

⁷⁴Jackson to Benton, 19 July 1813, *ibid.*, 1:310.

⁷⁵Benton to Jackson, 25 July 1813, *ibid.*, 1:314.

⁷⁶Jackson to Benton, 28 July 1813(?), *ibid.*

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 1:315.

horsewhip him "on sight,"⁷⁸ Benton was apparently doing his best not to be seen.

On Saturday, 4 September 1813, the Bentons were in Nashville on business. They stayed at the Talbot Hotel,⁷⁹ as they knew that Jackson and his friends normally headquartered themselves at the Nashville Inn, and they wished to avoid an encounter. But it was not to be avoided. When news of Benton's presence in town arrived, Jackson and John Coffee sallied forth on what gives evidence of being a search and destroy mission. The Nashville Inn and Talbot's faced each other on perpendicular streets with a public square between them and the post office next to Talbot's. Jackson and Coffee walked slowly across the square directly to the post office, perhaps trying to lure the Bentons out. When Thomas and Jesse refused to make the first move, Jackson and Coffee returned to their hotel indirectly, that is, down the sidewalk in front of Talbot's. Upon reaching Talbot's door and finding Thomas still in it, Jackson stepped into both the door and Thomas's face, and what

⁷⁸Heiskell, Jackson and Early Tennessee History, pp. 334-35, considers Jackson's difficulties with the Bentons to be "one of the most serious mistakes he made in his career. . . .," especially this public threat which Jackson then either had to carry out or appear as a coward.

⁷⁹Parton, Jackson, 1:391, and James, Jackson, p. 153, refer to the City Hotel, as the place was later known, but in 1813 it was the Talbot. Certificate of James W. Sitler, 5 September 1813, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:317.

followed was, in Thomas's words, "the most outrageous affray ever witnessed in a civilized country."⁸⁰

Jackson initiated the action by raising his riding whip and declaring, "Now defend yourself, you damned rascal!" Benton took this proffered advice and reached for his pistol, but Jackson more quickly drew his own and placed it at Benton's chest. As Benton slowly backed up, Jackson slowly moved forward. The unseen Jesse appeared in the room behind Jackson and shot him, severely wounding him in his left shoulder. As he was hit, Jackson fired an errant shot that burned a powder hole in Thomas's sleeve.⁸¹

The shots drew others into the fracas. A bystander, James W. Sitler, heard the shooting and ran into the hotel where he saw Jesse standing over the fallen Jackson with a pistol in his hand. Sitler quickly pulled Jackson out of the line of fire. Then Coffee rushed in, fired at Thomas unsuccessfully, and charged, with the obvious intention of pistol whipping him. The again retreating Thomas then fell backwards down a flight of stairs, thus removing the two principles from the field. Subsequent action saw Stockley Hays, a nephew of Rachel Jackson, come within a button of killing Jesse Benton. Hays lunged at him with his sword

⁸⁰Benton's account of the duel, 10 September 1813, Bassett, Correspondence, 1:317.

⁸¹Jackson would later claim that he had not fired his pistol, although this is contradicted by eyewitness testimony. Jackson's memorandum about his duels, 23 September 1824(?), *ibid.*, 3:267.

cane but it struck a large button on Benton's coat and shattered. In a "paroxysm of fury,"⁸² he threw Jesse to the floor, drew his dirk, and was attempting to remove his heart when a crowd of sufficient size was able to separate everyone and restore peace.

Jackson was removed to the Nashville Inn where, according to Rachel Jackson, his blood soaked two mattresses. A suggested amputation of the arm was firmly refused by Jackson and he carried Jesse's bullet in his shoulder for almost twenty years.⁸³ As he lay near death, the Bentons gathered outside the inn and taunted Jackson, inviting him to come out and renew the combat. Thomas even publicly broke Jackson's sword as a sign of contempt and defiance. Public opinion in Nashville strongly favored Jackson, and Benton complained: "I am literally in hell here."⁸⁴ Jackson's "puppys" were barking after him, and he said that Tecumseh's scalping-knife would be preferable to the affidavits of the Jackson men.

Less than two weeks after the Jackson fracas, Thomas Benton was again "drawing lint." He interpreted a statement made by William Carroll to be a challenge, and Benton wrote to him that "the challenge you addressed to me in your

⁸²Parton, Jackson, 1:394.

⁸³Jackson to Coffee, 21 January 1832, Bassett, Correspondence, 4:400.

⁸⁴Parton, Jackson, 1:395-96.

publication of yesterday is accepted."⁸⁵ Fortunately, Carroll was able to put him off and thus prevent the larger quarrel from going the full circle of Jesse Benton v. Carroll; Thomas and Jesse Benton v. Jackson; and, finally, Thomas Benton v. Carroll.⁸⁶

The proud Thomas Benton served under Jackson soon thereafter in the War of 1812, but Jackson prevented him from winning the laurels of battle; on the eve of both the battles of Horseshoe Bend and New Orleans, Jackson ordered Benton back to Nashville to help recruit new troops.⁸⁷ Benton saw that his future lay elsewhere, and, in 1815, he moved to the Missouri Territory; within two years he fought two duels with Charles Lucas, killing him in the second one on 26 September 1818.⁸⁸ Thomas Benton and Jackson did not see each other again until 1823 when, as United States Senators, they made their reconciliation.⁸⁹ Jesse, however,

⁸⁵Benton to Carroll, 16 September 1813, cited in Chambers, "Thwarted Warrior," p. 36.

⁸⁶Carroll wrote that he had not wished to challenge Benton, but if Benton chose to challenge him then he would oblige. Carroll to Benton, 16 September 1813, cited in Chambers, "Thwarted Warrior," p. 37.

⁸⁷Chambers, "Thwarted Warrior," pp. 38-39.

⁸⁸Seitz, Famous American Duels, pp. 169-75.

⁸⁹John H. Eaton to Rachel Jackson, 18 December 1823, Bassett, Correspondence, 3:217.

never forgave Jackson and as late as 1828 he was calling him "a man polluted with every crime."⁹⁰

While Jackson certainly was not guilty of every crime, he was guilty of more than a few. His duel with Waightstill Avery was his only "legal" duel because North Carolina law did not prohibit the practice per se in 1788. In 1801, the Tennessee legislature made it willful murder to kill in a duel and ruled that the survivor "shall suffer death without benefit of clergy." The law provided sanctions of a fifty dollar fine and thirty days in jail to bearers of a challenge; a fifty dollar fine, sixty days in jail, and loss of citizenship for one year for attempting to fight a duel; and a fifty dollar fine and one year loss of citizenship for accepting a challenge.⁹¹ In 1803, therefore, Judge Jackson, Governor Sevier, and Secretary of State Maclin should all have been fined and sent to jail. None were. The concluding chapter of this dissertation will comment further on this remarkable social acceptance of violence.

Jackson's 1806 duel with Dickinson was fought in Kentucky to avoid the jurisdiction of Tennessee law. Since Dickinson's friends did not seek an indictment, it is

⁹⁰Jesse Benton's "Plea to the Public," 30 October 1828, John Knibb Winn Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁹¹Edward Scott, Scott's Revision of the Laws of Tennessee and North Carolina, 1715-1820, 2 vols. (Knoxville: Heiskell and Brown, 1821), 1:717-19.

assumed that the law did not reach that far. Kentucky law provided for a fine of between \$150 and \$500 for duelling, but Jackson was not charged.⁹² In 1809, the Tennessee General Assembly passed a law stating that anyone who gave or received a challenge, within or without the state, or anyone carrying a challenge, could never again hold public office, give testimony in any court of record, or serve as a juror. By denying the right to hold public office, these sanctions seem to be aimed toward middle and upper class persons, which gives evidence of the class nature of the practice. The 1809 law called it slander if the unwilling party to a challenge were charged "with being a coward, poltroon, or any such words . . . whether spoken to a third person, or published in a newspaper. . . ." ⁹³ Jesse Benton, Andrew Jackson, and William Carroll were all violators of these laws in 1813. None was punished.

Although the 1801 and 1809 laws were clear, it was necessary in 1817 to revise them. Noting that they had been "ineffectual to prevent a practice so generally condemned by the more thinking part of society,"⁹⁴ the legislature, under

⁹²William Littell, The Statute Laws of Kentucky, 2: 284-85, cited by Coleman, Famous Kentucky Duels, pp. 2-3.

⁹³Act of 19 October 1802, Chapter 5, Scott's Revision, 1:1127-28.

⁹⁴Ibid., 2:364-65.

the prodding of Hugh Lawson White,⁹⁵ passed an act which established a test oath to be required of all state officers, civil, military, judicial, and executive, before they would be allowed to take their oaths of office. They would be required to "solemnly swear on the Holy Evangelists of Almighty GOD" that they had never given or accepted a challenge, fought a duel, served as the bearer of a challenge, or as a second in a duel at any time from passage of that act in 1817. They also swore never to do any of these things in the future, "SO HELP ME GOD." The present constitution of Tennessee continues this spirit by prohibiting duelists and their minions from holding offices of honor or profit in the state.⁹⁶

The violence of Andrew Jackson reflects both continuity and change. He was ever sensitive to his reputation; perhaps he grew even more sensitive through the years. His fights with Avery and Sevier were understandable reactions to clear deprecations, but his duel with Dickinson and the fight with the Bentons manifests a seemingly more calculated design for revenge. It almost seems that he had grown able to control his rages but not his anger.

⁹⁵Nancy N. Scott, ed., A Memoir of Hugh Lawson White: With Selections From His Speeches and Correspondence (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1856), p. 23.

⁹⁶Tennessee, Constitution, Art. 9, sec. 3.

CHAPTER IV

POLITICIANS, SOLDIERS, AND ENTREPRENEURS

The subjects of this chapter are three gentlemen with upper class credentials: Sam Houston, two term Congressman and the seventh Governor of Tennessee, commander-in-chief of the army of Texas during its rebellion against Mexico, President of Texas, United States Senator from Texas, and then seventh Governor of that state; Nathan Bedford Forrest, the much praised and daring Confederate cavalry officer who rose to the rank of lieutenant-general; and Joseph A. Mabry, a man of great power and wealth in post-Civil War Tennessee. These gentlemen and leaders shared among themselves at least four criminal assaults and three homicides.

Sam Houston rightly follows Andrew Jackson in this paper, as he advantageously followed him in Tennessee.¹ In

¹The most accessible source of primary material about Houston is Donald Day and Harry Herbert Ullom, eds., The Autobiography of Sam Houston (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954); the most scholarly work, which is based on her Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Texas, is Llerena B. Friend, Sam Houston: The Great Designer (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1954); and the colorful and lively Marquis James, The Raven: A Biography of Sam Houston (New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1929), supplies much detail. Other biographies add little of substance to these three books.

fact, one of the more striking things about his early life and career is the many parallels between the men. Both issued from Scotch-Irish ancestry, were fond of robust outdoor activity as young men, had spotty schooling but taught school themselves briefly, read law, and each served as attorney-general in Nashville. Both were successful soldiers, holding the rank of major-general in the Tennessee militia and serving as commanders-in-chief of armies. Politically, each held very important offices in state and national government, being elected to the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and the Presidency of their respective nations.

There are also familial parallels. Houston, as Jackson, was a member of a large frontier family headed by a strong-willed mother and an apparently often-absent father. Sam was born 2 March 1793 in Rockbridge County, Virginia, seven miles east of Lexington, and was the fifth son in a typically large frontier family of nine. From all accounts, including Sam's, his father was not a strong character and was often gone from the home while attending to his duties as an inspector in the Virginia militia, dying when Sam was fourteen.² Sam recalled him as "a man of moderate fortune . . . [who] possessed the means only of a comfortable

²Friend, Houston, p. 5; James, The Raven, pp. 6-12; Donald Braider, Solitary Star: A Biography of Sam Houston (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1974); and S. G. Heiskell, Jackson and Early Tennessee History, 3 vols. (Nashville: Ambrose Printing Co., 1918), 1:467.

subsistence."³ His mother Elizabeth, also, by all accounts, was a strong and forthright person. Sam recalled her "extraordinary . . ., gifted with intellectual and moral qualities, which elevated her . . . above most of her sex . . ., and yet she was nerved with a stern fortitude, which never gave way. . . ."⁴ The similarities between the two Elizabeths, Jackson and Houston, are quite evident. When the call to battle was sounded in the War of 1812, Sam asked his mother's permission to serve. She gave it and handed him a musket with the advice

. . . never disgrace it; for remember, I had rather all my sons should fill one honorable grave, than that one of them should turn his back to save his life. Go, and remember, too, that while the door of my cottage is open to brave men, it is eternally shut against cowards.⁵

While it can not be said with certainty what influence his mother's words may have had on Sam, he did say some forty-six years later that

Sages may reason and philosophers may teach, but the voice which we heard in infancy will ever come to our ears, bearing a mother's words and a mother's counsels.⁶

³Charles Edward Lester, ed., The Life of Sam Houston, The Only Authentic Memoir of Him Ever Published, in Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 3.

⁴Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 3-4.

⁵Ibid., p. 9; Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975), p. 326, notes an implicit sexual invitation in Mrs. Houston's injunction.

⁶Speech at Nacogdoches, 9 July 1859, quoted in Ernest C. Shearer, "The Mercurial Sam Houston," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 35 (1935):3.

As an adolescent and young man, Houston manifested some of the rebelliousness that would later make him a legend in the Texas war for independence. He twice opted out of society altogether, running away to live with the Indians when he was sixteen and eighteen years old. He was home long enough between his two odysseys⁷ to be arrested and fined for disorderly conduct for beating a drum so loudly outside the courthouse in Maryville that he disturbed its proceedings. Rather than pay the fine, he fled back to the Indians.⁸ Houston later recalled his youth in Jacksonsque terms: it "was wild and impetuous, but it was spotted by no crime."⁹

The personality of Houston matched that of his mentor in complexity. Historian Ernest C. Shearer has described him as

. . . inconstant as a weathervane, solid as a rock, mercurial as a chameleon, intense as the heat of the sun, enthusiastic as a child, vain and proud as a peacock, humble as a servant, direct as an arrow, polished as a marquis, rough as a blizzard, and gentle as a dove.¹⁰

⁷While he was on his odysseys, he read the Iliad. Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 6.

⁸Friend, Houston, pp. 5-6. The sources agree that this incident happened, although Beatrice Merle Smith in "Sam Houston in Tennessee" (M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, 1932), p. 14, feels that it was another Sam Houston; there were four men by that name living near Maryville at the time.

⁹James, The Raven, p. 18.

¹⁰Shearer, "The Mercurial Sam Houston," p. 3.

The mercurial Houston was capable of verbally and physically lashing out at his enemies, and on two notable occasions he attempted to kill or maim a domestic foe.

Houston fought his first and only formal duel with the intent to kill on 22 September 1826 when he was thirty-three years old. The immediate cause of his duel with General William A. White arose from a political squabble concerning the postmastership of Nashville. There is also some evidence of intermediate term disquietude and frustration which may have left him generally unsettled and perhaps more susceptible to provocation.

On 9 February 1825, the House of Representatives chose John Quincy Adams to be president. Houston's long and hard laboring among his fellow legislators to get Jackson the office had been in vain.¹¹ Houston may have been disappointed in his romantic affairs also. He had been courting a lady in Cheraw, South Carolina, known only as "Miss M--," and planned to marry her. He described his situation to a fellow bachelor, "For my single [emphasis his] self I do not know yet the sweets of matrimony, but in March or April next I will: unless something should take place not to be expected, or wished for!"¹² The unexpected

¹¹Houston to John H. Houston, 28 August 1824; Houston to Capt. W. V. Cobbs, 7 February 1825, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 28-29.

¹²Houston to A. M. Hughes, 22 January 1825, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 29.

or unwished for occurred, and he wrote in April, "My summer must needs be very active, and of these facts I felt bound in honor to let Miss M-- know all the facts, and she [emphasis added] concluded to defer matters until fall."¹³ Houston and the deferring Miss M-- never made it down the aisle, but Houston's later correspondence indicates that he was not terribly upset by this.

The "very active" summer which he had foreseen did come to pass, and his difficulties were of a personal, rather than a political nature. He was easily reelected to his seat in Congress, but he got involved in a dispute with a General Gibbs involving "slanderous expressions" the men made against each other, probably as a result of the campaign. Houston had written in April, "I have recently received from Tennessee letters indicating personal hostility to me [emphasis his]. I will take the best course to meet these threats, but (as the Frenchman said) if necessary, I will give them 'one dam'd Blue Plumb' to settle them!"¹⁴ And, later, he wrote, "My personal affairs must be settled in my own way, or not at all!"¹⁵ Although Houston was ready for a fight, he followed Jackson's advice and

¹³Houston to John H. Houston, 20 April and 30 June 1825, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 31-32.

¹⁴Houston to John H. Houston, 20 April 1825, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 31.

¹⁵Houston to John H. Houston, 30 April 1825, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 32.

controlled himself for the moment.¹⁶ He shortly thereafter submitted his dispute with Gibbs to arbitration by the Tennessee Grand Lodge of the Masons, of which both men were members. In October, the Grand Lodge exonerated both men, but the problems in Nashville festered along as Houston continued to see a political conspiracy headed by Felix Grundy opposed to him.¹⁷

Several months after his return to Washington, Houston was requested by Jackson to "attend to" some political business involving the appointment of a new postmaster in Nashville.¹⁸ Houston's attention in Washington to this political business of Nashville led him, circuitously, to the duelling ground in Kentucky. The Jackson-Houston candidate was B. Y. Curry, the interim postmaster, a deputy in that office for the previous eleven years, and a Jackson supporter; his opponent was John P. Erwin, the bankrupt brother of Henry Clay's son-in-law and editor of the Nashville Whig, a paper which Erwin described as, "the only

¹⁶Jackson to Houston, 11 August 1825, John Spencer Bassett, ed., Correspondence of Andrew Jackson, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1926-35), 3:290. The dispute somehow involved John Eaton, but it is not clear how. Friend, Houston, p. 13; Smith, "Houston in Tennessee," p. 52.

¹⁷Friend, Houston, p. 13; Houston to unknown addressee, 27 May 1826, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 35.

¹⁸James, The Raven, p. 64.

voice heard with effect, in behalf of the administration (of President Adams), in this land of political darkness."¹⁹

Houston wrote to Adams that Erwin was "not a man of fair and upright moral character . . . he does not pay his debts . . . [and he had been caught] eavesdropping. . . ." ²⁰ Erwin took exception to this characterization, and Houston prepared himself for trouble,²¹ although in comparison with the vituperation of the 1824 presidential contest, Houston's words do not seem so strong.²² His preparations included pistol practice on the outskirts of Washington²³ and a curious premortem letter comparing his enemies to timid hares, ferocious wolves, and servile spaniels who would

. . . attack a defenceless individual . . . assail the reputation of one absent [and] remorselessly suck the blood of honorable renown . . . but they cower to the look of an honorable man . . . and when they see or feel the lash, they are ready to lick the hand that has inflicted the stripes. My . . . attachment to Genl Jackson has caused me all the enemies I have, and . . .

¹⁹Erwin to Postmaster-General McLean, 16 February 1826, quoted in Smith, "Houston in Tennessee, p. 63.

²⁰Houston to President John Quincy Adams, 18 March 1826, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 33-34.

²¹Colonel Willoughby Williams to Judge Jo. C. Guild, 1 April 1878, in W. W. Clayton, History of Davidson County, Tennessee (Philadelphia: J. W. Lewis, 1880), p. 162.

²²See, for instance, Perry M. Goldman, "Political Rhetoric in the Age of Jackson," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 29 (Winter 1970-71):360.

²³James, The Raven, p. 64.

I will die proud in the assurance that I . . . possess his perfect confidence.²⁴

Clearly, Houston felt that he must return home and face down his enemies regardless of the consequences.

Within a day of his arrival in Nashville, Erwin initiated an exchange of notes and newspaper attacks which extended for several weeks.²⁵ The charges and counter-charges all related to appointment to the postmastership with no new accusations being levied, and all the parties were careful to stay within bounds of Tennessee's 1817 duelling law. Neither man ever directly offered a challenge; rather, each invited the other to do so. When Erwin got the mysterious Missourian known as Colonel John Smith, T.,²⁶ to deliver a message which said, in part: "I therefore demand of you, that which will occur to you at once, as the only suitable redress under existing circumstances," Houston refused to accept the note. He knew that accepting a challenge would make him ineligible to hold public office in Tennessee, thereby dashing his hopes of succeeding William Carroll as governor.

²⁴Houston to unknown addressee, 27 May 1826, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 35-36.

²⁵National Banner and Nashville Whig, 13 September 1826, quoted in Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 36-38; Knoxville Register, 20 September 1826, and National Banner and Nashville Whig, 21 August 1826, quoted in Smith, "Houston in Tennessee," pp. 64-69.

²⁶This reputed professional duelist's name is sometimes punctuated, Colonel John Smith T., with no comma and no closing period.

The second time Colonel Smith, T., carried a note to Houston he got the prominent local attorney, General William A. White, to accompany him as a witness.²⁷ Apparently, Houston accepted the note in his hand and, the feat accomplished, White said, "Let us walk [away], I reckon General Houston will not deny the delivery of the note." Houston immediately tried to extricate himself and said, "Yes sir, I do deny having received it." White responded, "It is in your hands and the gentlemen can see it." Houston threw the missive to the ground²⁸ and parried, "I have not received it. I do not know its contents. I will not open it . . . , but I will receive one from you, Gen. White, with pleasure." White parroted, "I will receive one from you." Houston kept the onus on White, "The saddle is on the other horse and that is enough to be understood between gentlemen." White objected to being drawn into the affair by Houston, and Houston accused him of meddling. By this time both men may have tired of the hair-splitting equivocations, and White said, "If I call upon you there will be no shuffling I suppose." Houston thereupon cast the die, "Try me, sir . . . there is a faction in this place

²⁷General White had earlier refused Erwin's request to act as his second.

²⁸Unidentified news clipping, Margaret (Warner) White Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

determined to put me down . . . I will maintain my ground or perish."²⁹

White did not accept the challenge to challenge immediately but went home and thought it over for about ten days and then decided that he must do so as an academic point of honor.³⁰ Houston professed that White was part of the conspiracy to ruin him and accepted the challenge six days later. The duel was arranged for sunup, 22 September 1826, just across the Kentucky line in Simpson County, on the plantation of Sanford Duncan, with the distance, fifteen feet, and the weapons, pistols. Houston trained for the fight at the Hermitage, where Jackson is said to have advised him to bite on a bullet when he drew his pistol in order to improve his aim.³¹

When the appointed hour arrived, Houston was prepared; there would be no deliberate delaying of his shot. Upon the command, he fired immediately, and his bullet

²⁹Their dialogue is generally agreed upon. Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 38; James, The Raven, pp. 64-65.

³⁰White decided to challenge Houston because Houston had printed accounts of their exchange which made White appear as a coward. White wrote an interesting observation of Nashville public opinion: "Knowing that, according to the tone of public sentiment here, a coward cannot live except in disgrace and obscurity, I did not hesitate as to my course, nor shall I have cause ever to regret it. . . ." White to Guild, 21 December 1826, Jo. C. Guild, Old Times in Tennessee with Historical, Personal, and Political Scraps and Sketches (Nashville: Tavel, Eastman and Howell, 1878), p. 287.

³¹James, The Raven, p. 66.

struck White in the groin.³² It appears that White fired as he was being hit, and his shot went into the air having no effect. Houston's men tried to rush him from the grounds, but he went to the fallen White who had said, "General, you have killed me." Houston replied, "White, my dear fellow, I am sorry for you," and White answered, "I do not blame you." They clasped hands, and Houston departed.³³

Fortunately, White recovered from his wound after a four month convalescence. Houston suffered no political disabilities,³⁴ as he won the race for governor less than a year later, easily defeating former three-time governor Willie Blount and future two-time governor Newton Cannon.³⁵ The law may have scorned the duelist, but the voters did not, even though Houston had been indicted by the Simpson County, Kentucky, grand jury for "having shot and feloniously wounded a certain William White."³⁶ In fact, another grand jury, that of Williamson County, Tennessee,

³²"Houston and White's Duel," The Tennessee Mason, May 1894, George W. Duncan Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

³³J. P. Clack to Richard G. Dunlap, 29 September 1836, Frederick Steidinger Heiskell Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

³⁴He was suspended for twelve months from the Masons, Cumberland Lodge, No. 8, of Nashville, for fighting a duel with Brother White. Friend, Houston, p. 18.

³⁵The political support given him by Jackson and incumbent Governor Carroll undoubtedly played a role in his victory.

³⁶Governor Sam Houston Papers, Archives Section, TSLA. He was never brought to trial.

sympathized with Houston's dilemma of having to choose between abiding by the law, refusing the challenge, and thereby appearing as a coward, or ignoring the law, fighting the duel, and being barred from office. This latter grand jury nominated him for governor.³⁷

After his election an obstacle still remained: the statutorily mandated oath of never having fought a duel. In November 1826, his friends in the legislature had attempted in vain to have the requirement modified.³⁸ There is no record of whether he took that preliminary oath. He probably did not.

There is no simple explanation of why Houston fought with White, but there are a few possible clues. In the intermediate term he may have been upset or frustrated by Jackson's failure to capture the presidency and his own failure to consummate the marriage to Miss M--; and the lingering personal-political troubles in Nashville left thoughts of conspiracies whirling in his head. He may have felt, as he indeed wrote, that all he needed to do was to stand up to his "enemies," and they would slither away. His return to Nashville set the immediate causes into action, the point of no return being the public confrontation with Smith, T., and White. He felt, perhaps intuitively, that he

³⁷Knoxville Register, 1 November 1836, cited by Smith, "Houston in Tennessee," pp. 76-77.

³⁸Smith, "Houston in Tennessee," p. 76.

could not appear the coward and hope to maintain public adulation. The man of honor felt he had no choice.

The second and last criminal assault of Sam Houston was a pseudo duel fought with Ohio congressman William Stanbery on 13 April 1832. For this assault he was reprimanded by the United States House of Representatives after a month-long trial and later fined five hundred dollars by a federal court. This chapter will be concerned primarily with the events preceding the attack rather than with the trial which followed it.

A great deal had happened to Houston in the five and one-half years since his duel with White. At first, his life had been a model of achievement: he had been comfortably elected governor of Tennessee in 1827 and had had a successful term of office. In January 1829, he married Eliza Allen, the blond-haired, blue-eyed eighteen-year-old daughter of a prominent Gallatin landowner.³⁹ A week later he announced his candidacy for reelection and apparently had the support of Andrew Jackson, even though he would be running against William Carroll.⁴⁰ Just as the campaign was so auspiciously beginning, he suffered a "tragic and humiliating defeat in his personal life"⁴¹ when

³⁹Houston was thirty-five years old.

⁴⁰James, The Raven, p. 76.

⁴¹Friend, Houston, p. 19.

he separated from his wife of less than a month. The effect of this was immediate and overwhelming: within a week he resigned as governor,⁴² and within two he left his state in disguise and disgrace. "Sic transit gloria mundi" wrote Dr. William Hume, the Presbyterian minister who had married the couple.⁴³ William Carroll commented in the vernacular, "Poor Houston . . . , he rose like a rocket; and he fell like a stick."⁴⁴

On his passage west, Houston described himself in a letter to Jackson as ". . . an unfortunate, and doubtless, the most unhappy man now living. . . ." He continued, however, that he still had his honor and his sense of duty and that he was going to live with his friends the Cherokee Indians in Arkansas and try to make himself useful.⁴⁵ For three years he sojourned among them playing the various roles of village drunk, trusted counselor, friend, and brother. Twice he made journeys to Washington to represent

⁴²Houston's Resignation as Governor, 16 April 1829, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 46-47.

⁴³Nashville Banner, 30 December 1907, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 47.

⁴⁴Carroll to Martin Van Baren, 4 August 1829, quoted in Smith, "Houston in Tennessee," p. 96.

⁴⁵Houston to Jackson, 11 May 1829, Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 49-50.

their interests to the Great White Father.⁴⁶ Houston was ever the enemy of the corrupt Indian agents who used their positions to fleece his adopted brothers, and on his first trip to Washington in 1830 he was perhaps playing the role of beneficent capitalist when he and New York financier John Van Fossen submitted a bid for a government contract to supply rations to the Indians. Their bid was not accepted by the War Department and, in fact, the contract was never even let; yet the incident later propelled Houston back onto the center stage of national events.⁴⁷ This will be returned to later.

There seem to have been three noteworthy occurrences in Houston's life between the spring and fall of 1831 that suggest the termination of his Indian interlude and the beginning of a new adventure. First was his defeat in the spring when he ran for a seat on the Cherokee council.⁴⁸ This may have told him his future with the Indians would not be a glorious one. Second, he returned for a visit to Tennessee and was coolly received there. While in Nashville

⁴⁶On the second trip he was not an official delegate. His concern for the Cherokees is shown in Robert L. Jones and Pauline H. Jones, "Houston's Politics and the Cherokees, 1829-1833," Chronicles of Oklahoma 46 (Winter 1968-69). This article contends that Houston reached his nadir in the first few months of 1831 and was then "sobered" by his defeat for the Cherokee council, pp. 422-23.

⁴⁷Friend, Houston, p. 27.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 29.

he penned a curious document which marks the nadir of his sense of self-respect and worth. He "proclaimed" in July 1831:

Know all men by these presents, that I, Sam Houston, "late Governor of the State of Tennessee," do hereby declare to all scoundrels whomsoever, that they are authorized to accuse, defame, columniate, slander, vilify, and libel me to any extent, in personal or private abuse . . . they are hereby permitted and authorized to write, indite, print, publish and circulate the same; and I will in no wise hold them responsible to me in law, or honor. . . . Given under my hand and private seal (having no seal of office) at Nashville, in the State of Tennessee.⁴⁹

The man was making a pitiful mockery of himself. Had this trip to Nashville shown him that Tennessee held no great future? The third event was the death of his mother; in September he returned to his homestead in Blount County to bury her. They had not been close in recent years, but her death severed one of his ties with Tennessee, and, as events like this can do, may have caused him to take a hard look at himself. It has been said that her death changed him and showed him that "there are times when a man must stand up."⁵⁰ Houston certainly had the inner resources to stand up and be proud.

⁴⁹Day and Ullom, Autobiography, pp. 64-65.

⁵⁰The effect of his mother's death can only be surmised; his biographers disagree on it. It is portrayed as significant in James, The Raven, p. 161, and Day and Ullom, Autobiography, p. 65. Friend, Houston, p. 30, reports the death without comment; and Braider, Solitary Star, p. 109, writes that he "probably only felt a slight loss."

The intermediate range factor in Houston's fight with Stanbery is thus similar to that of Jackson's with Avery; Houston was trying to establish (actually reestablish) his reputation, and Stanbery's slanders were a frustration to his on-going goal sequence. From the pitiful proclaimer of July had been born in less than a human gestation period a new and proud man--a man champing at the bit to attack a defamer in his lair, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

The immediate cause of the assault on Congressman Stanbery⁵¹ is comparatively simple, and the entire episode fits nicely into the pattern of the pseudo duel. In a speech to the House on 31 March 1832, Stanbery was casting dispersions on the administration of President Jackson, and, as part of his peroration he queried, "Was not the late Secretary of War [John Eaton] removed because of his attempt fraudently to give Governor Houston the contract for Indian rations?"⁵² When Houston read an account of the speech he wanted to go straight to the House and challenge Stanbery then and there, but he was dissuaded from such precipitous

⁵¹Representative William Stanbery was an Ohio Democrat who had broken with Jackson. His cognomen is sometimes spelled "Stanberry," but the Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1961 has it "Stanbery."

⁵²Friend, Houston, pp. 30-31.

action by James K. Polk.⁵³ Houston then formalized his relationship by sending, de rigueur, a note. He wrote Stanbery,

I have seen some remarks in the National Intelligencer of the 2nd instant, in which you are represented to have said, "Was the Secretary of War removed in consequence of his attempt fraudently to give to Governor Houston the contract for Indian rations?"

The object of this note is to ascertain whether my name was used by you in debate, and, if so, whether your remarks have been correctly quoted.⁵⁴

Cave Johnson, a member of the House from Tennessee, carried the message to Stanbery, but Stanbery refused to recognize Houston's right to question him.⁵⁵ The formalities had been complied with, and Stanbery armed himself in preparation for the worst.

On the night of 13 April 1832 at eight o'clock, Houston and Stanbery had their confrontation. Houston had been meeting in the room of Senator Felix Grundy with Senator Alexander Buckner of Missouri and Representative

⁵³Charles Sellers, James K. Polk: Jacksonian (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), p. 163. Polk stands as an example of a man who refused to be insulted into a fight. He ignored the accusations of Thomas D. Arnold that he was a "shivering coward." When Arnold wrote in the National Intelligencer, "I pronounce James K. Polk, of Tennessee, to be a coward, a puppy, a liar, and a scoundrel generally," Polk let it pass.

⁵⁴Houston to Stanbery, 4 April 1832, cited by James Parton, The Life of Andrew Jackson, 3 vols. (New York: Mason Bros., 1859-61), 3:389.

⁵⁵Stanbery to Cave Johnson, 4 April 1832, *ibid.*; Clement Lyndon Grant, "The Public Career of Cave Johnson" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1951), p. 37.

Blair from Tennessee.⁵⁶ When the meeting broke up, Houston, Buckner, and Blair took a walk down Pennsylvania Avenue where they happened upon Stanbery. Sensing trouble, Blair walked "rapidly" away, and Buckner stood by silently witnessing the brawl.⁵⁷

Houston asked, "Are you Mr. Stanbery?" Stanbery replied with a polite bow, "Yes, sir." Houston said, "Then you are a damned rascal," and cracked the Buckeye with his hickory walking stick.⁵⁸ The shower of blows continued and Stanbery exclaimed, "Oh, don't!" but Houston did. When Stanbery attempted to run, Houston jumped on his back and tripped him with his cane. As Stanbery fell, Buckner recalled that he hallooed; "indeed, he hallooed all the time pretty much, except when they were scuffling."⁵⁹ Stanbery was able to reach his pistol which he put to Houston's chest; fortunately for Houston the pistol misfired. He took the pistol away, stood up, and hit Stanbery a few more strokes, then finished him off with a left-handed smash to the groin. The rascal thoroughly thrashed, Houston took his leave.

⁵⁶Houston's meeting with men of such station is evidence that he was back in the mainstream of national affairs.

⁵⁷James, The Raven, p. 163.

⁵⁸Houston had freshly cut the stick from the grounds of the Hermitage.

⁵⁹Parton, Jackson, 3:390.

On the day following the attack, Stanbery sent a note to the Speaker of the House describing the attack which, he held, had taken place as a result of "words spoken in my place in the House. . . ." ⁶⁰ In spite of the strenuous objections of James K. Polk, the House voted to arrest Houston, and he was brought to trial before that body. The times boded badly for Houston. The House was already in revolt against the "highhanded" tactics of Jackson, this was an election year, and a treasured Congressional prerogative was at issue. ⁶¹ For their part, Jackson and his supporters rallied around Houston; little wonder the trial went on for a month and monopolized press attention. ⁶² In a way, the Houston-Stanbery affair foreshadowed the Preston Brooks-Charles Sumner sensation some

⁶⁰Governor James D. Porter to Charles D. Porter, 16 January 1894, American Historical Magazine 9 (April 1904): 189.

⁶¹The incident has been described as "the most violent, colorful, and historical challenge to congressional immunity . . . [and it] led to the first congressional trial of a private citizen for taking action against a member of congress," in Roger M. Busfield, Jr., "The Hermitage Walking Stick: First Challenge to Congressional Immunity," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 21 (June 1962):122.

⁶²Jackson described the arrest of Houston as "the greatest act of tyranny and usurption ever committed under our government," Jackson to Anthony Butler, 19 April 1832, Bassett, Correspondence, 4:435-36. According to the diary of John Floyd, Jackson said that "he wished there were a 'dozen Houstons' to beat and cudgel the members of Congress," quoted in Friend, Houston, p. 32. Paul H. Bergeron in "A Test for Jacksonians: Sam Houston on Trial," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 38 (1966):16-29, discusses the political aspects of the trial.

two decades later, in that both were viewed as something of clashes of cultures. The defenders of Houston argued that a man had a right to defend his good name against cowardly insinuations,⁶³ and the protectors of Stanbery were fearful "that tactics of the Nashville school were to be transferred to Washington and that the voice of truth was to be silenced by the dread of the assassin."⁶⁴ In the end Houston was mildly reprimanded by the House. Stanbery then took the case to a federal court which levied a five hundred dollar fine which Houston never paid, and Jackson later remitted. Other efforts by Stanbery to bring Houston under condemnation failed.⁶⁵

The public reaction in Tennessee to all this does not appear to have been strong. In Ohio, he was roundly denounced and booed, and when he attempted to go to the theater in Cincinnati the crowd would not let the performance go on.⁶⁶ Nationally, the trial of Sam Houston,

⁶³Jackson's Defense of Houston, Conversation with the Reverend Joshua Danforth, 20 April 1832, Emil Hurja Collection, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

⁶⁴United States Telegraph, 21 April 1832, cited by James, The Raven, pp. 164-65.

⁶⁵Stanbery insisted on an investigation by his congressional committee into possible fraud by Eaton and Houston in regard to the Indian rations contract, but the committee failed to endorse Stanbery's accusations; he also failed to have Houston barred from the floor of the House. Busfield, "The Hermitage Walking Stick," p. 129; Friend, Houston, pp. 33-34.

⁶⁶Friend, Houston, p. 35.

"late of Tennessee," resurrected him. Houston never failed to realize this, and he recalled many years hence

I was dying out and had they then taken me before a justice of the peace and fined me ten dollars it would have killed me. But they gave me a national tribunal for a theatre, and that set me up again.⁶⁷

Assaulting Stanbery made Houston neither a national hero nor a national villain. The important result was that it rekindled the flames of affection between Jackson and Houston,⁶⁸ and this may have given Houston the push that he needed to launch his new career in Texas. The affair was thus both a beginning and an ending for him. It was a hot tempered flash of emotion, the consequences of which were generally beneficent, and a thing for which Houston was never penitent. In the following case study, when Nathan Bedford Forrest killed his fellow officer A. Wills Gould in 1863, it, too, was a hot-blooded, instantaneous affair, but Forrest later said he regretted his action.

Nathan Bedford Forrest may well be the greatest warrior ever produced by Tennessee. He became a soldier at the age of forty when he enlisted in the Confederate Army as a private, and he rose, during the course of war, to the rank of lieutenant-general. As a daring battlefield commander, he was probably responsible for more lives, or

⁶⁷George Paschal, "Last Years of Sam Houston," Harper's New Monthly Magazine (April 1866), p. 631.

⁶⁸James, The Raven, pp. 172-73.

deaths, than any other person in this study.⁶⁹ Although his most noted act of domestic violence does not fit the upper class pattern of duels and pseudo duels, he is typical of the men previously discussed.

Bedford Forrest was born 13 July 1821 in Chapel Hill, in Marshall County, Tennessee, as the eldest son of a Scotch-Irish-English family that would eventually consist of eleven children. His father was an undistinguished, "plain, hard-working blacksmith,"⁷⁰ who died when Bedford was fifteen. His mother was more "heroic"; she was a large woman, five feet ten inches tall and, later in life, one hundred eighty pounds. She was clearly the dominate figure in his young life. She was a Presbyterian, and "no doubt had a strong Calvinistic tinge in her character."⁷¹ Stories of fighting off panthers and inspiring her young to bravery are told by enough of the biographers to give them credibility.⁷² Stories of Bedford's early years are

⁶⁹"He was not only a commander but himself a trooper in the very midst of combat, wounded four times, with horses shot out under him twenty-nine times, with no fewer than thirty enemy soldiers accounted for in hand-to-hand fighting. . . ." Robert Selph Henry, "First With the Most" Forrest (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1944), p. 17.

⁷⁰J. Harvey Mathes, General Forrest (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1902), p. 2.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ibid., p. 10; Eric William Sheppard, Bedford Forrest: The Confederacy's Greatest Cavalryman (London: Dial Press, 1930), pp. 17-18. Andrew Lytle praises her iron constitution and iron courage in Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company (New York: McDowell, Obdensky, 1960), p. 17.

similarly larger than life, but out of them all emerges the picture of an active, mischievous youth who was remembered as the noisiest boy around.

Until he joined the army in 1861, Forrest was noted for two things: his exceptionally successful business activities as a buyer and seller and his fearlessness. The New York Times in 1865 depicted him as the quintessential embodiment of the "reckless ruffianism and cutthroat daring of the Southwest."⁷³ The Times was arguing that there were two Souths, the one of the aristocratic pride of Virginia which Robert E. Lee represented, and the other South, the rough border fighters of Crockett, Bowie, and now Forrest. The Times was damning not deifying him. Before the war, he had moved to Memphis, and Memphis remembers her adopted son differently; his slave pen at 87 Adams Street was the finest in town, and "its operator was the most remarkable man who ever lived in Memphis. . . ."⁷⁴ They also remember his fearlessness. In 1857, he risked his life when he jumped into the midst of a mob bent on lynching a man whom Forrest did not know in order to save the man. He cut the rope off John Able's neck and returned him to jail.⁷⁵ Earlier in Hernando, Mississippi, he had put his life on the line when

⁷³New York Times, 19 March 1865, p. 5.

⁷⁴Shields McIlwaine, Memphis Down in Dixie (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1948), pp. 104-05.

⁷⁵Henry, "First With the Most," p. 15.

a gang of four men had beset his uncle and killed him. Forrest killed one of the four assailants and wounded the other three.⁷⁶ Like the previous men in this study, Forrest was a complex man who seemed to hold some things more sacred than life. And, when necessary, he could be unashamedly violent. One of his best biographers has described him as

. . . a man of mixed nature, compounded of violence and of gentleness. But through all the contradictions of a contradictory character, in one thing there was never a variation . . . whenever and wherever there was fighting to be done, he fought.⁷⁷

The killing of Andrew Wills Gould does not require elaborate analysis or great detail to explain; indeed, it was almost simple. Forrest was disappointed with the young lieutenant's performance as a soldier and requested that he be transferred to another command. Gould interpreted the transfer as a reflection on his bravery (or honor), went to Forrest to protest, and during the interview the men became angry. They exchanged blows with their weapons, and Gould was killed.

During the weeks which preceded the shooting, there were preliminary signs of trouble which may be considered as its intermediate causes. On two occasions Forrest felt that Gould had failed as a soldier, and in the second instance he accused him of cowardice. The first was at the Battle of

⁷⁶Lytle, Forrest, p. 20.

⁷⁷Henry, "First With the Most," p. 15.

Day's Gap, near Sand Mountain in north Alabama, 30 April 1863, when the Union Commander, Colonel Abel D. Streight, trapped some of Forrest's men in an ambush.⁷⁸ This was not to be a good day for Bedford Forrest. First, by ambushing him, Streight had outfoxed the fox. Forrest had always been a man who lived by his wits, and it must have troubled him to be trapped like this; he never allowed it to happen again. Second, his brother William, who was serving under him, was badly wounded in the leg. Third, a lieutenant, Gould, lost two precious twelve pound cannons. Gould had advanced to within three hundred yards of the Union line when Streight counterattacked. As several of Gould's horses had been killed, and the others were entangled in their equipment, Gould took his men out and left the cannon behind. When Forrest heard of this, he went into ". . . a towering, thundering rage. . . ." Gould had committed an "unforgivable offense."⁸⁰ Forrest even personally led his men in an unsuccessful attempt to recapture the battery.⁸¹ Although the end result of the campaign against Streight five weeks later was a great victory for Forrest, one

⁷⁸Ibid., pp. 146-47.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 147.

⁸⁰John W. Morton, "A Soldier Sums Up," in As They Saw Forrest: Some Recollections and Comments of Contemporaries, ed. Robert Selph Henry (Jackson, Tenn.: McCowat-Mercer Press, 1956), p. 278.

⁸¹Ibid.

wonders if Forrest did not displace the frustrations and failures of that earlier day on Gould. Gould became a marked man when, in early June, he displeased Forrest again. As part of his assault on Franklin, Tennessee, more than a year before the famous Battle of Franklin, Forrest had assigned Gould and three "pop gun" artillery pieces to divert the fire of Fort Granger by shelling them from the crest of a hill.⁸² Gould was doing just that when he moved his battery out of the line of fire to reload. Forrest saw the move and rode up to Gould and demanded, "Why in the hell, Lieutenant, don't you push your guns on top of the hill? Are you afraid?" Gould responded, "No, General, I am only protecting my men from sharpshooters."⁸³

Nine days later, around noon on 13 June 1863, Gould learned of his transference out of General Forrest's command. There was nothing in the transfer per se criticizing his performance, but Gould interpreted it as an insult to his honor and courage as a soldier, and he meant to discuss it with Forrest. They arranged a meeting for three o'clock that afternoon at Forrest's headquarters in

⁸²Frank A. Smith, "The Personal Encounter between Gen. Forrest and Lieut. Gould," Nashville Banner, 29 April 1911, pt. 2, p. 9. In addition to the only eyewitness account of the actual shooting, it contains the statements of several people who saw other parts of the activities that day as well as during the preceding days. It provides a necessary balance for the version presented by Forrest's biographers. The Nashville Rural Sun, 22 May 1879, has a discussion of the causes of the fight.

⁸³Henry, "First With the Most," p. 494.

the Masonic Building in Columbia. Before he left the meeting, Gould borrowed a pistol from one of his friends which he put in his pocket.⁸⁴ Four young boys happened by and, seeing General Forrest in the hall, lingered on to witness the entire affair.⁸⁵ The men were speaking in low but excited tones. There are two versions of what then happened. According to Forrest and his biographers, the general was picking his teeth with a small penknife when Gould arrived and demanded an explanation of his transfer. Forrest replied that he had made his decision, it was final, and he did not care to discuss it further. "No man," said Gould, "can accuse me of cowardice and both of us live!" He attempted to draw his pistol, but it hung in his pocket, and he fired a shot into Forrest's hip. At this point Forrest wrenched the pistol away from Gould with one hand, while opening his penknife with his teeth, and then stabbed him in the abdomen. In Forrest's version, Gould was clearly to blame.⁸⁶

The eyewitnesses, however, recall it somewhat differently. According to this account, as the men were talking, Gould said, "its false," or "that's all false,"

⁸⁴Smith, "The Personal Encounter," Nashville Banner, 29 April 1911.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Sheppard, Forrest, pp. 119-20; Mathes, Forrest, pp. 130-32; and Lytle, Forrest, pp. 181-83.

which would imply that Forrest had accused Gould of something, perhaps cowardice.⁸⁷ The general glared at the lieutenant, took the knife out of his pocket, opened it with his teeth and advanced toward him, whereupon Gould clutched at his pistol and fired.⁸⁸ Gould does not appear so guilty in this rendition because Forrest made the first overt aggression.

A third account, not to be taken seriously, appeared in the New York Times during the last days of the war. It was part of the northern propaganda effort and it depicts the incident as follows:

On one occasion he [Forrest] reprimanded a young lieutenant in language of great severity, and the officer, stung by the insulting words, was for a moment overcome by his passion and drew a pistol. Instantly the bloody chieftain walked deliberately up to the offender, drew his bowie-knife, and using his immense physical superiority to the uttermost, literally cut the poor fellow to the ground, and after the death stab had been given, plunged the reeking dagger again and again to the hilt in the quivering flesh; and then, when his hellish revenge was sated, coolly wiped the dripping blade, returned it to the wasteband of his pantaloons, and rode away quietly as though he had shot a yelping cur.

Such is the essential cut-throat fierceness of his nature!⁸⁹

⁸⁷Diary of Thomas Walker Davis, Manuscript Section, TSLA, has, in part, the following entry for 13 June: ". . . Gen. Forrest was shot today by a Lieut. whom he accused of cowardice."

⁸⁸In Gould's deathbed account of what happened, he described the same sequence of events to his cousin, Sam B. Lee. Smith, "The Personal Encounter."

⁸⁹New York Times, 19 March 1865, p. 5, and virtually the same story again in his obituary, 30 October 1877, p. 5.

The two critical factors through it all are the presence of weapons and Forrest's famous flaming temper.⁹⁰ Remove either of them and the killing most likely would not have happened. When Gould cried, "its false," Forrest flared up and threatened Gould with the knife, and the knife served as the cue which further exasperated Gould. Gould told his relative Sam Lee that he had shot Forrest in self-defense, "as Forrest stabbed" him. The affair took but a moment. Had the men not been armed, had they been forced to go out and search for weapons, it seems probable that they may have regained some self control. The personal honor factor is present, also. Had Gould not felt that his reputation was being threatened by the transfer, he would not have asked for the interview. And, too, perhaps Forrest felt that Gould was calling him a liar when he said, "its false." So through it all, the causes of the incident are not so unfamiliar.

After the men had wounded each other, Gould ran out of the hall, spurting blood with each heartbeat. The Quarter-Master called, "Stop that man! Stop that man! He's shot General Forrest!"⁹¹ Two physicians were in the street

⁹⁰Forrest and his superior, General Earl Van Dorn, had almost come to blows earlier that year when Van Dorn reproached him over an unimportant matter, and later he would violently quarrel with General Bragg and call him "a damned scoundrel." Henry, "First With the Most," pp. 143, 189.

⁹¹There is no significant disagreement on the events that followed, except as later noted.

and immediately took Gould into the nearest office, stretched him out, and began their ministry. Meanwhile, Forrest relates that yet another physician briefly examined his wound and advised him that it might be mortal, whereupon he seized two pistols and ran into the streets. Colonel J. Lee Bullock saw Forrest and told him that Gould was very badly wounded, and he need not be concerned with him. Forrest angrily replied, "Get out of my way, I am mortally wounded and will kill the man who has shot me."

Forrest barged into the tailor's shop where Gould was being treated and fired at Wills, who by now was fleeing out the back door. One of his shots ricocheted off a wall and hit "a Dutchman."⁹² Gould went a few yards into the weeds behind the shop and collapsed. Forrest walked over to him, nudged him with his foot as if to test him for life, and then turned and walked away. He commandeered the two doctors who had been treating Gould and made them examine him. The wound was not serious; the pistol ball had lodged in the large gluteal muscle of his left hip. Forrest's attitude changed immediately. He declined to have "the damned little pistol ball" removed,⁹³ and sent the doctors off at once to tend to Gould. Gould was taken to

⁹²Commonly, all Europeans were referred to as "Dutchmen."

⁹³He did have it removed not long thereafter.

the Nelson House where he lingered on and died 26 June 1863; he would have been twenty-three the next month.

Forrest's biographers contend that the two men reconciled before Gould's death, but it is not certain that they actually did. Forrest did admit that he had misjudged Gould and that Gould was a brave soldier. Forrest certainly regretted the incident. The deathbed exchange in which Gould said,

General, I shall not be here for long, and I was not willing to go away without seeing you in person and saying to you how thankful I am that I am the one who is to die and that you are spared to the country. What I did, I did in a moment of rashness, and I want your forgiveness.⁹⁴

does not seem to be a logical statement to come from a man who held until the end that Forrest had stabbed him before he fired his pistol. Further, Sam Lee stayed at Gould's door until he died, and Lee did not recall that Forrest ever personally called on Gould.⁹⁵

There was no investigation of the incident whatsoever, and it is not mentioned in the official records of the war.⁹⁶ Forrest's earlier biographers either do not mention it, or only allude to it.⁹⁷ It was an incident in which no one has taken pride; it was an act of mutual poor judgment,

⁹⁴Lytle, Forrest, p. 182.

⁹⁵Smith, "The Personal Encounter."

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷There is a summary of the treatment in Henry, "First With the Most," p. 163.

consummated in a flash. And yet the instantaneous things a person does often tell as much about him as the well reasoned, deliberate actions.

The sensational three-way mutual murder of Joseph A. Mabry, his son Joseph, Jr., and Thomas O'Conner was also not out of character; but, unlike the Forrest-Gould affair, the Mabry-O'Conner pseudo duel was the climax of a personal feud which had been building for several months. They shot it out 19 October 1882 on Gay Street in Knoxville; all three men were dead in less time than it takes to write about it.⁹⁸ And it has been written about, even by so notable a student of human madness as Mark Twain.⁹⁹ The day after the killing the fourth estate in Knoxville sold more newspapers than on any occasion to that date and the New York Times ran

⁹⁸The most recent account, part of a biography of O'Conner written by his great-niece, is Rebecca Hunt Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly: Thomas O'Conner, Halifax Court House, Virginia, 1836--Knoxville, Tennessee, 1882 (Tuscon, Ariz.: By the author, Skyline Printing Co., 1977). The fullest accounts are in Jerome G. Taylor, Jr., "The Public Career of Joseph Alexander Mabry" (M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1968, and idem, "The Extraordinary life and Death of Joseph A. Mabry," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 44 (1972):41-70.

⁹⁹Twain cited the entire press account of the shooting as it appeared in the Associated Press Telegram, 19 October 1882, as an illustration "thoughtlessly omitted" from the claim that "the Southern is the highest type of civilization this continent has seen." Life on the Mississippi (New York: New American Library, Signet Classic, 1961), pp. 238-39.

a front page story on the incident.¹⁰⁰ By their deaths the men gained a degree of immortality which they had not earned during their lives.

The protagonists of this case study, Mabry, as well as his opponent, O'Conner, require a brief introduction. "General" Joseph Alexander Mabry, II, was a member of a prominent and influential family.¹⁰¹ Among his English ancestors was Robert de Mowbray, one of the barons who forced King John to sign the Magna Charta at Runnymede in 1215.¹⁰² General Mabry was directly descended from George W. Mabry, who emigrated to America with two of his brothers around 1750.¹⁰³ Joseph Alexander Mabry, Sr., General Mabry's father, was a man of influence in local and state affairs who possessed a considerable fortune and represented

¹⁰⁰The Associated Press is said to have telegraphed "at least ten thousand words" to its newspapers reporting the event. Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly, p. 4.

¹⁰¹Although Mabry was consistently referred to before the Civil War (and occasionally afterwards) as "Colonel" and during and after the war as "General," the origins of the titles are uncertain. He never served in the active military, either in the regular army or in the militia, and is not listed among Tennessee's attorney generals or adjutant generals. It is, therefore, assumed that the title was an honorary one either having devolved to him from his father who was a brigadier general in the Tennessee militia or as a result of his prominence in other fields.

¹⁰²Miss Evelyn Hazen, interviews at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and at her home, April 1967. Miss Hazen is a granddaughter of Mabry.

¹⁰³The National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1901 ed., s.v. "Mabry, Joseph A.," 11:563-64.

Knox County in the state legislature between 1835 and 1837. He was also a brigadier-general in the state militia and a representative to the state constitutional convention of 1834.¹⁰⁴ One of Mabry's brothers-in-law was C. W. Charlton, a noted agriculturalist, editor, and church leader who married Mabry's wife's sister, Elizabeth Churchwell; another brother-in-law, William M. Churchwell, was a congressman, diplomat, and financier.¹⁰⁵ He also related by marriage to the distinguished physician and Tennessee historian, Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey and, through issue of that union, to the prestigious Crozier family.¹⁰⁶ Mabry was of fine blood and had the advantages such things can bring.

Mabry was born 26 April 1826 on a large estate thirteen miles west of Knoxville, and his father, Joseph, and his mother, Alice, had four other children.¹⁰⁷ Little is known of his early life. He was educated at the common schools of Knox County during his youth.¹⁰⁸ His higher education is assumed to have been at either Tusculum College,

¹⁰⁴Knoxville Daily Tribune, 14 July 1889.

¹⁰⁵Ruth Osborne Turner, "The Public Career of William Montgomery Churchwell" (Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1954).

¹⁰⁶Roscoe C. d'Armand, DeArmond Families of America (Knoxville: Family Record Society, 1954), pp. 580, 582-83.

¹⁰⁷Knoxville Chronicle, 20 October 1882; interview with Miss Evelyn Hazen.

¹⁰⁸Goodspeed Publishing Company, History of Tennessee, Knoxville Edition (Chicago: Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1887), p. 1002.

Holston Seminary, or Oberlin College, although the records of these institutions do not substantiate the assumption.¹⁰⁹ He married Laurel Evelyn Churchwell, member of a prominent local family, on October 12, 1852.¹¹⁰ They were married for over thirty years and had seven children.

The story of their offspring is unusual, if not significant. Their two eldest male children were murdered in the prime of life, at ages twenty-seven and twenty-four; two others died before reaching their second year; two before their fifth year; and the last at the age of seventeen.¹¹¹ Mabry's father had also met his death under peculiar circumstances. He had been killed while Mabry was

¹⁰⁹Reference is made in the National Cyclopedia, 11: 563, to his having been graduated from Tusculum College, but a letter from the registrar, Jack C. Haakoma, 3 January 1967, states that he was not graduated; however, he may have attended. George W. Stanbery, II, in "The Constitutional Convention of 1870" (Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1940), p. 44, refers to his having attended Holston Seminary, the records of which are not available. The National Cyclopedia also states that he attended Oberlin College, but their archivist, W. E. Bigglestone, says in a letter of 6 January 1967 that he could find no record that Mabry ever attended.

¹¹⁰Records of Knox County, Marriage License Record Book (Knox County Courthouse, Knoxville), Number 2, 1850-1861, p. 18.

¹¹¹Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, comp., "Tombstone Records of Old Gray Cemetery," Nashville, 1938, p. 84. (Typewritten)

in his early teens in a shooting incident in Alabama.¹¹² Thus, Joseph A. Mabry, Sr., General Mabry, Joseph A. Mabry, III (frequently referred to as "Jr."), and William M. Mabry all met violent deaths. Such a series of deaths must have had some effect on Mabry; it is hard to imagine that this would not have embittered him.

Throughout his career, General Mabry was a citizen of Knoxville and a participant in local and state affairs. As a large land owner, professional man, businessman, railroad president, real estate dealer, and devotee of horse racing, he had a great vested interest in his city, as well as in his section, the South.¹¹³ Mabry's business and political ventures after the Civil War continued apace. He was twice mentioned as a candidate for Congress, served as a delegate to the Tennessee Constitutional Convention of 1870, published the Knoxville Whig for a year, was appointed a trustee of East Tennessee University, was selected a deacon in the Missionary Baptist Church, advanced to the highest degree of Masonry, donated to Knoxville the land for the construction of the Market House (present site of the

¹¹²Miss Pollyana Creekmore, interview at the McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville-Knox County Public Library, May 1967. The particular details of this death are lost, but Miss Creekmore refers to the Knoxville Register, 19 April 1837 and 16 May 1838, which state that Mabry duelled in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, with Dr. William A. Leland "of that place" and that Mabry was killed.

¹¹³Brownlow's Knoxville Whig and Rebel Ventilator, 29 March, 26 April, and 29 November 1865, and 19 December 1866; Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 20 October 1882.

downtown Mall), and was president of the Knoxville and Kentucky Railroad.¹¹⁴ He was at the top of society. Then in the early 1870s Mabry's fortunes rapidly began to decline, perhaps as a result of the financial panic of 1873. As he saw his property fall under the auctioneer's gavel he relied increasingly on the bottle for comfort and on his pistols to protect his waning sense of honor. Unlike O'Conner, who had a long history of violence, Mabry did not begin shooting people until 1870.¹¹⁵

Thomas O'Conner's success as a speculator, businessman and community leader matched or exceeded that of Mabry's, even though his family background and early years did not portend such success. He was born 26 February 1836 at Halifax Court House, Virginia, as the seventh child and second son of John and Mary O'Conner.¹¹⁶ His parents do not appear to have been extraordinary. John was a journeyman of the backwoods sort, a jack of several trades; of Mary, it is only known that she was illiterate. Thomas received a bit of schooling, perhaps, and was then apprenticed off to

¹¹⁴Mabry's corruptions and manipulations of the state legislature and its railroad bonds on behalf of the Knoxville and Kentucky Railroad led Professor Corlew to describe him as the "Kingpin of railroad lobbyists." S. J. Folmsbee, Robert E. Corlew, and E. L. Mitchell, History of Tennessee, 2 vols. (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1960), 2:120.

¹¹⁵He was forty-four years old.

¹¹⁶They would have a total of nine children. This sketch is from Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly, pp. 3-6.

Lynchburg in 1854 where he became a saddler. After eighteen months of this, he "turned up missing" one day; he had run off to join his sister in Knoxville.¹¹⁷ He would live in other places during the coming years, but Knoxville became his home. May it suffice to say that he waxed prosperous.

O'Conner was variously a city alderman, delegate to the Democratic National Convention, co-host of the visit of President Rutherford B. Hayes to Knoxville, lessee of the state penitentiary, owner of the beautiful Melrose estate, founder and president of the Mechanic's National Bank, and, at the time of his death, "one of the wealthiest men" in Tennessee.¹¹⁸ He was also a man with a history of violence. His sister Rebecca suspected that a violent encounter may have precipitated his sudden arrival in Knoxville in 1854.¹¹⁹ If so, it was only the first of many. In 1868, he fought a duel near Augusta with Attorney-General Henry Patillo Farrow, of Georgia, in which no one was injured;¹²⁰

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 15.

¹¹⁸Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 20 October 1882; A. C. Hutson, Jr., "The Coal Miner's Insurrections, 1891-1892" (Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1933), p. 19.

¹¹⁹Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly, p. 21.

¹²⁰O'Conner was acting as the second for Mitchell A. Nevins who, as editor of the Rome (Georgia) Commercial, had proclaimed Farrow a "pusilanimous and cowardly man." Farrow retaliated in kind, and Nevins sent the challenge with O'Conner. When Farrow refused to fight Nevins, O'Conner offered himself as a substitute and was accepted. Ibid., p. 119.

and, later that year, he nearly lost his life in an Atlanta brawl where the men were armed with billiard cues and balls.¹²¹ Three years later, he and J. S. Haselton, of New Jersey, who was the principal owner of the Aetna Coal Company and Vulcan mines, engaged in fisticuffs on the streets of Nashville because of a difference arising out of O'Conner's lease of the penitentiary.¹²² In March 1878, he pistol-whipped Thomas Atcheson, the editor of the Nashville Banner, in the streets of that city and was angry because his adversary had not been armed. O'Conner had planned to shoot it out with him. As it worked out, he was fined fifty dollars for disturbing the peace. Six months later, he was back in court, this time being bonded to keep the peace; he had engaged in "hot words" with a man over a gambling debt, and the court, by now, knew of what Thomas O'Conner was capable.

The 1870s were violent years for Joseph A. Mabry, also.¹²³ Unquestionably, Mabry's aforementioned financial decline served as the intermediate cause of his violence. It may have lowered his self-esteem and made him overly defensive and suspicious. He began to see conspiracies and lashed out at them. Mabry was involved in three shooting incidents between 1870 and 1882. The first of them occurred

¹²¹Ibid., pp. 119-20.

¹²²Ibid., p. 38.

¹²³Ibid., pp. 166-67.

in Knoxville on 13 June 1870, when Mabry shot the prominent local attorney John Baxter. It was about 9:30 a.m., and Baxter was standing on the street talking with an associate when Mabry approached them. He addressed Baxter saying, "Business is business," drew his pistol and shot him in the wrist. Baxter was also armed, but he chose to flee rather than have a gun battle on the streets. As Baxter was running away, Mabry threw his pistol at him, drew another one from his pocket, and gave chase. Soon the ruckus was broken up by the appearance of Sheriff V. F. Gosset, who took Mabry off to jail where he put up \$1,000 bail and was told to appear before the circuit court.¹²⁴ Baxter evidently never pressed charges because Mabry never stood trial.

The reason for the shooting is not clear. The history of ill feelings between the two men was a long and impassioned one. It may have begun during the Civil War when Baxter and Mabry supported different causes. Baxter had been a loyal Unionist, and Mabry had thrown his influence behind the Confederacy. After the war Baxter had been one of the leaders in Knoxville's effort to punish the vanquished, and this may have been the origin of their personal feud. The breach was widened when Baxter purchased five shares of stock in the Knoxville and Kentucky Railroad

¹²⁴Knoxville Press and Herald, 14 June 1870.

and brought suit against its president, Mabry, for malfeasance.¹²⁵

By 1870, they were filling the newspapers with personal attacks on each other. Baxter accused Mabry of being a rascal, a tyrant, an opportunist, and completely unprincipled.¹²⁶ Mabry used his newspaper, the Whig, to denounce and accuse Baxter, emphasizing, for example, his deceit and fraud in connection with the Mineral Home Railroad.¹²⁷ Baxter filed two libel suits against Mabry for a total of \$50,000; Mabry, in turn, sued Baxter for a total of \$75,000, once for libel and once for slander.¹²⁸

In addition to their personal bitterness toward each other, there was a debt between them of \$65,000. Baxter,

¹²⁵Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly, p. 225.

¹²⁶For example, Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 1 June 1870.

¹²⁷Knoxville Daily Whig, 3 June 1870. Baxter's bank had arranged for the sale of the \$100,000 in state bonds received by the road; yet a route was never even surveyed. It was the only instance of the state's repudiating its debt. Tennessee, House Journal, Appendix (1870-71), "Report of the Committee on the Mineral Home Railroad;" S. J. Folmsbee, "The Radicals and the Railroads," in Tennessee: A History, 2 vols., ed. P. M. Hamer (New York: American Historical Society, 1933), 2:670-71.

¹²⁸Knoxville Daily Whig, 7 June 1870. According to a tongue-in-cheek item in the Nashville Republican Banner, 3 June 1870, reprinted in the Knoxville Whig, 5 June 1870, a bill was introduced in the legislature providing that since the Mabry-Baxter "vendetta" endangered the "entire state" Mabry and Baxter should be "armed with double-barreled shot guns" and not be permitted to "cease firing until both are declared dead." The funeral expenses were to be paid out of the assets of the assetless Mineral Home Railroad mentioned in note 127.

M. A. Regan, and W. B. L. Regan acknowledged themselves to be in Mabry's debt, but the final payment was to rest upon the decision of the court in Regan v. Mabry, still to be tried.¹²⁹ Mabry had a suit which countered this one, and matters seemed to be deadlocked.

It is, therefore, most probable that Mabry's statement of "business is business" at the time of the shooting referred to the debt, and Baxter's unwillingness to pay. The shooting, however, settled nothing, and the men continued to insult and degrade each other with what was almost gay abandon. In one of Mabry's suits against Baxter, Mabry accused him of the following: horse stealing; being the scion of a convicted felon and indentured servant; polygamy; being in the embraces of a Negro woman the day his second wife lay a corpse in his own house; making beastly attempts toward his third wife as she was on her deathbed; deliberately driving his late business partner insane; and several other indelicate offenses against the laws of both man and nature.¹³⁰ The court asked Mabry to withdraw these charges, and he consented. The final disposition of all the

¹²⁹John Baxter, M. A. Regan, and W. B. L. Reagan to Joseph Mabry, n.d., Mabry Papers, in possession of Miss Evelyn Hazen, Knoxville, Tennessee.

¹³⁰Cross-interrogations filed for J. A. Mabry v. John Baxter, *ibid.*

suits shows logic returning to the men. They withdrew all charges, and each paid the other's court costs.¹³¹

In the final years of his life, Mabry is said to have turned heavily to drink and was often known to have violent bursts of temper.¹³² The loss of a great deal of his land and further business complications seems to have almost gotten the best of him. The killing of his youngest son, Will Mabry, seems to have caused him to lose his mental balance. On Christmas Eve, 1881, Will and a friend, Constable Don Lusby, went to a "chicken fight" and then went out for an evening of tippling at Alf Snodderly's bar. According to a news report, a quarrel took place in front of the saloon in which Mabry sustained a cut over his eye. He followed Lusby into the saloon, asked why he had mistreated him, and then smashed him in the face with a plate. Mabry then ran from the bar, with Lusby pursuing him. Lusby shot twice, and Will Mabry fell dead.¹³³

The trial that followed brought forth the conclusion that the incident was the result of heavy drinking.¹³⁴ Witnesses testified that Will Mabry was a good person but

¹³¹Knox County, Tennessee, Courthouse, Circuit Court Records, vol. 20.

¹³²Knoxville Daily Tribune, 20 October 1882.

¹³³Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 25 December 1881.

¹³⁴Ibid., 29 December 1881.

was dangerous when drinking. The proceedings ended in a mistrial, and Lusby was freed on bail.¹³⁵

General Mabry was enraged. He would not accept the fact that the shooting was the result of a common barroom quarrel; instead, he felt that it was part of a broader conspiracy headed by Thomas O'Conner to defraud him in a land deal. At this point the story becomes rather involved. Previously, Mabry and O'Conner had had friendly relations and had raced horses together but, in time, the relationship became strained. When, in 1871, Cherry, O'Conner and Company leased the state penitentiary for labor purposes, Mabry is said to have gone to Nashville and lobbied for the repeal of the convict lease system.¹³⁶ Although the lease system was not repealed, O'Conner became very angry with Mabry, and it has been said that they were never close friends again.

By 1881, however, they did engage in negotiations about two pieces of land, the details of which remain obscure. There are two accounts of this land deal of 1881. One is that Mabry was to purchase the land with O'Conner as his agent. After the deal had been made, Mabry was called out of town; he entrusted the final details of the signing of the papers to his son Will Mabry and to O'Conner. When

¹³⁵Knoxville Daily Times, 27 August 1882.

¹³⁶Miss Evelyn Hazen, interview at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, June 1967. Miss Hazen stated that her grandfather felt that the lease system was unfair.

the night came to sign the papers, Will became sick, so O'Conner went alone. He was accused by Mabry of having had the land signed over to himself alone by making some last minute changes in the contract. In order to protect himself, he either hired or encouraged Don Lusby to kill Will Mabry. The other account of this incident is that O'Conner was purchasing the land for himself and that General Mabry thought that he intended, for an unknown reason, to present the land to Will.¹³⁷ When Will was killed, Mabry felt that O'Conner had commissioned the work to get out of having to give the land to Will. Whichever of the stories is accurate, if indeed either is, Mabry was convinced that O'Conner had played a role in the death of his son; and that is the important factor.

Both of these accounts are accounts of the fact that O'Conner purchased some 320 acres from Joseph and Will Mabry in May 1881.¹³⁸ Before the shooting of his son Will, General Mabry had accused O'Conner of duplicity, but O'Conner had denied it; and they resumed their friendship. After the death of Will, Mabry again began to accuse O'Conner of cheating him and also of being involved in the death of his son.¹³⁹

¹³⁷Knoxville Chronicle, 20 October 1882.

¹³⁸Knox County, Tennessee, Courthouse, Deed Book W-3, p. 519.

¹³⁹Knoxville Daily Times, 20 October 1882.

When the court declared a mistrial in Lusby's case, Mabry decided to take things into his own hands. He evidently had been making some nasty remarks about Lusby because Lusby let it be known that he was going to "get" Mabry. On 26 August 1882, Mabry and Robert Steele were in town, and Lusby approached Mabry and began cursing and insulting him. Before anything could happen, Mabry called the police chief, who arrested Lusby and took him to the courthouse to register charges against him. Lusby, accompanied by his brother Moses, was taken into the Recorder's office, where the police attempted to disarm their prisoners. A scuffle broke out and General Mabry and Joseph Mabry, Jr., appeared in the room and came to the aid of the police. During the encounter both Lusbys were shot to death. It was reported by an eyewitness that General Mabry had been hitting Moses with a book, and that Joseph, Jr., was trying to fire a defective pistol which refused to operate.¹⁴⁰ On these grounds, the Mabrys were arrested and charged with felonious assault and murder. The press accounts of the trial indicate that it was little more than a formality, and the Mabrys were soon cleared of all charges. When the verdict was announced they were congratulated by those present in the courthouse and were wished well all day on the streets of Knoxville.¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰Ibid., 27 August 1882.

¹⁴¹Ibid., 10 October 1882.

Mabry had part of his revenge. All that remained was to reciprocate the injustice he felt O'Conner had done him. To augment the hostility Mabry already felt toward O'Conner as a result of Will's death, O'Conner began to buy land from Mabry's family estate at a time when the Mabrys must have needed money and hence were forced to sell.

In June 1882, O'Conner purchased from Joseph, Jr., one-seventh of the family estate, Cold Springs Farms, for five hundred dollars. In September, Laura Mabry, General Mabry's wife, sold O'Conner another one-seventh (fifty acres), also for five hundred dollars. The transfer agreement carried the stipulation that she had an absolute right to repurchase within three years.¹⁴² This indicated that the Mabrys must have been in financial difficulty but felt certain that they would get out of it.¹⁴³ General Mabry evidently thought O'Conner a Shylock seeking his "pound of flesh."

On 18 October at the Fair, Mabry and O'Conner ran into each other, and Mabry upbraided him for making threats against his life and challenged him to fight it out then and there. O'Conner said that it was not the time or the place,

¹⁴²Knox County, Tennessee, Courthouse, Deed Book X-3, pp. 502, 178.

¹⁴³Moulder, in May the Sod Rest Lightly, pp. 231-32, depicts the transactions as friendly loans made by O'Conner to the members of the Mabry family with the land being used as security. She also sets the loan at seven hundred dollars.

and friends succeeded in separating them.¹⁴⁴ Although O'Conner had planned to leave on a business trip to New Orleans, he decided to forego it and remain in Knoxville. During the night they exchanged notes in which each promised to kill the other "on sight."¹⁴⁵ The hot words at the Fair served as the immediate cause of the shooting.

O'Conner's conception of the proper time and place became evident the next day. It was raining and muddy in Knoxville as Mabry and Robert Steele¹⁴⁶ were walking down Gay Street between Clinch and Church streets. At 10:20 a.m., O'Conner was hiding in the doorway of his bank, the Mechanic's National, as the men approached. Suddenly he leaped into the open and shot Mabry with a shotgun. A crowd began to gather immediately. O'Conner waved them aside and shot Mabry again. From inside the bank he was handed another gun; he then yelled for Steele, who had ducked into a store, to come out. At that moment, Joseph Mabry, Jr., who happened to be nearby attending to some business matters and had heard the shots, ran into the street, drew his pistol, and fired at O'Conner. The shot found its mark, but, as he fired, O'Conner saw him, wheeled around, and shot him.

¹⁴⁴Moulder, May the Sod Rest Lightly, pp. 232-33.

¹⁴⁵Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 20 October 1882.

¹⁴⁶Steele had been with Mabry when Lusby accosted him.

Two minutes from the first shot, all three men were dead and seven bystanders had been wounded.¹⁴⁷

The newspapers were appalled by this outbreak of violence, which they deemed the worst since the Civil War. The attitude, if not the expressed sentiment, of the papers was in O'Conner's defense. Their comments led the public to believe that O'Conner was justified in what he did because he had received a threatening note from Mabry. They do not mention that O'Conner had also threatened Mabry and, worse yet, had murdered him from ambush.

The Mabry-O'Conner pseudo duel lends itself to ready analysis. Both men were certainly capable of violence, and each had a history of it before their fatal confrontation. Mabry's financial woes, the steady erosion of his standing in the community, the death of his son Will, and then O'Conner's buying up his family estate convinced him that O'Conner was the root cause of his troubles. The hot-headed public threats and counter-threats at the Fair cast the die, and there was nothing else to be done for either man than to consummate their affairs. In Nashville a few days before the shooting, O'Conner had told friends that he was reluctant to return to Knoxville because he expected to have

¹⁴⁷Account is taken from both the Times and Chronicle, 20 October 1882.

to kill the Mabrys, or they would kill him.¹⁴⁸ His prophesy erred only in the use of the conjunction "or"; it should have been "and."

The central characters in this chapter were men of strong aggressive personalities and, while they were not habitually violent, violence seems to have played a larger role in their lives than in those of the other subjects of this paper. (Certainly Mabry and O'Conner, and perhaps Houston and Forrest, were, for the years here examined, as violent as anyone examined in this paper.) This is especially remarkable considering the positions of power and trust which they held. It is interesting, if obvious, to note that the causes of their violence were generally related to their professions; that is, Houston fought White over a disagreement resulting from a political appointment; Forrest killed Gould over a military affair; and Mabry and O'Conner killed each other over a business deal. The following chapter on journalists also reflects a close tie between profession and violence.

¹⁴⁸New York Times, 20 October 1882.

CHAPTER V

JOURNALISTS

One hundred years ago Mark Twain called national attention to the sometimes violent idiom of Tennessee journalism. As a result of the singularly vituperative and personal editorial policy of the fictional Morning Glory and Johnson County War-Whoop, aggrieved persons called at the office and visited their revenge on the young assistant editor who, on his first day on the job, had a finger shot off, two teeth knocked out, was thrown out of the window, tomahawked and, as he put it, shot so full of holes that "my skin won't hold my principles."¹ This chapter examines four violent encounters in which two editors were killed, one was shot in the face, another in the thigh, and another in the hand. All of the shootings were triggered by something they had written in their papers, usually a personal attack arising from the heat of a political contest, but in two of the instances there had been a history of bad feelings.

¹Mark Twain, Mark Twain's Works, vol. 19: Sketches Old and New, "Journalism in Tennessee" (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1875; reprint ed., Grosse Pointe, Mich.: Scholarly Press, 1968), pp. 45-53.

The name and career of William G. Brownlow are familiar to students of Tennessee history. The "Fighting Parson"² was primarily a crusader who was successively a Methodist circuit rider, editor of the Whig, governor, and then United States Senator from Tennessee. He was born 29 August 1805 in Wythe County, Virginia, the eldest of five children, and was orphaned eleven years later when his parents, Joseph and Catherine Gannaway Brownlow, died within three months of each other. The children then lived with various aunts and uncles, and William was put to manual labor, first on the farm then in a carpenter's shop.³ His life changed its direction in 1825 when he converted to Methodism and became a circuit rider. He became one of the

²The best book-length studies of Brownlow are E. Merton Coulter, William G. Brownlow: Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937; reprint ed., Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971), and Steve Humphrey, "That D----d Brownlow," Being a Saucy & Malicious Description of Fighting Parson William Gannaway Brownlow, Knoxville Editor and Stalwart Unionist, Who Rose from a Confederate Jail to become One of the Most Famous Personages in the Nation, Denounced by his Enemies as Vicious and Harsh, Praised by his Friends as Compassionate and Gentle (Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978).

³Brownlow briefly sketches his early years in two of his known works, Helps to the Study of Presbyterianism, or an Unsophisticated Exposition of Calvinism, with Hopkinsianism Modifications of Policy, with a View to a More Easy Interpretation of the Same. To which is Added a Brief Account of Life and Travels of the Author; Interspersed with Anecdotes (Knoxville: F. S. Heiskell, 1834), pp. 242-43, and Sketches of the Rise, Progress and Decline of Secession; with a Narrative of Personal Adventures among the Rebels (Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1862), pp. 16-17. The latter is commonly referred to as Parson Brownlow's Book.

Holston Conference's best known peripatetic parsons as he rode in the area in east Tennessee which has been described as "the scene of some of the bitterest religious conflicts in America,"⁴ making bombastic assaults on the devil, the Presbyterians, and the Baptists. His heart and tongue burned with the fire of a sectarian righteousness that would brook no compromise. He was strident, outspoken, and devoted to hyperbole; he damned and villified his enemies and seemed to enjoy their hatred.⁵ The Brownlow who served as reconstruction governor of Tennessee in the 1860s was in most ways the same Brownlow who rode the mountains of southern Appalachia in the 1830s. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about the Parson is that someone did not

⁴W. B. Hesseltine, "Methodism and Reconstruction in East Tennessee," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 3 (1931):42.

⁵These characteristics are mentioned in virtually every work about Brownlow, for instance, *ibid.*, p. 43; Thomas B. Alexander, "Strange Bedfellows: The Interlocking Careers of T. A. R. Nelson, Andrew Johnson, and W. G. (Parson) Brownlow," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 24 (1952):72; Samuel Mayes Arnell, "The Southern Unionist," p. 65, Special Collections, University of Tennessee Library, Knoxville (typescript); Ralph W. Haskins, "Internecine Strife in Tennessee: Andrew Johnson Versus Parson Brownlow," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 24 (Winter 1965), p. 323; Verton M. Queener, "William G. Brownlow as an Editor," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 4 (1932):68; David Sullins, Recollections of an Old Man: Seventy Years in Dixie, 1827-1898 (Bristol, Tenn.: King Printing Co., 1910), p. 30; and James Welch Patton, Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee, 1860-1869 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1966), pp. vii, 75-83.

kill him long before he ascended to the governorship. There were those who tried.

If a man can have a "natural enemy," Brownlow's was Landon C. Haynes, who was to become editor of the Tennessee Sentinel at Jonesboro in 1840, a political force in the Democratic Party and a member of the Confederate Senate.⁶ Haynes was the first-born of a wealthy and established upper east Tennessee family who, while Brownlow spent his teenage years laboring with his hands in the fields and shops of Virginia, spent his in the more cerebral surroundings of the lecture hall at Washington College. Their social class differences were amplified by their religious and political differences,⁷ and, as both men were outspoken champions of their causes, their verbal clashes were probably as inevitable as they were frequent. Yet, in spite of their incendiary mode of expression, neither was a physically violent man, and their pseudo duel in Jonesboro was not inevitable; in fact, it was the only encounter either man had which fits the definition of upper class violence used

⁶The most complete studies of Haynes are James W. Bellamy, "The Political Career of Landon Carter Haynes" (M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1952), and "The Political Career of Landon Carter Haynes," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 28 (1956):102-26. There is a brief sketch in Joshua W. Caldwell, Sketches of the Bench and Bar of Tennessee (Knoxville: Ogden Bros. & Co., 1898), pp. 330-31.

⁷Coulter, Brownlow, pp. 36-37.

in this dissertation. It is important, therefore, to look to its causes.

In the months preceding the incident, several events occurred which may have had an unsettling effect on the men. In 1839, Brownlow gave up the familiar, though hostile, routine of the circuit rider and began a new career as editor of a small town newspaper.⁸ A British traveler who stopped in the area in 1839 described the journalistic climate as

. . . the most abusive, unjust, and unprincipled that are [sic] anywhere to be found . . . they appear . . . to sacrifice truth, honor, and courtesy, to party-feeling; hesitating at nothing to blacken the character of a political opponent . . . sparing neither age nor sex, neither the living nor the dead.⁹

He was referring to the bitter political contest between Representative William B. Carter (Whig) and Joseph Powell, Jr. (Democrat), in which Brownlow's Whig was playing a soon-to-be familiar role to the hilt.

Haynes, too, had recently experienced some changes in his life. He was graduated from college in 1838, studied law with T. A. R. Nelson, and was admitted to the bar in 1839. In 1840, he married Eleanor Powell, daughter of Joseph, Jr., and changed his former Whig allegiance to a

⁸He began publishing the Tennessee Whig in Elizabethton in 1839, which had a population of around two hundred.

⁹James Silk Buchingham, The Slave States of America, 2 vols. (London, 1842), 2:246-48, as cited by Humphrey, Brownlow, pp. 17-18.

Democratic one. The young man may have been doubly anxious to prove himself in his new role. Haynes, the apostate Whig, may also have been doubly cursed in the eyes of Brownlow, the true Whig believer, especially since some of the Powells had earlier tried to kill him.¹⁰ In March or April of 1839, Haynes's future father-in-law had called at Brownlow's father-in-law's ironworks with the intent of thrashing Brownlow for some editorial comments the latter had made, but, according to Brownlow, he reversed the roles and gave Powell a thrashing with a club. Later that day, more Powells called at the ironworks, this time with pistols, but Brownlow maintained that he again prevailed and shot one of them amid a scene of much confusion.¹¹ The Powells were Brownlow's bitter personal enemies, but Brownlow spared Haynes until, according to Brownlow, Haynes denounced him as the biggest liar in Carter County and wrote verses depicting the erstwhile Parson as a consort of prostitutes.¹² Brownlow replied in kind, denouncing Haynes

¹⁰Brownlow had been friendly with the parents of Haynes and had been a guest in their home, but, when Landon married into the Powell family and became active in their political behalf, he became, in a short time, Brownlow's bitter foe.

¹¹Brownlow recounts the episode in the Elizabethton Tennessee Whig, 5 March 1840. Haynes had been telling the story to make it appear that the Powells had gotten the best of a cowardly Brownlow who had sought refuge behind the skirts of his mother-in-law. Actually, she had broken up the fight and made Brownlow come inside the house because his wife was pregnant with her second child.

¹²Ibid., 27 February 1840.

as "a liar, a puppy and a scoundrel,"¹³ but he wrote T. A. R. Nelson that he did "not wish to fight."¹⁴

Two events seem to have changed his mind. The first was an assassination attempt made the evening of 2 March 1840.¹⁵ Brownlow was at his desk around eight o'clock when someone fired two shots into his home and narrowly missed him. He returned the fire and gave chase but was unable to catch his assailant. He suspected Haynes had either done it or procured it and he blasted him in the next Elizabethton Tennessee Whig as the "greatest coward in this Congressional District. . . ." He continued, "You poor, pitiful, contemptible, lying, sneaking up-start, and cowardly rascal! You offer personal violence to me! You would rather stick your head in a forge-fire than to come in contact with me." The article closed with Brownlow's promising,

"Enough for all,
Enough for each,
Enough for ever more!"¹⁶

Even as the shots were still figuratively ringing in his ears, Haynes launched an attack on Brownlow's family

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Brownlow to Nelson, 2 February 1840, cited in Humphrey, Brownlow, p. 21.

¹⁵Humphrey, in Brownlow, p. 21, dates the attack to 9 March, but Brownlow first referred to it in the Elizabethton Tennessee Whig on 5 March. Coulter, in Brownlow, p. 37, has it on 2 March.

¹⁶Elizabethton Tennessee Whig, 5 March 1840.

antecedents, accusing him of being "low bred" and of "low parentage."¹⁷ E. Merton Coulter has written that Brownlow interpreted this as an insult to his mother and forthwith prepared himself for combat.¹⁸

The insult to his mother may well have been the breaking point for him, but Brownlow had most likely built a convincing case against Haynes in his mind. Haynes was the "vile tool"¹⁹ of the Powells who had once openly tried to do him physical harm and now had covertly tried to kill him. Brownlow may have felt toward Haynes in a manner similar to Jackson's feelings toward Dickinson or Houston's toward White--these underlings represented a broader conspiracy of the determined "enemy," and strong action must be taken against them. He had mentally arrived at the point of no alternative.

Brownlow admitted that he initiated the confrontation with Haynes which took place 14 May 1840 in Jonesboro.²⁰ There are several versions of exactly what happened in the street but the variant details do not seem

¹⁷Ibid., 26 March 1840.

¹⁸Coulter, Brownlow, p. 39.

¹⁹Elizabethton Tennessee Whig, 5 March 1840.

²⁰Ibid., 20 May 1840.

significant.²¹ Consensus has it that Brownlow was seated with some friends on the sidewalk when he noticed Haynes walking up the street alone. From appearances, Haynes was unarmed, although he was holding his right hand behind his back. Brownlow approached with his pistol in his right hand and his sword cane in his left. He called to Haynes to retract his slanders about his mother, but Haynes did not do so. At this moment one of three things happened: either Brownlow began to cane and pistol-whip Haynes, and Haynes responded by shooting Brownlow through the thigh; or Haynes fired immediately and Brownlow then seized him; or everything happened simultaneously. Bystanders separated the jousting journalists²² and the physical assault was over.

There were no legal actions taken, and public opinion gave no evidence of outrage. Brownlow recorded that there was some remorse, remorse that he had not been killed:

There positively was greater rejoicing, in all the Locofoco ranks of East Tennessee, at the prospect of our death than there could have been in the Church of

²¹Ibid.; Verton M. Queener, "The Pre-Civil War Period of the Life of William G. Brownlow" (M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1930), pp. 111-12; Bellamy, "Haynes," pp. 15-18; and Nancy Marlene Haley, "'Cry Aloud and Spare Not': The Formative Years of Brownlow's Whig, 1839-1841" (M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966), p. 59.

²² Actually, Haynes did not become editor of the Tennessee Sentinel at Jonesboro until shortly after the fight, although he had contributed to its columns previously.

God on earth, in Europe and America, upon hearing of the death and burial of his Satanic Majesty, the Devil!²³

One unusual result of their fight is that, unlike the majority of other such events, the Brownlow-Haynes pseudo duel settled nothing. The men continued their mutual attacks without ceasing, but they never again resorted to physical violence. When Haynes ran for the legislature in 1845, Brownlow attacked him as

. . . Landon Culprit Haynes, a stealer of corn, seller of a diseased hog, camp-meeting confessor to slander, an attempted assassin, a drunkard, of shooting Brownlow . . . and a liar about his board bill.²⁴

Haynes let it pass. Neither Brownlow nor Haynes was finished by the fight, and it did not have an adverse effect on their later careers; the public seemingly accepted their brawl as "one of those things." The middle Tennessee clash between Felix Zollicoffer and John Leake Marling in 1852 was similarly shrugged off by the people.

Feliz Kirk Zollicoffer was born in Maury County, Tennessee, 19 May 1712, as the youngest of the four children of John Jacob and Martha Kirk Zollicoffer.²⁵ His mother

²³Elizabethton Tennessee Whig, 27 May 1840.

²⁴Quoted in Queener, "The Pre-Civil War Period of Brownlow," p. 92.

²⁵The only book-length study of Zollicoffer, Raymond E. Myers, The Zollie Tree (Louisville: Filson Club Press, 1964), was not intended to be a definitive study. The interested person should also consult James W. McKee, Jr., "Feliz K. Zollicoffer: Confederate Defender of East Tennessee (Parts I and II)," East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 43, 44 (1971, 1972):34-59, 17-40; Edd Winfield Parks, "Zollicoffer: Southern Whig," Tennessee

died when he was three years old, and his father remarried and had three more children. The Zollicoffer family was a prosperous one by local standards, and by international standards they had the status of having descended from Swiss aristocracy. Little is known of Felix's early life except that he was educated in the old-field schools and attended Jackson College in Columbia for one year which was enough schooling for him to be considered an "educated person."

In his adult life, Zollicoffer's career always revolved around journalism, politics, and military service. He served variously as a printer, military figure, state comptroller, editor, state senator, and United States Congressman.²⁶ His power in the Whig Party of Tennessee grew in concert with his rising editorial responsibilities. In 1842, he was brought from Columbia, Tennessee, to Nashville as associate editor of the Republican Banner to help James C. "Lean Jimmy" Jones defeat the incumbent Democratic governor, James K. Polk. The Whigs prevailed, and Zollicoffer became known as a "Kingmaker" in the

Historical Quarterly 11 (December 1952):346-55, Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. "Zollicoffer, Felix Kirk," idem; and two works by James C. Stamper, "Felix Kirk Zollicoffer: Tennessee Editor, Politician, and Soldier" (Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1967), and "Felix K. Zollicoffer: Tennessee Editor and Politician," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 28 (Winter 1969):356-76.

²⁶Stamper, "Zollicoffer," p. 356.

party.²⁷ Ten years later, he was trying to elevate General Winfield Scott to the presidency and ran afoul of John L. Marling.

Marling was thirteen years Zollicoffer's junior, having been born 22 December 1825 in Nashville.²⁸ Marling's family had neither wealth nor position, although, according to one source, he inherited from his mother a gift for writing. He seems to have been primarily a self-educated person, although he did read law with A. O. P. Nicholson and was admitted to the Tennessee bar. He began his career in journalism with the Whig Nashville Daily Gazette in July 1850, and his outspoken editorial opposition to the secessionist talk at the Nashville Convention was strong enough to lead Donald Davidson to write that there was an effort made to bar him from attending their sessions.²⁹ In 1851, he purchased part of the strongly-Democratic Nashville Daily Union and became its editor;³⁰ the next year he and the paper were supporting Franklin Pierce for the presidency.

²⁷Parks, "Zollicoffer," p. 347; McKee, "Zollicoffer," p. 38.

²⁸National Cyclopedia of American Biography, "Marling, John Leake," 13:272-73.

²⁹Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. "Marling, John Leake," by Donald Davidson.

³⁰St. George L. Sioussat, in "Tennessee, the Compromise of 1850, and the Nashville Convention," Tennessee Historical Magazine 4 (December 1918):235-39, gives a description of the various Nashville newspapers and their politics.

The pseudo duel between Zollicoffer and Marling ostensibly resulted from an exchange of editorial barbs arising out of the presidential contest, but there seems to have been more to it. Five months before they fought, Zollicoffer showed that he did not always take criticism in stride when Reece B. Brabson, a member of the state legislature, made comments on the floor deprecating the fourth estate. Zollicoffer interpreted this as a personal affront³¹ and met Brabson near the City Hotel. Zollicoffer told the legislator that he was no gentleman; and Brabson slapped him, whereupon the editor drew a pistol and might have killed Brabson had not his aim been ruined by a jostling bystander.³² The year was to hold more frustrations for Zollicoffer.

He went to the Whig Convention in Baltimore as a member of the Tennessee delegation where he was determined to get the nomination for Millard Fillmore or another man favoring the Compromise of 1850. Frustrated in these efforts, Zollicoffer did agree, for the sake of party unity, to support General Winfield Scott.³³ Any reservations he may have had about Scott were kept private, and the Banner was full-throated in advocating his candidacy.

³¹Brabson had not mentioned Zollicoffer by name.

³²Chattanooga Gazette, n.d., cited by the Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 13 March 1852.

³³Stamper, "Zollicoffer," p. 363.

Zollicoffer and Marling may have been sparring on another matter before they took their gloves off in the presidential bout. In fact, Zollicoffer's principal biographer contends that their fight was caused by the dispute over the location of a proposed bridge across the Cumberland. Zollicoffer had been advocating a bridge at the Public Square, but Marling favored it at another location and had accused Zollicoffer of self-interest.³⁴ Zollicoffer's strong sense of personal honor may have been aroused by these accusations which may have served as an intermediate cause of their pseudo duel.³⁵

The direct cause of their fight was the rhetoric occasioned by the presidential contest and, more specifically, the transformation of Zollicoffer and Marling's editorial duel from political attacks to personal ones. Two weeks before the shooting, Zollicoffer cautioned

³⁴An examination of the newspapers does not substantiate the story; however, it is given in Myers, Zollie Tree, p. 24; "General Felix Kirk Zollicoffer, His First and Last Battle--Correct Story of his Death and His Duel with Marling," Nashville Banner, 5 March 1910, clipping in the Bettie M. Donelson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; and the Nashville American, 23 May 1900.

³⁵Zollicoffer is quoted in his granddaughter's book as having once told his wife that "without honor my life would be valueless to my family and myself. . . ." Octavia Zollicoffer Bond, The Family Chronicle and Kinship Book of Maclin, Clack, Cocke, Carter, Taylor, Cross, Gordon and Other Related American Lineages (Nashville: McDaniel Printing Co., 1928), p. 376. Bond also records that, when Zollicoffer's wife was told that he had been sent a challenge, she responded, "Did he accept it? Because if he didn't, I will."

Marling for being unmindful of the "proprieties of good neighborhood in the press . . .," by permitting personal attacks on him to appear in the Union.³⁶ Although it was open season on the candidates, editors should not insult one another. On 17 August, Marling wrote that the friends of General Scott represented "the darkest and most disreputable chapter in the political history of this country. We have never known so much down right dishonesty to enter a political canvass before."³⁷ The next day, the Banner was accused of feeding "blarney" to its subscribers. The atmosphere was charged enough that a third paper editorialized on 19 August against some editors "who either presume that a political campaign cannot be waged without a resort to insinuations or declarations personally offensive to their editorial opponents or else are ignorant of the . . . amenities of life."³⁸ On that same day, Zollicoffer wrote some cool-headed advice to the Union: "We are loth to construe the language of our neighbor discourteously; but we think if he does not mean to provoke unfriendly

³⁶Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 5 August 1852.

³⁷Nashville Union, 17 August 1852.

³⁸Daily Nashville True Whig, 19 August 1852. The Whig was directing its condemnation at a Democratic paper in Gallatin.

relations, he ought to be more careful in abstaining from such expressions."³⁹ But cooler heads were not to prevail.

The unquestioned direct cause of the fight was an editorial which appeared in the Union Friday morning, 20 August 1852, in which Marling wanted "to say a plain word or two to the Banner." Marling defended his policies by attacking Zollicoffer's as "most reckless and unscrupulous . . . [and of] belieing General Pierce. We use the word in all its length and breadth. It is a shameless misrepresentation." There was no mistaking Marling's meaning when he continued, "We say, if this course is to be persisted in . . . by the political press, the occupation of a political editor, hitherto honorable, will become disgraceful in the eyes of all honest men."⁴⁰

Zollicoffer read the article and felt that it was "unquestionably intended to be personally insulting to [me]. . . ." ⁴¹ He responded immediately by sending a friend to Marling's office with the message that the next time they met he intended to denounce him. ⁴² Marling's reply was

³⁹Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 19 August 1852.

⁴⁰Nashville Union, 20 August 1852.

⁴¹Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 24 August 1852.

⁴²There are no disagreements among the various newspaper accounts of the incident; however, the story that Zollicoffer's wife molded the bullets for his pistol on her nursery hearth the night before appears to be apocryphal since the article which caused the shooting did not appear

equally quick--he was ready. Zollicoffer continued to press by walking over from the Banner office on Deadrick to the corner of Cherry and Cedar (now Fourth and Charlotte) across from the Union's office and waiting for Marling to come out. He did and was duly denounced. Both men were armed and, evidently, prepared to kill or be killed. Marling fired first but missed and, when Zollicoffer tried to complete the volley, his pistol partially misfired. While he was getting another percussion cap out of his pocket, Marling fired again and inflicted a flesh wound on two fingers of Zollicoffer's right hand. Zollicoffer then calmly took his shot hitting Marling on the right side of his face above the nose. The ball passed on through the cheekbone and lodged in the muscles of his neck. There were some anxious days of concern about Marling's injury, but he was back at his desk after three months of recuperation.

The reaction of the press to the incident was curiously benign. The True Whig and the Gazette gave brief matter-of-fact reports the next day and noted that "the encounter was occasioned by the newspaper articles growing out of party politics."⁴³ In the Banner, four days after

until the next day. Interestingly, on the day of the shooting Zollicoffer seemed to be trying to terminate the quarrel when he wrote that "we drop the subject, despairing of inducing our neighbor to correct the error he has fallen into." Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 20 August 1852.

⁴³Nashville Gazette; Daily Nashville True Whig, 21 August 1852.

the "recontre," Zollicoffer acknowledged that it had happened, reported the facts, and wished Marling a speedy recovery.⁴⁴ Marling's paper, the Union, referred to the "unfortunate affray" and defended its editor as a man who had no choice in a regrettable situation. He continued:

The occurrence of difficulties like this are extremely unfortunate. But they are sometimes unavoidable. No man is worthy to conduct a paper who is not ready to meet all responsibilities, and the readers of the Union are assured that such responsibilities will always be met here. Regard for the public peace would cause the Editor and Assistant Editor . . . to prefer a more quiet mode of adjustment, but when forced upon them in the public streets . . . they have no option but to meet them there, and leave the public to pass their own judgment.⁴⁵

This editorial comment warrants very serious consideration. It says that respectable men should never choose to fight, but there are circumstances in which there is no choice. If a man is to maintain his honor and standing in the community, then he must fight and "leave the public to pass their own judgment." This gives the frustration-aggression hypothesis a curious twist because it postulates that the most important inhibitor of aggression is the fear of punishment, and in cases like this the fear of punishment (loss of status) appears to be greater if one does not fight than if one does. More will be made of this point later. Whatever may have driven the men to shoot it

⁴⁴Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 24 August 1852.

⁴⁵Nashville Union, 21 August 1852.

out in the Nashville streets, it is clear that they did not receive public censure for having done it. As noted, the press more or less accepted it as a fact of life, no criminal proceedings were brought, and, still more illuminating, Zollicoffer was elected to the United States House of Representatives the next year and was twice reelected. He ended his career and life as a brigadier general in the Confederate Army. Marling continued as an editor and was appointed by President Pierce in 1854 as United States Minister Resident to Guatemala.⁴⁶

The attitude of the press toward honorable gentlemanly combat changed when Allen A. Hall, editor of the Nashville Daily News, killed George Gilmer Poindexter, editor of the Nashville Union and American, on 18 November 1859. As with the Zollicoffer-Marling affair, this one arose during a hotly contested political campaign when the journalists began to take editorial shots at each other, but, although they were fierce newspapermen, they otherwise seem unlikely combatants. Hall was gray-haired, fifty-seven years old, and quite unfamiliar with firearms; and Poindexter was diminutive, sickly, and very nearsighted. Yet, on a rainy day, as Poindexter was quickly striding

⁴⁶Myers, Zollie Tree, p. 26. The Zollicoffer-Marling quarrel, as well as those of Poindexter-Hall and Cooper-Carmack, are described in Hugh Walker, Tennessee Tales (Nashville: Aurora Publishers, 1970), pp. 197-203; also, there is a typescript account of the three quarrels in the William Henry McRaven Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

toward the office of the News, Hall, a man whom he had never met, shot him with a double-barreled shotgun loaded with single 0 buckshot and pleaded self-defense.

George G. Poindexter was born 30 November 1829 in Louisa County, Virginia, and was the youngest son of his mother, who died while he was still an infant,⁴⁷ and his father, who moved the family to Kentucky for a short time. After wandering, he moved to Tennessee where he died while George was still young. George was then reared in his sister's home in Weakley County. He was a good student, even a scholar, and was admitted as a sophomore to Bowdoin College in Maine when he was seventeen. He graduated in 1850 and returned to Tennessee where he taught school and studied law at Cumberland Law College in Lebanon and was graduated from there in 1853.⁴⁸ After practicing law, he was appointed Chief Clerk of the Post Office in 1857. In the summer of 1858, he purchased part of the Nashville Union and American and became its principal editor. He was a pronounced Democrat, and one paper wrote of him that "by his earnest efforts, his forcible arguments, and skill as a

⁴⁷The Memphis Appeal, n.d., cited by Nashville Union and American, 26 November 1859, has a sketch of his life.

⁴⁸Some sources say he graduated from Dartmouth College, but a letter of tribute from a classmate of Bowdoin College mentioned him as a member of their class of 1850. Nashville Union and American, 16 December 1859.

controversialist he contributed perhaps more than any other editor in Tennessee to the success of the party."⁴⁹

Almost nothing is known of Allen A. Hall's early years except that he was born around 1802, was a native of North Carolina, and moved to Nashville in 1824 or 1825 where he went into the newspaper business as editor of the Republican and State Gazette.⁵⁰ He was a Whig and, for thirty years, a political ally of John Bell, the leader of that party in Tennessee who rewarded him intermittently with government positions.⁵¹

Almost two decades before his quarrel with Poindexter, Hall had engaged in a similar contest of personal vituperation with one of Poindexter's predecessors at the Union, Jeremiah George Harris. Their feelings grew so bitter that Harris described Hall as, "the loathsome little creeping thing that dabbles in the filth. . . ."⁵²

⁴⁹The Democrat, 19 November 1859, cited by the Nashville Union and American, 22 November 1859.

⁵⁰James T. Horton, Jr., "The Evolution of a Whig Editor in Tennessee: Allen A. Hall" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1966), p. 2. This study carries Hall's life to 1840 and does not mention the duel with Poindexter.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 3; Thomas Perkins Abernathy, "The Origin of the Whig Party in Tennessee," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 12 (March 1926):506; and Norman L. Parks, "The Career of John Bell of Tennessee in the United States House of Representatives" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1942), p. 56.

⁵²Nashville Union, 24 July 1839, quoted in Horton, "Hall," p. 110.

In a preview of things to come, Hall pictured Harris as a sympathizer with the abolitionists and dug up old stories Harris had written for the Massachusetts Gazette in New Bedford that implicated him as such.⁵³ Later, Poindexter would do the same thing to Hall, with fatal results.

The "Black Republicans" were anathema in middle Tennessee in 1859 and being tarred with the brush of abolitionism was a very serious matter. At a time when Hall and the News were defending John Bell's position on slavery, Poindexter and the Union American charged them with favoring abolitionism. They applied the first stroke to Hall 10 November 1859 by reproducing part of an article which had appeared in the Hall-edited Republican in 1834.⁵⁴ The last three lines of the article were omitted and this made it appear as if the paper were supporting an abolitionist amendment to Tennessee's constitution, which, in fact, it was not exactly doing. Poindexter noted that Hall was out of town when the article was run but condemned him for not disavowing it later. Two days later, Hall was accused of having had a long association with "men such as Seward and Greeley" and of having cooperated with the abolitionists.⁵⁵

Hall took no notice of the attack for almost a week, then on 16 November he responded, "The Union and American

⁵³Horton, "Hall," pp. 110-11.

⁵⁴Nashville Union and American, 10 November 1859.

⁵⁵Ibid., 12 November 1859.

is at its old trick of garbling-- . . . for the unworthy purpose of perverting the words and meaning of a political opponent."⁵⁶ The article reproduced in full the questioned story and told of the editor's absence from town, then closed by accusing the Union and American of suppressing and obfuscating the truth. Poindexter wrote the next day,

The charges and insinuations against this paper, contained in the leading editorial article of the News yesterday, are utterly destitute of truth. We cannot consent to carry on a newspaper controversy with an editor who utters calumnies against a contemporary trusting to the supposed privileges of age to shield him from responsibility.⁵⁷

His fulminations elicited an editorial response from Hall and a physical attack from Hall's son, John. As Poindexter was on his way to breakfast on 17 November, the younger Hall approached, asking if he were the author of the above quoted article and, when Poindexter replied that he was, Hall called him a "damned rascal [or "damned scoundrel"]."⁵⁸ They "came into collision" and were separated by a third party. As Hall continued his denunciations, Poindexter told him, "I never bandy epithets. I will give you an opportunity where we can settle this matter free from interruption." Shortly thereafter, the men

⁵⁶Nashville Daily News, 16 November 1859.

⁵⁷Nashville Union and American, 17 November 1859.

⁵⁸The only account of their meeting is part of the testimony during the courtroom examination of Allen Hall. Nashville Union and American, 1 December 1859.

exchanged several threatening notes, but nothing was arranged. Hall closed his final message, "When you call upon one for the satisfaction of a gentleman, you shall be properly answered."⁵⁹ If there were any doubt in Poindexter's mind that he had to call on Allen Hall, it was removed by the News the next day.

Under the simple heading, "A Card," Hall reprinted the text of Poindexter's editorial and continued,

The "charges" I made against the Union and American . . . I established by undeniable facts. . . . I made no "insinuations."

The assertion that I trust to the privileges of age to shield myself from responsibility for any statements I make is false and calumnious. He who made the assertion trusts to the pistol to shield from exposure the misrepresentations and falsehoods of the journal with which he is connected. That is the plain English of the matter. The shield he has selected will prove insufficient for his purpose. I shall go on as I have begun, with a thorough exposure of all the misstatements, misrepresentations, and falsehoods which may appear in the Union and American and which I deem worthy of notice--fully able and prepared to protect my person against assault and punish the assailant.

Allen A. Hall⁶⁰

Hall had indeed prepared himself.⁶¹ The day before, he had consulted with a friend as to the type of weapon he

⁵⁹John Hall to George G. Poindexter, 17 November 1859, George G. Poindexter Papers, Tennessee Historical Society Collection, TSLA. This is the only note which survived.

⁶⁰Nashville Daily News, 18 November 1859.

⁶¹This writer's description is based on the testimony given during Hall's preliminary examination, verbatim records of which were carried in the press. All the papers carried the four days of testimony and the

should use in case of trouble. He tried an old duelling pistol but rejected it because he could not aim it properly through its sights. A shotgun was suggested, and Hall had one brought to the office, fully loaded with buckshot, the evening before the above article was to appear in his paper. Poindexter was also prepared. He borrowed some pistols and slept with them at his bedside the night before the encounter.

On Friday, 18 November 1859, it was raining. Poindexter had breakfast with friends and showed them Hall's "card" and asked them how he ought to reply to it. They said that circumstances would determine that. Poindexter asked W. C. Whitthorne, a state legislator from Columbia, to accompany him to the office of the News because he had never seen Hall. Whitthorne agreed, and they set out in the rain. When Poindexter did not open his umbrella, Whitthorne asked him if he were nervous, and Poindexter joked that "it's not much of an umbrella and not much rain," but opened it. He then asked Whitthorne whether it would be better to strike Hall with his open hand or with his umbrella and received a "wait and see" reply. When they arrived at the News office, they learned that Hall had not yet arrived. They waited for several minutes and then walked away. In the interim, Hall

Nashville Union and American, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 December 1859, carried the next day's summary by the prosecution. It did not include the summary remarks of defense counsel.

arrived and was told that Poindexter had called. Hall asked that the shotgun be brought to him and stepped out into the street in front of his office. Although Poindexter had gone up the street with his friend and told him, "I don't anticipate a duel or anything of that kind," he decided to return to the News.

As Poindexter retraced his steps, Hall held the shotgun in his hands and called for him to "stop!" Poindexter walked still faster and Hall again called for him to halt, and now raised his weapon to the ready. He cried "stop" a third time. The witnesses disagreed on what happened at this juncture. Those for the prosecution said that Poindexter simply continued to walk toward Hall; Hall's defense witnesses testified that Poindexter stopped and began to draw a pistol, thus inciting Hall's response. Whichever was the case, a few seconds after the third "halloo," Hall shot Poindexter dead at a distance of forty-three feet. He then sent for a police officer and surrendered himself into his custody.

The press reaction was mostly predictable. The Union and American ran heavy black columns to signify mourning, described their fallen editor's manly courage, called him "as nearly faultless as humanity can become," and damned Hall.⁶² The News briefly noted the facts of the

⁶²Nashville Union and American, 19 November 1859.

preceding day's "personal difficulty." The Republican Banner was little more than factual in reporting the "melancholy and fatal occurrence [sic]." ⁶³ Only the Gazette asked the right questions. Under the heading, "Whose [sic] at Fault?", they asked, where was the peacemaker who could have soothed the men? They asked if "the pernicious false social code whose requirements sternly demand . . . the sacrifice of human life" did not share part of the blame. The paper took pity on "him who hazards and loses his life in obedience to the desperate mandates of this inexorable custom." To exorcise this custom, the Gazette called upon men of good will to take the lead and to set worthy examples; "this remnant of barbarism" must be banished. ⁶⁴

The law took its course, at least for a while. A coroner's jury met immediately and bound Hall over to be examined by the local magistrates. Before that bar, Hall's defense team included former Governor Neill S. Brown, and the prosecution was headed by Attorney General (later Governor and United States Senator) William B. Bate. During the examination of witnesses Brown tried to depict Poindexter as a dangerous man. The description of him by the prominent Democrat Cave Johnson was typical: Johnson

⁶³Nashville Daily News; Nashville Republican Banner, 19 November 1859.

⁶⁴Nashville Daily Gazette, 20 November 1859.

knew him "as mild, amiable and unoffending . . . but on questions affecting his honor and veracity, he was very sensitive--exceedingly so, and perhaps . . . remarkably so."⁶⁵ Other testimony revealed that he had shot a General Hornberger in Clarksville, perhaps in a duel, on a similar point of honor, but no one knew much about the incident. It seems that this slight, sickly man possessed an essential characteristic for this kind of outburst: a high and sensitive regard for his personal honor and a willingness to defend it regardless of the consequences. Furthermore, the physical attack on him by Hall's son, as the physical attack on Brownlow by the unknown assailant, may well have been an equally important factor; without that, the men might have been content to confine their quarrels to the editorial page, but once the other party turned it into a physical brawl the men felt compelled to respond in the new idiom.⁶⁶

The final point concerns punishment and sanctions. The result of the preliminary hearing which ended 2 December 1859 was that Hall was bound over to the next session of the Davidson County grand jury on the charge of murder. Perhaps because of the dislocations of secession and the Civil War,

⁶⁵Nashville Union and American, 1 December 1859.

⁶⁶There were suggestions that Poindexter's death was part of a conspiracy. For instance, Isham G. Harris wrote that he was of "the opinion that Poindexter fell victim to one of the most deliberately planned assassinations that is to be found upon the annals of crime. . . ." Isham G. Harris to A. R. Crozier, December 1859, Isham Green Harris Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

he not only did not stand trial, he continued his important duties at the News and in 1863 President Lincoln appointed him Minister to Bolivia.⁶⁷ Although Hall was not being rewarded for his crime, he most certainly was not being punished, either. The people of Tennessee still felt that there were some things more important than life, and men had a right to settle their personal differences outside of institutional constraints. Inasmuch as this represents a frontier mentality, then the frontier persisted.

It is symbolically significant that the final case study in this dissertation is the first and only one in which the judicial process was carried fully to its conclusion. Yet, the juries' decisions and the judges' punishments in the killing of Edward Ward Carmack seem less the results of citizens demanding an end to such killings than the results of an outrageous newspaper campaign and a politically active special interest group seeking to make a martyr of their fallen leader.

The dovetailing careers of Edward Ward Carmack and Duncan Brown Cooper are as colorful as they are complex. Cooper, fourteen years Carmack's senior, was born 21 April 1844 in Maury County, Tennessee, into a prominent family. He was the son of Matthew D. Cooper and his third wife,

⁶⁷A post in which he served until his death in 1868.

Marian Whitherspoon (Brown).⁶⁸ During the Civil War, he served as an officer in the command of an earlier subject of this paper, General Nathan Bedford Forrest. After the war, he was admitted to the bar but left Tennessee for a while in pursuit of adventures in Mexico, Honduras, and Washington, D.C. He returned home and was elected to the state legislature in 1880 to represent Maury County. From 1886-1888 he controlled the Nashville American, a position which greatly enhanced his political power. It was as its president that he recruited the fiery young editor, Edward Ward Carmack. Cooper preferred to play his politics behind the scenes, and he was much more the patron and counselor of politicians than he was a politician himself. It was a matter of political support that drew him into conflict with his erstwhile friend and employee, Edward Ward Carmack.⁶⁹

Carmack now appears larger than life. His is one of only four monuments erected on the Capitol grounds in Nashville.⁷⁰ At the time of his death, he was memorialized

⁶⁸"Biographical Note," Duncan Cooper Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; Nashville Tennessean, 5 November 1922.

⁶⁹According to his nephew, M. D. C. Stockell, and also to Will Dunn Smith, in the most scholarly study of the Carmack-Cooper affair, Cooper won the American in a poker game. Stockell says he lost it in a similar manner, but Smith found that he sold it. Memorandum of M. D. C. Stockell, n.d., Cooper Family Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA; Will Dunn Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign and Its Aftermath in Tennessee Politics" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1939), p. 80.

⁷⁰The others are Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, and Sam Davis.

by the great and powerful.⁷¹ His passing probably insured the passage in Tennessee of state-wide prohibition, helped temporarily to erode the powers of the governor's office, and effected the split in the Democratic Party which permitted the Republicans to inaugurate their first governor since the early 1880s. Although his influence from the grave was greater than from his editorial desk, he nonetheless had had a useful life on the firing line.

He was born in Sumner County, 5 November 1858, as the third and final child of his parents.⁷² His father was a Christian Church minister, and died when "Ned" was four years old. The Carmacks were as obscure and unknown as the

⁷¹Nashville Tennessean, 16 November 1908; Robert Franklin Crutcher, "The Career of Edward Ward Carmack and the Cooper-Sharp Trial" (M.A. thesis, Western Kentucky State Teachers College, 1932), pp. 53-58.

⁷²Biographical sketches of Carmack abound in the many obituaries published at the time of his death and practically all of the works cited in this study include at least brief references to his early years. In addition, one may consult Jay Guy Cisco, Historic Sumner County, Tennessee, with Genealogies of the Bledsoe, Cage, and Douglas Families, and Genealogical Notes of Other Sumner County Families (Nashville: Folk-Keelin, 1909; reprint ed., Nashville: Charles Elder, 1971), pp. 239-41; Paul Franklin Bumpus, Carmack: The Edward Ward Carmack Story (Franklin, Tenn.: By the Author, 1977); "Biographical Sketch," Edward Ward Carmack Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA (a photocopy of the original collection held by the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill); and Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. "Carmack, Edward Ward," by Walter Lynwood Fleming.

Coopers were established and influential.⁷³ The young Carmack was forced to hire himself out for what he could earn as soon as he was old enough to do so. One can only suppose what effects being raised in the fatherless home during the Civil War may have had on him, but, like Andrew Jackson, Carmack developed a driving ambition to rise above his origins; also, like Jackson's and Houston's, Carmack's mother may have played a highly influential role in his life.

I say to you that the sweetest wisdom of this world is a woman's counsel, and the purest altar from which a human prayer ever went to heaven is a mother's knee.⁷⁴

Carmack was educated in the public schools of Sumner County, and for a year at Webb School in Culleoka (now moved to Bell Buckle), Tennessee, before attending Cumberland Law School in Lebanon. He was admitted to the bar in 1879 and returned to Columbia to open his practice. He dabbled in local politics, became editor of the Columbia Herald, and served a term in the state House of Representatives. He then moved to Nashville where he helped Duncan Cooper edit the American. In 1892, he moved to Memphis to become editor-in-chief of the Commercial, and the highest paid editor in

⁷³Edward Ward Carmack, Jr., told Will Dunn Smith that the Carmack family had lived for some time in the Cooper home when they first moved to Columbia. "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," p. 81.

⁷⁴Edward Ward Carmack, Character, or The Making of the Man (Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1909), p. 66.

the South.⁷⁵ He served in the United States House of Representatives from 1897 until he was sent to the United States Senate in 1901.⁷⁶ Carmack was a member of that body until 1906, when he was defeated by former Governor Robert L. Taylor in the Democratic primary. Two years later, he was again defeated in a Democratic primary, this time by Malcolm Patterson in the governor's race.

Much can, and has, been written about the career of Edward Ward Carmack, but this study will focus on those aspects of his life which are related to his violence. Carmack's personality and style fit into the pattern of the highly motivated, ambitious, complex men who have preceded him on these pages. His tongue and pen were intelligent, sharp, uncompromising, and often sarcastic. By these measures, he compares with Brownlow, and they also compare as zealous crusaders. For the most part, Carmack's combativeness was restricted to verbal expression, although after moving to Memphis his attacks on fellow journalist Thomas Collier led Collier to challenge him to a duel, and

⁷⁵George Fort Milton, "Edward Ward Carmack," North American Review 185 (June 1908):808; Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," pp. 12-15.

⁷⁶Frank Embrick Bass, "The Work of Edward Ward Carmack in Congress" (M.A. thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930), covers this period of Carmack's career.

they came within an hour and a half of shooting it out in Holly Springs, Mississippi.⁷⁷

The relations which had been so warm between Carmack and Cooper may have begun to cool in 1896 when Carmack ran for the United States House of Representatives against Josiah Patterson, and Cooper supported Patterson. Cooper may have felt that Carmack's bombast was useful enough for selling newspapers, but he preferred a more conservative politician for elective office. Will Dunn Smith has held that the issue separating the two men was their attitude toward corporate wealth. Cooper had a close relationship with large corporations and was a long-time lobbyist for the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, while Carmack favored the farmer, the debtor, and in the campaigns of the 1880s "Free Silver."⁷⁸

If the election of 1896 drove the first wedge between the two men, the second one was driven ten years later. In 1901, Carmack had been elected without opposition to the United States Senate where he quickly made a

⁷⁷Collier was the owner of the Memphis Appeal-Avalanche. Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," pp. 15-16; Bumpus, Carmack, p. 6. When the news of the impending duel spread, Carmack was arrested, and this caused him to miss his train. He hired a special train to take him to the scheduled place of the duel, Holly Springs, but was late. Collier had not received the telegram Carmack had sent asking for a delay; therefore, he declared Carmack in default and returned to Memphis. Carmack criticized him for this, but friends were able to smooth things over between them.

⁷⁸Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," p. 82.

reputation for himself as an outspoken opponent of imperialism and a supporter of greater railroad regulation.⁷⁹ When he sought renomination for the seat in 1906, he was opposed by former Governor Taylor, perhaps the most popular Democrat in the state.

Their contest was the first in Tennessee history in which the Democrats used a primary election to choose their gubernatorial candidate, and the people chose Taylor by a vote of 72,841 to 66,477.⁸⁰ One of the issues during the campaign had been prohibition. Carmack had attacked Taylor as a tool of the liquor interests and had vowed: "If they [the liquor people] defeat me . . . it shall be my next ambition to be handed down to history as the last man who was ever defeated for office by the saloon power of Tennessee."⁸¹ Actually, the man and the issue joined somewhat late. Carmack had earlier opposed prohibition, but his Senate voting record was good enough that the anti-saloon people selected him to introduce bills for them in that body and by 1905 he was supporting state-wide

⁷⁹Crutcher, "Career of Carmack," pp. 23-25; Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee Senators as Seen by One of their Successors (Kingsport, Tenn.: Southern Publishers, 1942), p. 472; and Paul E. Isaac, Prohibition and Politics: Turbulent Decades in Tennessee, 1885-1920 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965), p. 107.

⁸⁰Robert H. White, ed., Messages of the Governors of Tennessee, 1796-1821, 8 vols. (Nashville, Tennessee Historical Commission, 1952), 7:704.

⁸¹Nashville American, 21 November 1905, quoted in Isaac, Prohibition and Politics, p. 108.

prohibition with the enthusiasts of the latter-day convert.⁸²

Duncan Cooper's role in this was to support Carmack's opponents. In 1905-06, he supported Taylor, and two years later he supported incumbent Malcolm R. Patterson when Carmack challenged him for the Democratic nomination for the governor's office.⁸³

On 15 March 1908, Carmack first denounced Cooper editorially, and it is clear that Cooper's sins were those of association--association with his political enemies and with the corporations. Carmack wrote:

We may mention Colonel Duncan B. Cooper of Davidson and Colonel Robert N. Graves of Madison, gentlemen of many amiable qualities who have been constant bolters and have at least come together in the rivalry of enthusiastic devotion to the political interests of the Governor, the L.&N. Railroad in all its history of crime, political debauchery and general corruption and degradation ever actually occurred.⁸⁴

The pioneer campaign of 1908 was a mighty clash with Patterson and Carmack duelling in a series of debates across the state. Carmack had made "the entire abolition of liquor

⁸²Ibid., pp. 107-08.

⁸³William Waller, ed., Nashville, 1900 to 1910 (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1972), pp. 92-93; Everett Robert Boyce, ed., The Unwanted Boy: The Autobiography of Governor Ben W. Hooper (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1963), p. 49.

⁸⁴Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," p. 83.

traffic in this state"⁸⁵ the first plank of his platform, but the men debated many subjects.⁸⁶ The debates became so emotional and bitter that on one occasion Carmack tried to assault Patterson physically and had to be restrained.⁸⁷ Carmack continued his verbal attacks on Patterson and his supporters, and, in May 1908, he made his first reference in the debates to the sixty-five-year-old Cooper as "a little bald headed angel of hell."⁸⁸ Cooper was reportedly sensitive about his baldness and sent word to Carmack that such references were uncalled for; he was a private citizen not seeking public office; and he felt that his name should not be dragged into the debates. Carmack evidently considered Cooper as part of the "machine"⁸⁹ that opposed him and thus fair game for an occasional insult.

The campaign between Patterson and Carmack raged to its conclusion in June, but Carmack again found himself

⁸⁵Nashville Tennessean, 11 April 1908; Lucille Neville, in "Edward Ward Carmack in the Fight for Prohibition in Tennessee" (M.A. thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929), pp. 6-30, traces the campaign and debates of 1908.

⁸⁶Patterson favored the more moderate local option plan which was then in effect. Isaac, Prohibition and Politics, p. 154.

⁸⁷The incident occurred in May at Fayetteville. Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," p. 57.

⁸⁸Nashville Tennessean, 19 May 1908, cited by Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," p. 57.

⁸⁹Carmack's wrath for the "machine" suggests the feelings that earlier subjects had toward "conspiracies."

defeated. Carmack was very bitter over his loss. His determination to continue the campaign against the "machine" in the November general elections may have been a combination of the desire to get even with his political enemies, which would help explain his abuse of Duncan Cooper, plus the wish to promote the cause of prohibition.⁹⁰ Whatever his motivation may have been, he was provided forum enough to express his views when he was made editor of the Nashville Tennessean in September 1908.⁹¹ On election day the Tennessean blistered the alleged conspiracy. The editorial cartoon showed a rattling snake coiled around a ballot box with the caption, "Here's your problem--is this to be a government of men or snakes?" The editorial read, in part,

Now mark you, gentlemen of the machine! The eyes of the country are upon you. . . . We shall see . . . whether you have closed as you began this campaign--in perfidy and dishonor. . . . You have deliberately added thousands of Negro votes to the National Republican ticket. They will vote for you, for the grog shop, for the gambling halls, for the L. & N. Railroad, and for Taft.⁹²

The voters gave a comfortable victory to Patterson over his Republican opponent but voted in a legislature

⁹⁰Isaac indicates that Carmack "reluctantly advised his readers to vote for Democratic candidates in the coming general election." Prohibition and Politics, p. 155.

⁹¹The Tennessean and its owner Luke Lea had been among Carmack's most ardent supporters.

⁹²Nashville Tennessean, 3 November 1908.

which the prohibitionists claimed to control. Carmack did not relent in his diatribes against his foes, and, when he learned that Cooper had helped to effect a reconciliation between Patterson and his erstwhile political adversary, ex-Governor John Cox, he attacked Cooper editorially. The 8 November editorial ridiculed Cooper:

All honor to that noble spirit, Major Duncan B. Cooper, who wrought this happy union. . . . All honor to Major Dunc and may the honors of the Peacemaker be upon him! May he be heir to all the beatitudes, and especially to the blessings reserved for those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. . . .⁹³

The attack launched the chain of events that would end with Carmack's death. On November 8, Cooper told E. B. Craig, a friend of both men, that he was very angry and that, "if my name appears in the Tennessean again, the town of Nashville will not be large enough to hold both of us."⁹⁴ Craig offered himself as a mediator, and Cooper gladly accepted his offer. He did not demand an apology, but said that Carmack should be informed that, if Cooper's name appeared in the paper again, Cooper had prepared a note to send him. Craig went immediately to Carmack with this information but reported back to Cooper that Carmack was in

⁹³Cox had been an ally of Carmack. Nashville Tennessean, 8 November 1908.

⁹⁴Craig testified that Cooper had said that if his name appeared again that either he or Carmack would die; Cooper denied having said this. Cooper and Cooper v. Tennessee, p. 33, Middle Tennessee Supreme Court, Archives Section, TSLA.

an ugly mood and would not make any agreements.⁹⁵ In fact, Carmack's response was to call a friend over to his office, borrow a pistol from him, and then pen his most vitriolic attack yet. Cooper also borrowed a pistol.

The next day, November 9, Carmack's article appeared under the heading, "The Diplomat of Zweibund," and said:

To Major Duncan Cooper, who wrought the great coalition, who achieved the harmonious confluence of incompatible elements; who welded the pewter handle to the wooden spoon, who grafted the dead bough to the living tree and made it bloom . . . who made soda and vinegar to dwell placidly in the same bottle and who taught oil and water how they might agree--To Major Duncan Brown Cooper, the great diplomat of the political zweibund, be all honor and glory forever!⁹⁶

Although this article is usually considered the immediate cause of the killing, the events of that day lead to the conclusion that the article provided necessary but not sufficient cause.

When the paper appeared, Cooper was terribly angry, and his friends were alarmed. Governor Patterson walked over to the Maxwell House to see him, and there Cooper revealed that he had written a note to Carmack. The note did not challenge Carmack to fight but repeated that he was a private citizen, and Carmack had no right to use his name

⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 29-30.

⁹⁶Nashville Tennessean, 9 November 1908. Boyce, in The Unwanted Boy, p. 50, states that the title of the editorial was a paraphrase of a title accorded to the German Chancellor Bismarck, "The Diplomat of the Dreibund."

in print. Patterson asked Cooper not to send the note, and Cooper handed it over to a third party, Judge J. C. Bradford, a local attorney. Cooper consulted with his son Robin, also an attorney, who likewise counseled moderation.⁹⁷ Tempers had calmed down enough so that at 3:00 p.m. Bradford called Governor Patterson telling him that the note had not been delivered, and Cooper had agreed to let the matter drop. Ten minutes later, Patterson telephoned Cooper and asked him to visit the gubernatorial mansion, which was on Seventh Avenue North between Union and Cedar, to discuss the affair and some other political business. On their way to the mansion, the shooting took place.

Robin decided to accompany his father and, on their way out of his office, he grabbed his overcoat, in the pocket of which he had a pistol. As they walked from their office at Third and Church up to Union Street, they chanced on former Sheriff John D. Sharp who began to walk with them. As they reached the corner of Union and Seventh, Robin and Sharp saw Carmack across the street on Seventh. Robin tried to hurry his father up so that the men would not see each other, but Duncan saw Carmack and, according to J. C. Bradford, said, "There is Senator Carmack; I am going to speak to him."⁹⁸ When Robin asked him not to, Duncan

⁹⁷Robin, like young Joe Mabry before him, seems to have sensed the impending crisis which he was powerless to prevent.

⁹⁸Waller, Nashville, p. 96.

replied, "I know Carmack and he knows me; there will be no trouble." Carmack was greeting a prominent friend, Mrs. Charles H. Eastman, when Cooper called to him. She testified that Cooper said, "Well, here you are all right, I have the drop on you now," or words to that effect.⁹⁹ Carmack then drew his pistol, and Cooper continued, "You dastardly coward, you cowardly scoundrel, hiding behind that woman, are you? Get out from behind that woman." She quickly moved five to seven feet out of the line of fire. She could not recollect who fired first, but, when it concluded, Carmack was dead and Robin wounded. Her testimony rather clearly puts the guilt on the Coopers, and Duncan's statement, "here you are all right," implies that they expected to find him there, hence a premeditated conspiracy.

The Coopers presented a different picture of the events. They denied that Duncan made the verbal challenge which Mrs. Eastman recollected and argued that, when Duncan called to Carmack, the latter drew his pistol and fired two shots at Robin, wounding him in his right shoulder. Robin then drew his pistol and returned the fire. As all three of Robin's shots hit Carmack and any of them could have been fatal, then Carmack had clearly fired first; and Robin was merely defending himself. Also, as Duncan had not fired a

⁹⁹Cooper and Cooper v. Tennessee, p. 193.

shot, the case should be dismissed.¹⁰⁰ It was up to the jury to decide.

A fair trial would have been difficult given the conflicting testimony, but the Tennessean made a fair trial next to impossible. Its headline the following day was, "Senator Carmack Is Shot Down In Cold Blood." It was a matter of first degree "murder, premeditated, deliberately planned and executed in a cold-blooded style."¹⁰¹ The Tennessean continued this line throughout the trial, while the prohibitionists immediately rallied to the cause of demanding "justice" for the killer of their hero.¹⁰²

The trial itself and the appeals go beyond the scope of this study, but a brief account is necessary. The grand jury met 12 November 1908, three days after the shooting, and the next day indicted both Coopers and Sharp, the bystander, on charges of first-degree murder. They remained in jail until their trial began 20 January 1909. It took twenty-three days to select the jury. On 17 March the judge made a lengthy charge to the jury, and two days later it reported that it had agreed to acquit Sharp but could not decide on the Coopers. The judge instructed the jury to

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁰¹Nashville Tennessean, 10 November 1908.

¹⁰²The prohibitionist press around the state presented the same version of the events. The Carmack Papers, TSLA, contain several clippings; also, see, Isaac, Prohibition and Politics, p. 159; and Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign, pp. 90-91.

keep at it until it had reached a decision. Three days and twenty-five ballots later, it returned the verdict that both Coopers were guilty of second-degree murder, and the judge affixed a sentence of twenty years in the penitentiary. They immediately appealed the verdict to the Supreme Court of Tennessee where their case was heard in April. On the thirteenth, that court remanded the case of Robin back to the lower court but upheld the decision regarding Duncan.¹⁰³ Thus, Duncan, who had a crippled right hand and had not fired a shot, was guilty of second degree murder; but Robin, who had killed Carmack, was supposed to get another trial.

Governor Patterson had followed the Cooper-Carmack affair from its inception, and perhaps he felt personally responsible since the men began to quarrel because of Duncan Cooper's support for him. In any event, his political opponents charged him with trying to influence the Supreme Court judges on Cooper's behalf.¹⁰⁴ When the court upheld the verdict, Patterson immediately pardoned Duncan Cooper and said that, "it took the Supreme Court seventy-two days to decide this case and it decided it the wrong way. It took me seventy-two minutes and I decided it the right

¹⁰³In addition to court records and newspaper accounts, there are accounts of the trial in Crutcher, "Career of Carmack," pp. 59-68, and Waller, Nashville, pp. 97-102.

¹⁰⁴Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," pp. 95-96.

way."¹⁰⁵ The pardon of a governor is absolute in a case like this, and the legal proceedings were at an end. Charges against Robin were dropped.

The political power of Governor Patterson was also coming to an end. In the legislature the Democratic and Republican prohibitionists joined forces not only to elect legislative officers but also to pass a state-wide prohibition law and to override Patterson's veto of it. This split in the Democratic Party was not simply a matter of prohibition, and it broadened into a struggle between the legislative branch and the executive branch.¹⁰⁶ The split solidified into a coalition, and the popular dislike of Patterson was so great that he withdrew his candidacy for reelection when no major newspapers would support him. The Republican prohibitionist Ben W. Hooper was elected governor in 1910 and again in 1912. It is not possible to quantify the effect that Carmack's death and Patterson's pardon of Cooper had on all this; most likely it served as a

¹⁰⁵Ibid., Crutcher, "Career of Carmack," pp. 67-58.

¹⁰⁶The legislature reduced the governor's political powers by taking away his authority to appoint the members of the State Election Board and assuming that prerogative themselves. Accounts of the political effects of the affair can be found in Stanley J. Folmsbee, Robert E. Corlew, and Enoch L. Mitchell, Tennessee: A Short History (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1969), pp. 442-47; Crutcher, "Career of Carmack," pp. 68-69; Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign," pp. 91 et seq.; Waller, Nashville, pp. 91-103; and Dewey W. Grantham, Jr., "Goebel, Gonzales, Carmack: Three Violent Scenes in Southern Politics," Mississippi Quarterly 11 (Winter 1958):35-36.

catalyst on the forces already at work. The prohibitionists may have captured the legislature before the shooting and passed the prohibition measure and overridden Patterson's veto before the pardon; but still the shooting certainly affected the passage and override, and the pardon affected Patterson's political future as adversely as if he had conspired in the shooting. Robin Cooper's bullets felled more than one man, and, ironically, the man he killed seems to have accomplished more for prohibition by dying than he had by living.¹⁰⁷

A summary of the violence of journalists should first point to the diversity among the subjects. In each set of antagonists for which background information is available, one man came from a prominent family and the other did not. The men (except Brownlow and Haynes) were also almost a generation apart in age (seventeen years is the average difference). The incidents ranged over a fifty year period of time during which public opinion against personal violence gradually hardened. Similarities are also apparent. In almost all the cases the men fought because they had allowed their political differences to become personal and had used their papers to attack their opponents. Contrary to Mark Twain's depiction of Tennessee

¹⁰⁷Robin Cooper later married the daughter of the president of the L. & N. Railroad, and in 1919 he was "mysteriously murdered," according to Isaac, Prohibition and Politics, p. 184.

journalists, these newspapermen do not seem to have been frequently physically violent. Perhaps this is because they were able to vent their hostilities in their papers.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation has presented various historical and scientific explanations of violence and has examined some fourteen major incidents of upper class violence in Tennessee. Although the emphasis throughout the case studies has been on personal factors, important social factors have been referred to, and these external conditions need to be drawn together at this point. After this has been done, attention will be turned to the patterns which have manifested themselves, and comments will be made on the contributions of the social science models and their usefulness in an historical inquiry.

The frontier experience has long been one of the most popular explanations of American violence. It has been held that the general lawlessness and lack of institutional restraints found there imprinted upon Americans a strain of violence which persisted long after the frontier had technically passed.¹ While this argument is appealing and

¹Richard Maxwell Brown, Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. vii, 1-5.

true in places, it seems to suffer the same flaw as the frustration-aggression hypothesis--it is too vague and open-ended. To state that Tennesseans who committed acts of violence were somehow ipso facto displaying a sort of frontier imprint appears to be begging the question, or, at least, not to be of much value in furthering our understanding.

The greater significance of a frontier explanation of violence is found at the societal level of analysis. This dissertation has argued that the violence in the case studies was, for the most part, rational and purposeful, that the men were responding to situations in a social context, that they often thought about what they were going to do before they did it, and that they most likely weighed the consequences of their actions in terms of costs and benefits. Assuming that the personal dilemmas of these nineteenth century men were probably not greatly different than those of twentieth century men, what, then, explains the apparent higher incidence of upper class violence among public figures in the nineteenth century? An important part of the answer lies in a cluster of social conditions and community attitudes which may be said to have reflected a frontier tradition.

One provocative possibility is that there was a perceived community attitude which may have actually encouraged several of the violent encounters. Physical

courage was a highly desirable attribute for any frontiersman, and it seems to have been almost an essential one for frontier leaders. John Hope Franklin has pointed to the avidity with which Southerners sought military titles which he said reflected "the extensive influence that the martial spirit had [in] . . . Southern life."² More fundamentally, this avidity seems to indicate the persistent reverence in which Southerners held men who had distinguished themselves by their courage and skill in fighting. Anita Goodstein's observation that Nashville in 1800 "looked to leadership based on traditional pioneer virtues, physical courage, endurance, and a talent to survive . . ."³ appears to confirm the notion that the leadership was expected to be physically brave. With courage held at such a premium, leaders could ill afford to quake before a foe. Colonel White pointed directly to the stigma attached to the fearful when he explained his duel with Houston thusly: "Knowing that, according to the tone of public sentiment here [Nashville], a coward cannot live except in disgrace and obscurity, I did not hesitate as to my course [to fight the duel], nor shall I have cause ever

²John Hope Franklin, The Militant South, 1800-1861 (New York: Beacon Press, 1964), p. 192.

³Anita S. Goodstein, "Leadership on the Nashville Frontier, 1780-1800," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 35 (Summer 1976):175-98.

to regret it."⁴ To paraphrase Ben Franklin, it seems to have been necessary not only to be fearless but also to give the appearance of being fearless.

In several cases the leaders may well have been responding as much to the perceived community expectations of bravery as to their personal antagonisms. Witness the public posturings of Jackson and Sevier; Swann, Jackson, and Dickinson; Jackson and the Bentons; Houston and White; Brownlow and Haynes; and Mabry and O'Conner. In these incidents, and perhaps several more, an important, albeit unanswerable, question arises--if their quarrels had been private and the public had been totally unaware of them, then how many shots would have been fired?

The apparent power of the word "coward" to draw a fight intersects frequently with the lengths to which these men would sometimes go to protect their reputations. The most touchy aspect of their honor was their courage; it seems to have ranked above integrity and other virtues as the one they would risk death to defend. Recall that it was Dickinson's allegation that Jackson was "a coward and a poltroon" that triggered Jackson's challenge. The word was used and received as a bludgeon by Sevier, Brownlow, Swann, Houston, White, and Forrest. Other insults would later

⁴White to Guild, 21 December 1826, in Jo C. Guild, Old Times in Tennessee with Historical, Personal, and Political Scraps and Sketches (Nashville: Travel, Eastman and Howell, 1878), pp. 286-88.

replace "coward," but for the Jacksonian and Civil War generation the crown jewel in a man's reputation was his physical bravery.

These violent incidents did not take place in a rural setting. Almost eighty percent of them occurred in Nashville (8), Knoxville (2), and Washington, D.C. (1); further, almost sixty percent occurred in what was at that time a capital city. It is not surprising that the urban setting should have been so frequent. One would expect men of these professions to live in and around the more populated areas.

In this writer's opinion, the two most important social factors were the presence of weapons and the tolerance with which the community seemed to accept personal violence. America has always had a high ratio of guns to individuals (about 1:1), and that ratio originated on the frontier. It was perpetuated into the nineteenth century to such an extent that a recent study has concluded that there was a "general tendency to carry arms," even in the cities.⁵ A previously mentioned paper by Berkowitz demonstrates that, when a person is angry (or his inhibitions against aggression are particularly low), even the casual sight of a

⁵Lee Kennett and James LaVerne Anderson, The Gun in America: The Origins of a National Dilemma (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976), pp. 148, 249.

weapon can stimulate aggressive behavior.⁶ It is, therefore, reasonable to assume (and the case studies seem to substantiate this) that, when gentlemen go about their daily business with weapons on their persons, the likelihood of violence is increased. Of the fourteen incidents of violence dealt with in this dissertation, only four or five dealt with men who deliberately armed themselves with the specific intent of committing the act of violence which transpired; in the nine others, the men were either gratuitously armed or had taken up arms "just in case."

In the first half of the nineteenth century, especially, Tennesseans apparently condoned personal violence in certain circumstances. This attitude can not be quantified but it manifests itself in at least three different ways: the reaction of the press, the lack of judicial punishment, and the continuing rise of the participants' public careers. It has already been shown that typically until the mid-1850s the press reacted to the incidents as unfortunate and regrettable but somehow perhaps understandable. Very seldom was there condemnation and, in those few instances in which disapproval was expressed, it seems not to have been of the violence per se but of the specific results of the violence in that instance. When the

⁶Leonard Berkowitz and Anthony LePage, "Weapons as Aggression-Eliciting Stimuli," in The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, eds., Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 134.

supporters of Dickinson criticized Jackson, it was not so much for having killed their man but for displaying bad form in the manner in which he did it.

In only one of the fourteen major incidents did a trial jury convict someone for his crime, and when that happened Governor Patterson granted a pardon. In other cases grand juries may have met, but trials did not follow. Although the circumstances were different in each instance, the sum of the parts seems to be that our citizens tolerated men settling their private disputes privately. Matters were allowed to take their course if the participants abided by what seemed to have been the unwritten rules of prior notification; an open, face-to-face "fair fight"; and the sparing of innocent bystanders.

Beginning, however, in the late 1850s editors and prosecutors became more critical of "gentlemen of property and standing" who shot each other. With the exception of the wartime Forrest-Gould affair, in every case from Poindexter-Hall (1859) on, the press and the courts began to ask rather serious questions. Hall was examined by the grand jury for almost a week, Mabry and O'Conner both had been in court before 1881, and then, finally, in 1908, Cooper was tried and convicted of second-degree murder. Increasingly, as personal violence seemed to cause more problems for the participants than it settled and damaged more reputations than it saved, gentlemen were more willing

to restrain themselves. Recall that, of the fourteen incidents of violence examined, only two occurred after the Civil War. The days were passing when a Jackson could kill a Dickinson and later be sent to the United States Senate and elected president, or a Houston could shoot a White and still be elected to Congress and then the governorship. While it can not be precisely stated why the personal violence of politicians and journalists declined so markedly after the Civil War, a large part of the answer may lie in this change of public attitude. To be successful, politicians and journalists, perhaps above all other professionals, had to be responsive to public opinion. They seem to have been so.

The final external condition is striking and points to the importance of both social and personal factors in violence. Almost two-thirds of the incidents took place in the throes of a political or military campaign in which both of the men usually had been actively involved. On the personal level this seems to confirm Guy A Cardwell's observation that "unbridled political argument"⁷ was a major cause of duels; but, since about one-half of the fights were not directly caused by the events of the campaign, it also suggests the possibility of some form of social contagion. Almost all of the campaigns had charged and excited the

⁷Guy A. Cardwell, "The Duel in the Old South: Crux of a Concept," The South Atlantic Quarterly 66 (Winter 1961):52.

communities with an unusual spirit of conflict; therefore, the men's inhibitions against aggression, which were strong enough in more halcyon days, may have melted away in the heat of the general controversy.

Birth order is a rather ambiguous, yet persistent, factor. Of the eleven men for whom it can be established, ten were either the first or last children in their families. It is not clear whether this relates to their success or to their violence, but Alfred Adler has observed that first children are "trained to fight"⁸ and that last children are similar to first ones in that "the extreme positions [first and last in birth order] provide extreme problems."⁹ He suggests that birth order may be related to both success and violence. This writer prefers to consider a birth order pattern as something of a parenthetic observation: it seems to be present but exactly what it means is not certain.

There are problems with the other factors relating to family background. In an objective clinical situation it is possible to determine things such as punitive parents, weak fathers, strong mothers, and the like, but in an

⁸To fight for the mother's attention when later children are born.

⁹Alfred Adler, What Life Should Mean to You (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1932, 1960), pp. 144-54. Adler contends that "the position in the family leaves an indelible stamp upon the style of life."

historical study the data are often either absent, sketchy, or subjective. In some cases an absent father can be established, and in some a strong mother can be suggested; but, in this study, these cases represented a minority of the total. And the rosy reminiscences by adults of the lessons learned on their mother's knee are less than compelling. In sum, this writer feels that, while general personality attributes can be reasonably established in an historical study, the precise relationship of early family and childhood experiences to that personality is still quite tenuous.

The intermediate factors were those circumstances and events which may have disrupted the actor's normal life pattern and hence lowered his usual inhibitions against aggression. It was wondered if the violence came as a "bolt out of the blue," or whether there might have been preliminary destabilizing events--the beginning of a new career, events such as a lost election, a major business setback, or some other important failure. In almost eighty percent¹⁰ of the fights a significant disruption seems to have been present in the life of one of the principals. Based on this, the evidence seems to support the observation that frequently factors not directly linked to the men's interpersonal relationship may well have made the aggression possible. If Jackson had been an established lawyer, would

¹⁰Eleven of the fourteen incidents.

Avery's sarcasm have driven Jackson to challenge or, if Mabry's fortunes had not begun to decline, would he have reacted to O'Conner in the same way? These questions can not be answered, but they are important to consider.

In addition to the above, there were, in at least fifty percent of the cases, incidents of violence or near-violence involving the men or their surrogates prior to the notable incident. The Powells' attacking Brownlow or Hall's son's attacking Poindexter are examples of this phenomenon which seem to bridge the gap between the intermediate and immediate factors. They, too, likely served as catalysts of aggression.

The immediate causes of violence were those words and events which directly precipitated the fight and, in most of the incidents, they were clear enough. In no cases did the principals fight over the possession of women, and in only one does money seem to have been at the bottom of the conflict (Mabry-O'Conner). There are no instances of the assault being committed during a drunken rage, and the record does not show that the subjects murdered or assaulted members of their immediate families.¹¹ In many ways, the motives and methods of the men in this paper are not typical of today's modal murderer or aggravated assaulter, nor

¹¹These observations are based on the information this writer has acquired; it is, of course, possible that some of these things may have happened.

should they have been, given the limits within which the study has been conducted.¹² Without significant exception, however, the immediate cause was words or actions by one man which held the other in disrepute. It seems clear (as suggested earlier) that these words apparently related in most instances to deprecations of reputation or what Abraham Maslow has called esteem needs.¹³

A purpose of this dissertation has been to provide reliable accounts of the various notable incidents of upper class violence. It is hoped that the undergraduate student can be shown that collectively the incidents seem both to present a pattern and represent a theme in nineteenth century Tennessee history. The public deprecations of reputation were followed by exchanges of warnings; the men then armed themselves and had their confrontations. Time and again the men responded to roughly parallel situations with similar actions and, although the frequency of the violence seems to have declined, the pattern remained essentially constant from Jackson and Avery's 1788 duel in Jonesboro to Cooper and Carmack's 1908 pseudo duel in Nashville.

¹²For instance, the average age of the offender in aggravated assault today is nineteen, but the subjects of this study averaged somewhat over forty years in age.

¹³The need for achievement, strength, competence, reputation, and status or prestige.

In conclusion, this paper has attempted to approach specific incidents of violence by following a line from the social and cultural influences which revered physical courage and tolerated aggressive personality characteristics; through intermediate disquieting events (such as personal failures) which may have prepared the individuals for violence; to the immediate causes of the violence (which were the threats of some of the parties' being held publicly in disrepute). Also, the presence of weapons seems to have been an important factor both socially and personally.

Considered in its totality, no single theory can explain, much less predict, the incidence of upper class violence in Tennessee. Social learning theory has contributed an understanding of the importance of living in an environment where one witnesses aggression and how that may lower one's own inhibitions. The frustration-aggression hypothesis, and more specifically Berkowitz's revisions thereof, has directed this writer's attention to the intermediate factors, the triggering mechanism and the importance of weapons. The lack of data, however, mandates that these theories must remain more as helpful and instructive guideposts which can broaden the student of history's perspectives, rather than definitive solutions of the problems of understanding violence.

APPENDIX

THE AMERICAN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS AND THE
TREATMENT OF NINETEENTH CENTURY
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The primary purpose of this appendix is to inquire into American history survey textbooks in order to measure their treatment of nineteenth century domestic violence. The first chapter in this dissertation demonstrated that scholars in many fields are actively studying violence. This appendix questions not so much whether our textbooks are reflecting these latest efforts at knowledge but whether they are dealing with violence at all; and, if so, how? Are Hofstadter's¹ and Klein's² evaluations of historians' and history textbooks' treatments of violence (as quoted in the introduction) accurate?

Before answering these questions, a first matter needs consideration. How do levels of domestic violence in America compare with those of other nations? If Americans

¹Richard Hofstadter, "Reflections on Violence in the United States," in Richard Hofstadter and Michael Wallace, eds., American Violence: A Documentary History (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1970), p. 3.

²Milton Klein, "The Face of Violence: A Historical Perspective," Social Education 37 (October 1973):541.

have a comparatively peaceful present, then it would not be as serious a concern if the textbooks demur and dulcify our violence. However, if our present is comparatively violent, then our textbooks should reflect our past experiences, so that the present ones might be better understood. News person Edwin Newman's view regarding violence in the United States is clear. In January 1977, the National Broadcasting Company presented a three hour television special, "Violence in America," on which Newman, commenting on the ubiquity of his subject, remarked that America is "singularly and astonishingly violent among the advanced nations."³ It is not difficult to question this answer, but it is difficult to answer this question. Cross-cultural comparisons are very chancy and filled with hazards, not the least of which is that behavior which one society may consider violent and unacceptable, another society may not condemn. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report lists at least fourteen variables which affect comparisons made among crime levels in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Atlanta.⁴ If one tries to compare the levels in Paris, Phnom-Pehn, and

³NBC, "Violence in America," 5 January 1977.

⁴Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports for the United States--1976, issued by Clarence M. Kelly (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976), p. v.

Poughkeepsie, the brew is all the more frothful. But a measure is needed.⁵

Political scientists Ted Robert Gurr and Vaughn F. Bishop have compared levels of violence in eighty-six nations during the 1950s and 1960s.⁶ In eight categories of violence,⁷ they have identified the six most offending and the six least offending nations. While the United States never ranked among the six least cacophonous, we were among the six most guilty only once: a fifth place finish in "militarism." Generally, the emerging third world nations were the most violent places to live, and the more stable and developed nations were the most peaceful.

Extending their data, Gurr and Bishop then ranked the nations from first (most violent overall) to eighty-sixth (least violent overall). By this composite measure the United States finished near the top of the second quartile in twenty-fourth place. If, on this numerical rating scale, the United States does not loom large in world perspective, it would nevertheless be a mistake to take much comfort in that. That America is less violent than Vietnam

⁵Jarol B. Manheim, Dèjà Vu: American Political Problems in Historical Perspective (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), pp. 52-53.

⁶Ted Robert Gurr and Vaughn F. Bishop, "Violent Nations, and Others," The Journal of Conflict Resolution 20 (March 1976):79-110.

⁷Social violence, military intervention, discrimination, militarism, protest, internal war, external war, and repression.

is no great achievement. The more relevant comparison is with the nations with which we share a cultural heritage, as well as similar levels of political and economic development. In this comparison we do almost as poorly as possible. Of all the Western democracies, only France ranked higher⁸ than the United States.

An earlier study by Gurr produced approximately the same findings. An examination of civil strife⁹ in 114 nations and colonies from 1961-1965 found the United States again in the second quartile, this time toward the bottom, in forty-fourth place.¹⁰ Again, however, when compared with the seventeen other Western nations, the United States did as badly as possible. Even France did not outrank the United States this time.

On the basis of this evidence and more,¹¹ it seems that, in the 1950s and 1960s at least, America was a comparatively violent nation. This writer certainly does

⁸France finished in seventh place.

⁹"Civil strife" is defined as "all collective non-governmental attacks on persons and property . . . but not individual crimes. . . . [It] includes symbolic attacks on political persons or policies such as political demonstrations and political strikes." Ted Robert Gurr, "A Comparative Study of Civil Strife," in The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, eds. Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969), p. 573.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 629.

¹¹Ivo K. Feierabend, Rosalind L. Feierabend, and Betty A. Nesvold, "Social Change and Political Violence: Cross-National Patterns," Violence in America, pp. 632-87.

not contend that this has always been the case, and the pitfalls present in cross-cultural and limited time span studies are real. Violence is, however, a major social problem today,¹² and, in the words of psychologist Sheldon G. Levy, "its roots run very deep."¹³ Is it unfair, then, to ask that our history textbooks reflect part of our violent heritage? At least the information should be available if the students are to confront the issues squarely.

How, then, have the textbooks dealt with nineteenth century American domestic violence? In order to answer this question, this chapter will make a bipartite content analysis of American history textbooks. The first part is to determine the number of incidents handled by the books and the type of treatment afforded those incidents. The second, in response to Klein's "mountain of words" accusation, will determine the proportional amount of space used to describe domestic violence. At the outset, a few definitions and operations must be established consistent with the conventional procedures of content analysis.

Few would disagree with historian Robert Fogel's observation that direct measurement is most often

¹²Uniform Crime Report--1976, p. v.

¹³Sheldon G. Levy, "A 150-Year Study of Political Violence in America," Violence in America, p. 100.

accomplished by counting.¹⁴ The concern here is with what to count. Rather than attempt to handle every American history textbook in print, a sample of them was selected. Since this dissertation's case study is of Tennessee violence, it was deemed appropriate to examine those textbooks in use in Tennessee's twenty public institutions of higher education. A survey of those colleges and universities revealed that the following texts were in use during the academic year 1974-75:

Baydo, Gerald. A Topical History of the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

ADOPTION: Shelby State Community College

Bedford, Henry F., and Colbourn, Trevor. The Americans: A Brief History. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.

ADOPTION: The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville

Blum, John M., Morgan, Edmund S., Rose, Willie Lee, Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., Stamp, Kenneth M., and Woodward, C. Vann. The National Experience: A History of the United States. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1973.

ADOPTION: Dyersburg State Community College
East Tennessee State University
Memphis State University
Motlow State Community College
Walters State Community College

Burner, David, Marcus, Robert D., and Rosenberg, Emily S. America: A Portrait in History. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

¹⁴Robert William Fogel, "The Limits of Quantitative Methods in History," American Historical Review 80 (April 1975): 337.

ADOPTION: Columbia State Community
College

Current, Richard N., Williams, T. Harry, and Freidel, Frank.
American History: A Survey. 3rd ed. New York:
Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

ADOPTION: Chattanooga State Technical Community
College
Middle Tennessee State University
Roane State Community College
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

Garraty, John A. A Short History of the American Nation.
New York: Harper and Row, 1974

ADOPTION: University of Tennessee, Nashville

Garraty, John A. The American Nation: A History of the
United States. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row,
1966.

ADOPTION: Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee, Martin

Gruver, Rebecca Brooks. An American History. New York:
Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.

ADOPTION: Austin Peay State University
Cleveland State Community College

Hofstadter, Richard, Miller, William, and Aaron, Daniel.
The United States. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
Prentice-Hall, 1972.

ADOPTION: Jackson State Community College

Pickens, Donald D., and Seligmann, Gustav L., Jr. America
in Process. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.

ADOPTION: Shelby State Community College

The admonition of political scientist Ole Holsti
that "valid inferences depend upon the quality of both the
analyst's data and the criterion (or norm) being used for

comparison"¹⁵ has thus been partially heeded. The establishing of the criterion for comparing the texts was a matter of great concern because a fair as well as an accurate measure was desired. An appropriate means of satisfying both these goals was suggested elsewhere by Holsti and also by University of Manitoba historian Thomas F. Carney: the construction of a representative version of the theme based on the work of an expert or experts in the field which can be used as a check list or yardstick by which to measure the texts.¹⁶ The texts in question are checked against this list and a "score" can be derived for each book which will permit comparing them with each other, as well as arriving at a composite score or typical treatment of the subject.

This writer sought a single source which would primarily offer a broad listing of the more important incidents from across the spectrum of violent behavior. There are several works which would have been more or less

¹⁵Ole R. Holsti, "Introduction to 'Aspects of Inference from Content Data,'" in The Analysis of Communications Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques, eds. George Gerbner et al. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969), p. 117.

¹⁶Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969), p. 58; Thomas F. Carney, Content Analysis: A Technique for Systematic Inference from Communications (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1972), pp. 161-62; Julian L. Simon, Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation (New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 274-76.

sufficient to serve as the catalog of violence;¹⁷ but, from among them all, Hofstadter and Wallace, American Violence, was chosen because it offered "a collection of well-chosen . . . incidents, [and] gives a good cumulative sense of the extent and variety of the nation's social violence. . . ." ¹⁸

The book, undoubtedly familiar to even parenthetic students of violence, consists of a forty-three page essay by Hofstadter, "Reflections on Violence in the United States," and, more important for this dissertation, a compilation of some 107 incidents ranging in time from the 1634 beaver trade dispute between the Pilgrims of Plymouth and the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to the 1968 riots at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. In

¹⁷The most scholarly volume on American violence is the aforementioned Graham and Gurr, Violence in America, but it is too specialized and sometimes esoteric for the general purposes here, although its "Historical Patterns of Violence in America," by Richard Maxwell Brown, is quite good; Brown has two other works of merit which the interested student should examine, American Violence (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), and Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975). Henry Steele Commager offers a little piece, "The History of American Violence: An Interpretation," Violence: The Crisis of American Confidence, ed. Hugh Davis Graham (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), and some 1,200-1,800 bibliographic entries of approximately 1,100 authors are offered in Dirk Hoerder, comp. and ed., Violence in the United States: Riots--Strikes--Protest and Suppression: A Working Bibliography for Teachers and Students (Berlin: John F. Kennedy Institut Fur Nordamerikastudien-Freie Universitat, 1973).

¹⁸David Grimsted, review of American Violence, by Hofstadter and Wallace, in American Historical Review 76 (Summer 1971):1582.

order to make the textbook analysis chronologically coincident with the Tennessee case study, the sixty-two incidents which took place during the years 1796-1914 have been selected as the units of analysis. The editors have rendered the violence into eight classifications--political; economic; racial (slave revolts and their suppression, race riots, ghetto riots, and some casualties of conquest); religious and ethnic; anti-radical and police; personal; assassinations, terrorism, and political murders; and violence in the name of law, order, and morality.

Hofstadter and Wallace "claim no more than convenience and partial validity"¹⁹ for their classifications. It would be a mistake to take them too earnestly; nevertheless, they can be suggestive of the texts' areas of emphasis and neglect. To these sixty-two units of analysis and eight classes of violence, this dissertation will add the twelve events of the Tennessee case study; thus, there will be a total of seventy-four units of analysis.

The next step is to classify the type of treatment each unit has received in each of the textbooks in the sample. Every unit will be placed into one of four possible categories: "not mentioned," "alluded to," "mentioned," or "discussed."

Noting Julian L. Simon's Basic Research Methods in Social Science directive that categories be defined so that

¹⁹Hofstadter and Wallace, American Violence, p. vi.

the units of analysis "will fit into one or another category without too much doubt or arbitrariness in the process,"²⁰ the following definitions are offered. Where there is no direct or indirect reference to an incident, it will be considered "not mentioned." The second possibility is to be "alluded to" or referred to in general terms but not specifically mentioned by name. For instance, the 1851 Christiana Affair in which Edward Gorsuch of Maryland was killed when he attempted to retrieve a slave from the black community of Christiana is "alluded to" by Bedford and Colburn's description, "a Maryland planter was shot while chasing his runaways in Pennsylvania."²¹ Another text alludes to the 1834 anti-abolition riot in New York thusly: "Abolitionists never enjoyed much public support, even in the North, and during the 1830's antiabolitionist mobs harrassed writers and speakers."²²

The third category is "mentioned," which will include incidents specifically referred to but not discussed in terms of their inherent causes and effects. Current, Williams, and Freidel's text "mentions" the murder of Elijah

²⁰Simon, Research Methods, p. 299.

²¹Henry F. Bedford and Trevor Colbourn, The Americans: A Brief History (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972), 1:194.

²²David Burner, Robert D. Marcus, and Emily S. Rosenberg, America: A Portrait in History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 217.

Lovejoy in their description: "Another mob seized Garrison on the streets of Boston and threatened to hang him, and a member of still another group shot and killed the anti-slavery editor Elijah Lovejoy in Alton, Illinois (1837)."²³ They also "mention" the 1822 Vesey affair: "In 1822 the Charleston free Negro Denmark Vesey and his followers--rumored to total 9,000--made preparations for revolt, but again word leaked out and retribution followed. In 1831 Nat Turner. . . ." ²⁴

To be "discussed," the particular causes and effects of the incident must be included in the text's description. While there should be little question or disagreement as to when an episode is being discussed, one example is offered. It will be noticed that this example consists of the three elements of the causes, the event itself, and the results of the event. One text describes the Haymarket riot of 1886, beginning with the development of the Knights of Labor in particular and organized labor in general, then:

This inchoate militancy built toward a tragic climax. At a demonstration in Chicago's Haymarket Square, as a few anarchists harangued an apathetic crowd of workmen, 180 policemen charged, some man unknown to history threw a dynamite bomb, and the police opened fire on the crowd. Seven people died and dozens were injured. The episode resulted from hysteria building up over labor

²³Richard N. Current, T. Harry Williams, and Frank Freidel, American History: A Survey, 3rd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), p. 312.

²⁴Ibid., p. 323.

activity, and the bombing led to yet further hysteria: a court found eight anarchists, none ever linked to the actual bombing, guilty, and four of them were hanged. The labor movement--which had no actual part in the terrible Haymarket affair--was the great loser. The "spirit of 1886" of labor optimism and militancy disappeared in an instant, and the Knights went into a decline almost as precipitous as their rise.

The collapse of the Knights of Labor in the aftermath of the Haymarket Riot perhaps symbolized the darkening mood of the late eighties better than any other single event. Workingmen and the forces of middle-class humanitarianism would remain apart for a half-century of industrial organization. . . .²⁵

All of the above will produce one-half of the analysis to which the ten textbooks are to be put. The second part of the analysis will address Professor Klein's contention that the texts have buried our violence under a "mountain of words describing our more peaceful evolution to greatness."²⁶ To do this, the number of lines (not words) used to describe the aforementioned episodes was divided by the total number of lines in the texts, thus producing the proportional amount of textual space allotted to violence.

More specifically, to determine the number of lines used to describe each incident (the "1" column on the charts), each line, whether whole or fractional, was counted as one line. For example, the present paragraph would be counted as eighteen lines. This was done for each incident and, at the end, the number of lines was added up and

²⁵Burner, Marcus, and Rosenberg, America, p. 360.

²⁶Klein, "Face of Violence," p. 541.

divided by the total number of lines in the chronologically-relevant parts of the book. This second figure was derived first by figuring the gross number of pages which the text used to discuss the period, 1796-1914. For example, in Blum et al., The National Experience, pages 132-555, or a total of 432 pages, were relevant. From this figure, the number of totally non-text pages was subtracted. All pages consisting entirely of maps, charts, cartoons, bibliographic material or the like which was not a part of the continuing verbal text were considered non-textual and thus not counted. In The National Experience, twenty-two pages were excluded, leaving a total of 401 relevant pages.

After determining this number, it was necessary to arrive at a reliable estimate of the number of lines per page. A sampling procedure was used in which six percent of the total number of relevant pages was examined. Determination of which six percent was made by figuratively throwing a dart at a table of random numbers and using the subsequent numbers as the pages in the text. If a number should be non-textual, then it was discarded, and the first text page overleaf was used. On each page all whole and fractional (each counting as a whole) lines of text were counted.²⁷ This completed, the number of pages was divided by the number of lines, producing the average number of

²⁷Captions, titles, and the like were not counted.

lines per page. The total number of relevant textual lines in the book was arrived at by multiplying this average number of lines per page by the total number of relevant textual pages. The number of lines dedicated to violence was divided by the total number of lines in the relevant part of the book, resulting in the "percent of textual lineage devoted to violence" figure, which is found at the bottom of each book's chart.

Recall that The National Experience had 432 relevant pages. Six percent of 432 is twenty-six, so the total number of lines on twenty-six pages was counted and the result was an average of 45.24 lines per page. The total relevant text pages was 401; therefore, there are 18, 141.24 lines, this divided into the 495 lines of violence yields 2.72 percent of the text's space allotted to violence.

These simple procedures were followed for each of the ten textbooks in the sample, and the resultant charts are included in this appendix. An eleventh chart which summarizes this data follows immediately overleaf. This chart of charts codifies all the information, except the number of lines devoted to each individual incident.

Chart 1

Baydo, Gerald. A Topical History of the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974. Pp. vii, 534.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851	X			
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	4	0	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	67%	0	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913		X		
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	6	1	0	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	60%	10%	0	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834			X	
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838	X			
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844			X	
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1857	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857			X	
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871				X
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885				X
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	5	0	3	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	0	30%	20%

Note: (Charts 1 through 11)

A Not mentioned C Mentioned
 B Alluded to D Discussed

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
X			
X			
			X
X			
3	0	0	1

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
7	0	0	0

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	X		
			X
X			
1	1	0	1
11	1	0	2
79%	7%	0	14%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
			X
1	0	0	1
50%	0	0	50%

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

		X	
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
5	0	1	0
83%	0	17%	0

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
X				
			X	
				X
				X
X				
X				
3	0	1	3	
43%	0	14%	43%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
7	0	0	0	
100%	0	0	0	

GRAND PERCENTS

68%	3%	8%	21%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 2

Bedford, Henry F., and Colburn, Trevor. The Americans: A Brief History. 2 vols. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972. Pp. viii, 556.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851		X		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	3	1	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	17%	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877	X			
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	8	0	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	0	0	20%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838	X			
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871	X			
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	10	0	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	100%	0	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
X			
		X	
		X	
X			
2	0	2	0

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
7	0	0	0

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
	X		
2	1	0	0
11	1	2	0
79%	7%	14%	0

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
2	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

		X	
	X		
X			
			X
X			
X			
3	1	1	1
49%	17%	17%	17%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
			X	
			X	
				X
X				
X				
X				
3	0	3	1	
43%	0	43%	14%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
X			
		X	
X			
X			
X			
6	0	1	0
86%	0	14%	0

GRAND PERCENTS

74%	5%	11%	10%
-----	----	-----	-----

Chart 3

Blum, John M., Morgan, Edmund S., Rose, Willie Lee, Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., Kenneth M. Stamp, and C. Vann Woodward. The National Experience: A History of the United States. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1973. Pp. vii, 889.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851		X		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	3	1	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	17%	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892				X
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	6	0	0	4
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	60%	0	0	40%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834			X	
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871	X			
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	1	1	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	10%	10%	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
X			
		X	
			X
X			
2	0	1	1

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
		X	
X			
X			
X			
X			
6	0	1	0

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
		X	
		X	
0	0	2	1
8	0	4	2
57%	0	29%	14%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	X		
X			
1	1	0	0
50%	50%	0	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

		X	
X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
4	0	1	1
66%	0	17%	17%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
			X	
			X	
				X
			X	
X				
X				
2	0	4	1	
29%	0	57%	14%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
X				
	X			
X				
X				
6	1	0	0	
86%	14%	0	0	

GRAND PERCENTS

62%	6%	16%	16%
-----	----	-----	-----

Chart 4

Burner, David, Marcus, Robwrt D., and Rosenberg, Emily S. America: A Portrait in History. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974. Pp. xvi, 704.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851				X
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	3	0	0	3
PERCENT IN TOTAL	50%	0	0	50%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877		X		
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892	X			
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	8	1	0	1
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	10%	0	10%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871				X
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	1	0	1
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	10%	0	10%

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

	A	B	C	D
Louisiana Uprising, 1811	X			
Vesey Uprising, 1822				X
Nat Turner, 1831				X
Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860	X			
SUBTOTAL	2	0	0	2

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

Providence, 1831	X			
Cincinnati, 1841	X			
New York Draft Riots, 1863				X
New Orleans, 1866	X			
Vicksburg, 1874	X			
Wilmington, 1898	X			
Atlanta, 1906	X			
SUBTOTAL	6	0	0	1

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864		X		
Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890		X		
Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902				X
SUBTOTAL	0	2	0	1
TOTAL	8	2	0	4
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	57%	14%	0	29%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834		X		
Tompkins Square, 1874	X			
TOTAL	1	1	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	50%	0	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804			X	
Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806		X		
Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827	X			
Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856				X
Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88	X			
Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881	X			
TOTAL	3	1	1	1
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	49%	17%	17%	17%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
			X	
			X	
				X
X				
X				
X				
3	0	3	1	
43%	0	43%	14%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
7	0	0	0	
100%	0	0	0	

GRAND PERCENTS

66%	10%	6%	18%
-----	-----	----	-----

Chart 5

Current, Richard N., Williams, T. Harry, and Freidel, Frank. American History: A Survey. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971. Pp. xx, 917.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851		X		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État	X			
TOTAL	3	1	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	17%	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837			X	
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	6	0	1	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	60%	0	10%	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871	X			
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	9	1	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	90%	10%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
X			
		X	
			X
X			
2	0	1	1

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
X			
X			
6	0	0	1

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
			X
			X
0	0	0	3
8	0	1	5
57%	0	7%	36%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	X		
X			
1	1	0	0
50%	50%	0	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
4	0	0	2
67%	0	0	33%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1919
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
				X
				X
			X	
			X	
			X	
	0	0	4	3
	0	0	57%	43%

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
			X
	X		
	X		
X			
X			
4	2	0	1
57%	29%	0	14%

GRAND PERCENTS

56%	8%	10%	26%
-----	----	-----	-----

Chart 6

Garraty, John A. A Short History of the American Nation. New York: Harper and Row, 1974. Pp. xii, 532.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851		X		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	3	1	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	17%	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887		X		
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892			X	
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	5	1	1	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	10%	10%	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871		X		
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	2	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	20%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
		X	
			X
			X
X			
1	0	1	2

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
X			
X			
6	0	0	1

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
X			
			X
1	0	0	2
8	0	1	5
57%	0	7%	36%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
2	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
4	0	0	2
67%	0	0	33%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
X				
				X
				X
				X
X				
X				
X				
4	0	0	3	
57%	0	0	43%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
X				
	X			
6	1	0	0	
86%	14%	0	0	

GRAND PERCENTS

65%	8%	3%	24%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 7

Garraty, John A. The American Nation: A History of the United States.
2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, 1966. P. 946.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851	X			
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'Etat, 1874	X			
TOTAL	4	0	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	67%	0	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887		X		
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892			X	
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	5	1	1	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	10%	10%	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871		X		
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	2	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	20%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

	A	B	C	D
			X	
				X
				X
X				
1	0	1	2	

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X				
X				
			X	
X				
X				
X				
X				
6	0	1	0	

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

				X
			X	
				X
0	0	1	2	
7	0	3	4	
50%	0	21%	29%	

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
2	0	0	0	
100%	0	0	0	

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

				X
X				
X				
				X
X				
X				
4	0	0	2	
67%	0	0	33%	

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
				X
				X
				X
X				
X				
2	0	1	4	
29%	0	14%	57%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
X			
X			
	X		
X			
X			
6	1	0	0
86%	14%	0	0

GRAND PERCENTS

61%	6%	8%	24%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 8

Gruver, Rebecca Brooks. An American History. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972. P. 1093.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851	X			
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874		X		
TOTAL	3	1	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	50%	17%	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	7	0	0	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	70%	0	0	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871		X		
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	2	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	20%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

	A	B	C	D
X				
				X
				X
X				
2	0	0		2

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X				
X				
			X	
X				
X				
X				
X				
6	0	1		0

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

				X
				X
				X
0	0	0		3
8	0	1		5
57%	0	7%		36%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
2	0	0		0
100%	0	0		0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

				X
X				
X				
			X	
X				
X				
4	0	0		2
67%	0	0		33%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1905
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
				X
			X	
				X
				X
X				
X				
2	0	2	3	
29%	0	29%	42%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
X			
X			
	X		
X			
X			
6	1	0	0
86%	14%	0	0

GRAND PERCENTS

65%	6%	5%	24%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 9

Hofstadter, Richard, Miller, William, and Aaron, Daniel. The United States. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972. Pp. xiii, 879.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851		X		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1856			X	
TOTAL	2	1	1	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	33%	17%	17%	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	7	0	0	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	70%	0	0	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834		X		
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838		X		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871	X			
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	8	2	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	80%	20%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

A	B	C	D
X			
			X
			X
X			
2	0	0	2

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
X			
X			
6	0	0	1

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

			X
			X
			X
0	0	0	3
8	0	0	6
57%	0	0	43%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

		X	
X			
1	0	1	0
50%	0	50%	0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

		X	
X			
X			
			X
X			
X			
4	0	1	1
66%	0	17%	17%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
				X
				X
				X
			X	
X				
X				
2	0	2	3	
29%	0	29%	42%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
X				
	X			
X				
X				
6	1	0	0	
86%	14%	0	0	

GRAND PERCENTS

64%	6%	6%	24%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 10

Pickins, Donald D., and Seligmann, Gustav L., Jr. America in Process.
 Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973. Pp. xxii, 525.

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	X			
Christiana Affair, 1851	X			
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				X
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	X			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				X
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	X			
TOTAL	4	0	0	2
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	67%	0	0	33%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	X			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	X			
Squatters' Riots, 1850	X			
Railroad Strike, 1877				X
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	X			
Homestead, 1892				X
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	X			
Pullman Strike, 1894				X
Wheatland Riot, 1913	X			
Ludlow, 1913-14	X			
TOTAL	7	0	0	3
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	70%	0	0	30%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	X			
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838	X			
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	X			
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	X			
Louisville, 1855	X			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	X			
Orange Riot, 1871	X			
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871		X		
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	X			
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	X			
TOTAL	9	1	0	0
PERCENT IN CATEGORY	90%	10%	0	0

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

	A	B	C	D
X				
X				
				X
X				
3	0	0		1

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

X				
X				
X				
X				
	X			
X				
X				
6	1	0		0

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	X			
X				
		X		
1	1	1		0
10	2	1		1
72%	14%	7%		7%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	X			
X				
1	1	0		0
50%	50%	0		0

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X				
X				
X				
				X
X				
X				
5	0	0		1
83%	0	0		17%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Henry C. Frick, 1892
 Assassination of Frank Steunenberg, 1905
 Dynamiting of Los Angeles Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

	A	B	C	D
			X	
			X	
			X	
				X
				X
X				
X				
2	0	3	2	
29%	0	42%	29%	

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1825
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT IN CATEGORY

X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
X			
7	0	0	0
100%	0	0	0

GRAND PERCENTS

73%	6%	6%	15%
-----	----	----	-----

Chart 11

Grand Totals of the Ten Textbooks

	A	B	C	D
I. POLITICAL				
Philadelphia Election Riot, 1834	10			
Christiana Affair, 1851	5	5		
Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61				10
Baltimore Election Riot, 1856	10			
Harper's Ferry, 1859				10
New Orleans Coup d'État, 1874	8	1		
TOTAL	32	6	1	21
PERCENT PRESENT	53%	1%	1%	35%
II. ECONOMIC				
Baltimore Anti-Bank Riot, 1835	10			
New York Flour Riot, 1837	9	1		
Squatters' Riots, 1850	10			
Railroad Strike, 1877	1		1	8
Louisiana Sugar Strike, 1887	9	1		
Homestead, 1892	1			9
Coeur d'Alene, 1892	7		2	1
Pullman Strike, 1894				10
Wheatland Riot, 1913	9	1		
Ludlow, 1913-14	10			
TOTAL	66	3	3	28
PERCENT PRESENT	66%	3%	3%	28%
III. RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC				
Burning of the Ursuline Convent, 1834	7	1	2	
Anti-Mormon Riot, 1838	5	5		
Philadelphia Nativist Riots, 1844	9		1	
Pentecost Riot in Hoboken, 1851	10			
Louisville, 1855	10			
Mountain Meadows Massacre, 1857	8	2	1	
Orange Riot, 1871	9	1		
Los Angeles Anti-Chinese Riot, 1871	5	3		2
Rock Springs Massacre, 1885	9			1
New Orleans Anti-Italian Riot, 1891	10			
TOTAL	81	12	4	3
PERCENT PRESENT	81%	12%	4%	3%

IV. RACIAL

A. SLAVE REVOLTS

Louisiana Uprising, 1811
 Vesey Uprising, 1822
 Nat Turner, 1831
 Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860
 SUBTOTAL

	A	B	C	D
Louisiana Uprising, 1811	8		2	
Vesey Uprising, 1822	2		3	5
Nat Turner, 1831			1	9
Texas Slave Insurrection, 1860	10			
SUBTOTAL	20		6	14

B. RACE RIOTS

Providence, 1831
 Cincinnati, 1841
 New York Draft Riots, 1863
 New Orleans, 1866
 Vicksburg, 1874
 Wilmington, 1898
 Atlanta, 1906
 SUBTOTAL

Providence, 1831	10			
Cincinnati, 1841	10			
New York Draft Riots, 1863	3		3	4
New Orleans, 1866	10			
Vicksburg, 1874	9	1		
Wilmington, 1898	10			
Atlanta, 1906	10			
SUBTOTAL	62	1	3	4

C. CASUALTIES OF CONQUEST

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864
 Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890
 Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902
 SUBTOTAL
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

Cheyenne Massacre, 1864	1	3		6
Wounded Knee Massacre, 1890	4		2	4
Philippine Brutalities, 1899-1902	1	1	2	6
SUBTOTAL	6	4	4	16
TOTAL	88	5	13	34
PERCENT PRESENT	63%	4%	9%	24%

V. ANTI-RADICAL AND POLICE

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834
 Tompkins Square, 1874
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

Anti-Abolition Riot in New York, 1834	6	3	1	
Tompkins Square, 1874	9			1
TOTAL	15	3	1	1
PERCENT PRESENT	75%	15%	5%	5%

VI. PERSONAL

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804
 Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806
 Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827
 Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
 Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88
 Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

Hamilton-Burr Duel, 1804	1		5	4
Jackson-Dickinson Duel, 1806	8	2		
Sand Bar Gun Battle, 1827	10			
Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856	1			9
Hatfields and McCoys, 1873-88	10			
Gunfight at O.K. Corral, 1881	10			
TOTAL	40	2	5	13
PERCENT PRESENT	67%	3%	8%	22%

VII. ASSASSINATIONS, TERRORISM, POLITICAL MURDERS

Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
 Assassination of Lincoln, 1865
 Assassination of Garfield, 1881
 Haymarket, 1886
 Attempted Murder of Frick, 1892
 Murder of Steunenberg, 1904
 Dynamiting of L.A. Times, 1910
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

A	B	C	D
2		8	
		5	5
		5	5
			10
3		3	4
9		1	
9		1	
23		23	24
33%		33%	34%

VIII. IN THE NAME OF LAW, ORDER, MORALITY

Portland Whorehouse Riot, 1824
 Vicksburg Gamblers, 1835
 Astor Place Riot, 1849
 San Francisco Vigilance Committee, 1856
 Montana Vigilantes, 1863-65
 Cincinnati Riot, 1884
 Lynching at Memphis, 1893
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

10			
10			
9			1
8	1	1	
5	5		
10			
9	1		
61	7	1	1
87%	10%	1%	1%

IX. TENNESSEE CASE STUDY

Andrew Jackson versus:
 Waightstill Avery, 1788
 John Sevier, 1803
 Charles Dickinson, 1803
 The Bentons, 1813

 Carroll-Benton, 1813
 Houston-White, 1826
 Forrest-Gould, 1863
 Mabry-O'Conner, 1882
 Brownlow-Haynes, 1840
 Zollicoffer-Marling, 1852
 Poindexter-Hall, 1859
 Cooper-Carmack, 1908
 TOTAL
 PERCENT PRESENT

9	1		
9	1		
8	2		
8	1	1	
10			
10			
10			
10			
10			
10			
10			
10			
104	5	1	
95%	4%	1%	

GRAND PERCENTS PRESENT*

67%	5%	8%	20%
-----	----	----	-----

PERCENT OF TEXTUAL LINAGE DEVOTED TO VIOLENCE:

2.87%

*Excludes Tennessee case study

Unfortunately, there is no objective measure which can be applied to the foregoing data which would statistically mandate whether or not violence has been given adequate treatment by textbooks. Adequacy, as beauty it seems, is largely in the eye of the beholder, and recent literature offers little in the way of clarifying that point.²⁸ For instance, Recent Trends in History Curricula and Pedagogy lists 517 works, none of which deals with the analysis of the content of textbooks.²⁹ Several recent articles which did offer content analyses relied more heavily on subjective opinion than on objective measures in determining adequacy.³⁰ This does not mean that we are

²⁸This is illustrated by the following articles by Harvey L. Molotch and Marilyn Lester, "News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents and Scandals," American Sociological Review 39 (February 1974):101-12, and "Accidental News: The Great Oil Spill," ibid., 81 (September 1975):235-260; and Gaye Tuchman, "Objectivity as a Strategic Ritual," American Journal of Sociology 77 (January 1972):660-79. Also, an interesting debate between two sociologists on objectivity is Gaye Tuchman, "The News' Manufacture of Sociological Data," American Sociological Review 41 (December 1976):1065-1067, and M. Herbert Danger, "Reply to Tuchman," ibid., 1067-1071.

²⁹Paul G. Capuzzello and Mark A. Schlesinger, Recent Trends in History Curricula and Pedagogy: A Bibliographic Study (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University, 1976).

³⁰Maxine Seller and Andrew Trusz, "High School Textbooks and the American Revolution," The History Teacher 9 (August 1976):535-55; Arlene B. Hirschfelder, "Treatment of Iroquois Indians in Selected American History Textbooks," The Indian Historian 8 (Fall 1975):32-39; and Margrit Eichler and Carol Ann Nelson, "History and Hystography: The Treatment in American Histories of Significant Events Concerning the Status of Women," The Historian 40 (November 1977):1-15.

groping as blindly as Professor Hans Morganthau once suggested;³¹ it does mean that caution and a sense of fairness and balance must be observed.

It is generally a strength of the textbooks that they do not often fall into factual error. Mistakes such as "on July 2, 1881, Charles Guiteau . . . shot and killed Garfield"³² (when, in fact, Garfield did not die until over two months later on 19 September 1881) do pop up, gremlin-like, from time to time; and, while such things may be expected, they certainly should not be ignored.

Questions of a quasi-interpretational nature also arise. The assault on Charles Sumner by Preston Brooks is a significant incident in American domestic violence: significant primarily as it both reflected and exacerbated the growing sectional tensions of the 1850s. The incident is discussed by nine of the textbooks and there is a consensus on the causes and results of the affair, as well as on its deeper implications in the days before the Civil War. On some particulars, however, the texts continue to reflect the disagreements which have existed since the assault took place on 22 May 1856. The first point of

³¹Morganthau jestingly compared history with a blind man answering questions which no one had asked. Comments by Professor Hans J. Morganthau, Convention of the American Historical Association, New York, New York, December 1968.

³²Gerald A. Baydo, A Topical History of the United States (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 264.

contention relates to the severity of the beating itself, and the second questions the relationship between the beating and Sumner's subsequent prolonged absence from his Senate duties. Not surprisingly, Southerners have tended to minimize the physical damage caused by the caning, and Northern opinion has maximized it.³³ When, for instance, Sumner's brother George dismissed his physician, Dr. Cornelius Boyle, Southerners accused him of doing so because he had testified before Congress that his patient had received "nothing but flesh wounds . . . [which did not] necessarily confine him one moment. . . ." ³⁴ George demurred and, ever since, questions have existed about how serious the injuries actually were. Southerners have also accused Sumner of shamming his invalidism, of, in effect, "playing possum"³⁵ for his own political advantage and making a martyr of himself. David Donald's studied opinion is that Sumner was most certainly not shamming, but he notes "it must be admitted that the precise nature of Sumner's ailment was mysterious."³⁶ On the severity of the injury,

³³The definitive scholarly account of the affair is David Donald, Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), pp. 278-347.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 313-14.

³⁵Ibid., p. 323.

³⁶Ibid., p. 326.

Donald states only that it was "painful,"³⁷ thus leaving the question open. He feels that the ailments which kept Sumner out of the Senate for "over three years"³⁸ were not, neurologically, the result of Brook's beating.³⁹ Obviously, one who seeks to present with certainty the facts of the assault on Sumner is faced with a Charybdis of detail.

The textbooks offer an inconsistent treatment. Garraty writes that "the physical damage suffered by Sumner was relatively superficial, but for obscure psychological reasons the incident so affected him that he was unable to return to his seat in Congress until 1859,"⁴⁰ but there are others who hew more to a northern perspective. Gruver accuses Brooks of "a vicious attack . . . beating him so badly that he was an invalid for three years."⁴¹ Another book states the duration of the absence a bit differently but maintains that the attack "injured him so severely that

³⁷Ibid., p. 312.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Modern medical specialists would classify Sumner's condition as "post-traumatic syndrome." A complex, largely unclear psychogenic condition which produced lingering psychic injuries which remained after the physical damage had long been repaired. Ibid., p. 366.

⁴⁰John A. Garraty, The American Nation: A History of the United States, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), 1:387-88.

⁴¹Rebecca Brooks Gruver, An American History (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972), p. 512.

Sumner remained an invalid for three and a half years."⁴²
Current, Williams, and Freidel further extend the period of recovery until "the injured senator stayed out of the Senate four years. . . ."⁴³

This chapter does not seek to be overly concerned with unimportant details, nor does it wish to present a corrigendum of small inconsistencies; it does note, however, that, in their treatment of specific incidents of violence, the textbooks do make errors and of these errors the classroom instructor should be cognizant.

In their general attitudes toward violence, the textbooks are neither scoldingly moralistic nor benignly permissive. They have presented the subject in an objective manner. In explaining its causes, they have presented the deeper socioeconomic and political factors as well as the immediate triggering stimuli. They have not sought to promulgate "devil theories." Violence is not depicted as something that "just happens," nor is it foisted off on kismet or karma. The texts have been realistic about violence and have addressed themselves to its causes and consequences in the individual instances.

⁴²Richard Hofstadter, William Miller, and Daniel Aaron, The United States, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 369.

⁴³Current, Williams, and Freidel, American History p. 534.

This is just the problem. Violence has been treated in its singular manifestations rather than a more coherent and comprehensive manner. This is partially explained by the fact that, with only one exception, the texts are arranged chronologically rather than topically. However, if they are willing to discuss frontier religion or frontier democracy, then why not frontier violence? If they will generalize on the importance of political parties, of tariff policy, of the national debt, then why not generalize on riots, assassinations, and vigilantism? It is somewhat parenthetical, but nevertheless interesting, to note that, whereas the symbol of peaceful change, the "election," is fully indexed in seven texts and partially so in another; "riots," a symbol of a breakdown in the system are fully indexed in but one book and are completely omitted in six. Thus, three times as many texts do not fully index "riots" as do not fully index "elections." At a minimum, this indicates a failure by the publishers to be as appreciative of riots as of elections.

Several omissions need to be noted. The role of the conservative mob and the kindred, uniquely-American phenomena of lynching and vigilantism has been gravely slighted. Leading historians of violence agree that "most American violence . . . has been initiated with a

'conservative' bias."⁴⁴ Not only do the texts neglect to point this out generally but also they fail to deal with many of its specific incidents. In fact, Leonard L. Richards has commented that "there is very little in our history books that is likely to help [us to understand the phenomenon] . . . there is much in many books that is apt to mislead."⁴⁵ The philosophical implications of this are as great as the pedagogical. The fact that industrial strikes, riots, and assassinations are well represented in the texts but lynchings, vigilantism, and violence against religious and ethnic minorities are not suggests that extremism in the defense of the established community standards is much more readily forgotten than extremism in defiance of those standards. If a high proportion of our violent actions come from the "top dogs or the middle dogs"⁴⁶ and our books

⁴⁴Hofstadter and Wallace, American Violence, pp. 11, 20-24. The conservative nature of vigilantism is discussed in Richard Maxwell Brown, Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), pp. 93-94. Brown is the authority on the subject, and this book and his essay, "The American Vigilante Tradition," in Graham and Gurr, eds., Violence in America, pp. 154-226, are imperative for interested students. Also, see, Clement Eaton, "Mob Violence in the Old South," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 25 (December 1942):351-70, and H. C. Brearley, "The Pattern of Violence," in W. T. Couch, ed., Culture of the South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), pp. 678-92.

⁴⁵Leonard L. Richards, "Gentlemen of Property and Standing": Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. viii.

⁴⁶Hofstadter, "Reflections on Violence," p. 11.

do not reflect this, then this adds evidence that they do not recognize an important aspect of the American way of violence.

Another curious omission relates to Andrew Jackson. This writer can appreciate that textbooks surveying the entire panorama of American history might neglect much of the violence of this dissertation's Tennessee case study, but the complete disregard of Andrew Jackson's having killed Charles Dickinson in a duel is difficult to justify. Some texts refer to his frontier brawling or to his youthful exuberance or to the 1828 "coffin handbill" which the political supporters of Adams used to accuse Jackson of ordering the shooting of six of his militiamen during the War of 1812,⁴⁷ but none deal with the duel. The closest any of the books come is to refer to "a number of successful duels,"⁴⁸ and, elsewhere, to "his duels . . . were the stuff of legends. . . ."⁴⁸ This is scarcely sufficient. Surely the fact that at the mature age of thirty-nine Jackson

⁴⁷For instance, Current, Williams, and Freidel, American History, p. 246, painstakingly clarify this point and explain the confused circumstances of his marriages to Rachel but omit the duel with Dickinson.

⁴⁸David Burner, Robert D. Marcus, and Emily S. Rosenberg, America: A Portrait in History (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 189.

⁴⁹Henry F. Bedford and Trevor Colbourn, The Americans: A Brief History (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972), p. 145.

killed a man in a duel and, further, was the only President of the United States to do such a thing is noteworthy.

One broader observation needs to be made. Thomas Carney has said that, "while frequent mention makes it possible for . . . [a] . . . thing to be noticed, it is emphasis that compels notice."⁵⁰ It has already been shown that the texts totally and collectively ignore forty-four (71%) of the incidents⁵¹ of domestic violence and deal with but eighteen incidents; so it seems clear that the texts are not frequently mentioning violence. Also, texts have not given much emphasis to violence, either. Can our texts be anything but quantitatively inadequate when they allot but 2.87 percent of their space to the subject?⁵² Surely we have, as Professor Klein suggested, "buried [the topic] under the mountain of words describing our more peaceful evolution to greatness . . . [and] painted too roseate a picture of our past."⁵³ While we would not promulgate a rule that all books must have at least ten percent or fifteen percent of its space devoted to the subject of violence, more attention both qualitative and quantitative needs to be paid to it. In light of the inadequate

⁵⁰Carney, Content Analysis, p. 179.

⁵¹Ninety-six percent of the cases.

⁵²This is the weighted or true average. It is not an average of the averages.

⁵³Klein, "The Face of Violence," pp. 541, 545.

treatment given to violence, it appears incumbent upon the classroom teacher to supplement the text. The student should not be left with the impression that every six or seven years something nasty happens, but otherwise we tread along peacefully down the highway of history.

Remarkable patterns of usage do exist among the textbooks. They may largely agree not only upon which incidents of violence to include but also upon which ones to exclude and, further, on what type of treatment (allude to, mention, or discuss) the included incidents should receive. The following list indicates the most frequently included incidents:

Discussed by all the texts:

Bleeding Kansas, 1854-61
Harper's Ferry, 1859
Haymarket, 1886

Discussed by ninety percent of the texts:

Nat Turner, 1831
Assault on Charles Sumner, 1856
Homestead, 1892

Discussed by more than half of the texts:

Vesey uprising, 1822
Cheyenne massacre, 1864
Pullman strike, 1894
Philippine uprising, 1899-1902

Discussed or mentioned by at least half the texts:

Hamilton-Burr duel, 1804
Murder of Lovejoy, 1837
New York Draft Riots, 1863
Assassination of Garfield, 1881
Wounded Knee, 1890
Attempted murder of Frick, 1892

It will be noticed that, of these sixteen episodes, five are related in some way to the Civil War, six involve slavery and/or racial antagonisms, and five are industrial riots. This kind of topical balance is hard to fault, although there are some omissions of which the student must be aware.

The coincidence of agreement among the textbooks carries further still. The following list indicates that all ten (100%) of the texts classify twenty-five of the sixty-two (40%) incidents of violence in the same manner (not mentioned, alluded to, mentioned or discussed). Also, it will be noted that there are only three incidents upon which at least half of the texts did not concur in their treatment.

Incidence of similar treatment	Number of incidents so treated (%)
100%	25 (40%)
90%	17 (27%)
80%	4 (6%)
70%	2 (3%)
60%	5 (8%)
50%	6 (10%)
-50%	3 (5%)

The precise meaning of this concurrence is ambivalent. On the one hand it indicates that the important incidents of American domestic violence are so manifestly

obvious that all serious textbooks must agree upon what they are and how much significance they warrant. This is at least partially the case. On the other hand the concurrence may substantiate the old political axiom that in a closely-contested race it is better to be similar to your rivals than to try to differentiate yourself. The publishing business is a highly competitive one and, in the last five years, ten college publishers have failed.⁵⁴ In this market situation it is possible that publishers will seek to be in the conventional mainstream. They will commission known authors to write books that are likely to appeal to the diverse national market and will not, therefore, risk a bold venture which might produce unacceptable returns.

Most likely it means that we are, as Professors Klein, Hofstadter, Richards, Graham, Gurr, and others have said, a bit myopic of the darker sides of our history. It is the obligation of the classroom instructor to provide the corrective spectacles. In 1910, Frederick Jackson Turner issued a famous challenge to the historians of his day. To issue that challenge once again is in order:

A comprehension of the United States to-day, an understanding of the rise and progress of the forces which have made it what it is, demands that we should

⁵⁴Roger G. Emblen, Marketing Director, Harper and Row Publishers, to this writer, 11 January 1977.

rework our history from the new points of view afforded by the present.⁵⁵

If our recent experiences with violence suggest that we should seek historical antecedents, then the textbooks need to include more of the monographic work on violence which is beginning to appear. If we are to understand the presence of violence, then we must study the history of violence. We must eschew what Pulitzer prize-winning historian Howard Mumford Jones has called "the gray prose of many standard history textbooks"⁵⁶ and diligently pursue the elusive topic of American domestic violence. To do otherwise is to continue to ignore a significant aspect of our national experience, and this serves no good cause.

⁵⁵Frederick Jackson Turner, "Presidential Address, American Historical Association, 1910," quoted in Barton J. Bernstein, ed., Towards A New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History (New York: Random House, 1967; Vintage Books, 1969), p. v.

⁵⁶Howard Mumford Jones, The Age of Energy: Varieties of American Experience, 1865-1915 (New York: Viking Press, 1970, Viking Compass Edition, 1973), p. 375.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Manuscript Collections, Government Documents, and Interviews

- Bigglestone, W. E. Archivist, Oberlin College. Letter to Jerome G. Taylor, Jr., 6 January 1967.
- Creekmore, Miss Pollyanna. McClung Historical Collection, Knoxville-Knox County Public Library, Knoxville, Tennessee. Interview, May 1967.
- Emblen, Roger G. Marketing Director, Harper and Row to Jerome G. Taylor, Jr., 11 January 1977.
- Haakoma, Jack C. Registrar, Tusculum College. Letter to Jerome G. Taylor, Jr., 3 January 1967.
- Hazen, Miss Evelyn. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and her home, Knoxville, Tennessee. Interviews, April and June 1967.
- Knox County, Tennessee. Courthouse. Circuit Court Records, vol. 20.
- _____. Deed Book, W-3.
- _____. Marriage License Record Book, number 2, 1850-61.
- Knoxville, Tennessee. University of Tennessee Library. Special Collections. Samuel Mayes Arnell Papers, "The Southern Unionist."
- Knoxville, Tennessee. Miss Evelyn Hazen. Joseph Alexander Mabry Papers.
- Moore, Mrs. John Trotwood, comp. "Tombstone Records of Old Gray Cemetery." Nashville, Tennessee, 1938. (Typewritten)
- Morganthau, Hans J. Comments at the Convention of American Historical Association, New York, New York, December 1968.

Nashville, Tennessee. State Library and Archives. Archives Section. Middle Tennessee Supreme Court. Cooper and Cooper v. Tenn.

_____. Governor Sam Houston Papers.

Nashville, Tennessee. State Library and Archives. Manuscript Section. Edward Ward Carmack Papers.

_____. Duncan Brown Cooper Papers.

_____. Cooper Family Papers.

_____. Thomas Walker Davis Papers.

_____. Bettie M. Donelson Papers.

_____. George W. Duncan Papers.

_____. Figuers Collection.

_____. Moses Fisk Papers.

_____. Isham Green Harris Papers.

_____. Frederick Steidinger Heiskell Papers.

_____. Emil Edward Hurja Collection.

_____. Andrew Jackson Papers.

_____. William Henry McRaven Papers.

_____. John Sevier Papers.

_____. Margaret (Warner) White Papers.

_____. John Knibb Winn Papers.

Nashville, Tennessee. State Library and Archives. Tennessee Historical Society Collection. George G. Poindexter Papers.

_____. Miscellaneous Collection.

NBC. "Violence in America," 5 January 1977.

Porter, James D. To Charles D. Porter, 16 January 1894.
American Historical Magazine 9 (April 1904):187-92.

Tennessee, Constitution (1870).

Tennessee House Journal 1870-71, Appendix. "Report of the Committee on the Mineral Home Railroad."

U.S. Census Office. Mortality Statistics of the Seventh Census of the United States, 1850.

Newspapers

Associated Press Telegram, 19 October 1882. Quoted in Mark Twain, Life on the Mississippi, pp. 238-39. New York: New American Library, Signet Classic, 1961.

Brownlow's Knoxville Whig and Rebel Ventilator, 29 March, 26 April, and 29 November 1865, and 19 December 1866.

Cate, Wirt Armstrong. "'Peach Blossom' and the Jackson-Dickinson Duel." Nashville Banner, 12 April 1955.

Chattanooga Gazette, n.d. Quoted in Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 13 March 1852.

"Coffin Hand Bill." John Spencer Bassett, ed. Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. 7 vols. 3:455-64. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1929.

Daily Nashville True Whig, 19, 21 August 1852.

Democrat, 19 November 1859. Quoted in Nashville Union and American, 29 November 1859.

Elizabethton Tennessee Whig, 27 February, 5, 26 March, and 20 May 1840.

Henderson, Archibald. "Jackson's Loose Living Common Sin Of His Period, But Records Show That He Has Been Much Libelled." Raleigh (N.C.) News and Observer, 17 October 1926.

Knoxville Chronicle, 29 December 1881.

Knoxville Daily Chronicle, 1 June 1870, 25 December 1881, and 20 October 1882.

Knoxville Daily Times, 27 August, 20 October 1882.

Knoxville Daily Tribune, 20 October 1882, and 14 July 1889.

Knoxville Daily Whig, 3-7 June 1870.

Knoxville Press and Herald, 14 June 1870.

Knoxville Register, 20 September 1826, and 1 November 1836.
Quoted in Beatrice Merle Smith, "Sam Houston in Tennessee," pp. 65, 76. M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1932.

_____, 19 April 1837, and 16 May 1838. Quoted in Miss Pollyana Creekmore. Knoxville, Tennessee.
Interview, 11 May 1967.

Memphis Appeal, n.d. Cited by Nashville Union and American, 26 November 1859.

Moore, John Trotwood. "Andrew Jackson's Duel in a New Light," New York Times, 15 March 1925. Jackson Papers, Manuscript Section, TSLA.

Nashville American, 23 May 1900.

_____, 21 November 1901. Quoted in Paul E. Isaac, Prohibition and Politics: Turbulent Decades in Tennessee, 1885-1920, p. 108. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965.

Nashville Banner, 30 December 1907. Quoted in Donald Day and Harry Herbert Ullom, eds., The Autobiography of Sam Houston, p. 47. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.

Nashville Clarion and Tennessee Gazette, 9 February-23 April 1813.

Nashville Daily Gazette, 20 November 1859.

Nashville Daily News, 16-19 November 1859.

Nashville Gazette, 21 August 1852.

Nashville Gazette and Mero-District Advertiser, 25 November 1803.

Nashville Impartial Review, 1-22 February, 15 March, 2, 4, and 31 May, and 28 June 1806.

Nashville Republican Banner, 19 November 1859.

Nashville Rural Sun, 22 May 1829.

Nashville Tennessean, 11 April, 2, 8-10, and 16 November 1908, and 5 November 1922.

Nashville Tennessean, 19 May 1908. Quoted in Will Dunn Smith, "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign and Its Aftermath in Tennessee Politics," p. 57. M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1939.

Nashville Union, 17, 20, and 21 August 1852.

_____, 24 July 1839. Quoted in James T. Horton, Jr., "The Evolution of a Whig Editor in Tennessee: Allen A. Hall," p. 110. M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1966.

Nashville Union and American, 10, 12, and 17 November 1859, 22 November, and 1-6 and 16 December 1859.

National Banner and Nashville Whig, 21 August 1826. Quoted in Beatrice Merle Smith, "Sam Houston in Tennessee," p. 66. M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1932.

_____, 13 September 1826. Quoted in Donald Day and Harry Herbert Ullom, eds., The Autobiography of Sam Houston, pp. 36-38. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.

New York Times, 19 March, 1865, p. 5, 30 October 1877, p. 5, and 20 October 1882.

Republican Banner and Nashville Whig, 5, 19-24 August 1852.

Smith, Frank A. "The Personal Encounter Between Gen. Forrest and Lieut. Gould." Nashville Banner, 29 April 1911, pt. 2, p. 9.

Tennessee Gazette, 21 December 1803. Quoted in Carl S. Driver, John Sevier: Pioneer of the Old Southwest p. 184. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932.

_____, 17 May, 19 July, and 9 August 1806.

United States Telegraph, 21 April 1832. Quoted in Marquis James, The Raven: A Biography of Sam Houston, pp. 164-65. New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1929.

Secondary Sources

Books

- Abernethy, Thomas Perkins. From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee: A Study in Frontier Democracy. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932; reprint ed., Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1967.
- Adler, Alfred. What Life Should Mean to You. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1932, 1960.
- Allison, John. Dropped Stitches in Tennessee History. Nashville: Marshall and Cruce Co., 1897.
- Aristotle. The Basic Works of Aristotle. Edited by Richard McKeon. Politics. New York: Random House, 1941.
- Armstrong, James L. Reminiscences, Or an Extract from the Catalogue of General Jackson's "Juvenile Indescretions" Between the Ages of 26 and 60. Quoted in James Parton, The Life of Andrew Jackson. 3 vols., 1:265. New York: Mason Bros., 1859-61.
- Arnow, Harriette Simpson. Seedtime on the Cumberland. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Aronson, Sidney H. Status and Kinship in the Higher Civil Service: Standards of Selection in the Administrations of John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Baldick, Robert. The Duel: A History of Duelling. London: Chapman and Hall, 1965.
- Bandura, Albert, and Walters, Richard H. "Adolescent Aggression." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 90-100. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Bassett, John Spencer, ed. Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. 7 vols. Washington, D.C. Carnegie Institution, 1926-35.
- Bassett, John Spencer. The Life of Andrew Jackson. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Co., 1916; reprint ed., Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String, 1967.

- Baydo, Gerald. A Topical History of the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Bedford, Henry F., and Colbourn, Trevor. The Americans: A Brief History. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1972.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Berkowitz, Leonard, and LePage, Anthony. "Weapons as Aggression-Eliciting Stimuli." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 133-42. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Bertelson, David. The Lazy South. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1961.
- Boorstin, Daniel J. The Americans: The National Experience. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Boyce, Everett Robert, ed. The Unwanted Boy: The Autobiography of Governor Ben W. Hooper. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1963.
- Blum, John M., Morgan, Edmund S., Rose, Willie Lee, Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr., Stamp, Kenneth M., and Woodward, C. Vann. The National Experience: A History of the United States. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1973.
- Bond, Octavia Zollicoffer. The Family Chronicle and Kinship Book of Maclin, Clack, Cocke, Carter, Taylor, Cross, Gordon and Other Related American Lineages. Nashville: McDaniel Printing Co., 1928.
- Braider, Donald. Solitary Star: A Biography of Sam Houston. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1974.
- Brearley, H. C. "The Pattern of Violence." In Culture of the South, pp. 678-92. Edited by W. T. Couch. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.
- Brown, Paul, and Elliott, Rogers. "Control of Aggression in a Nursery School Class." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 101-07. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Brown, Richard Maxwell. American Violence. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

- Brown, Richard Maxwell. "Historical Patterns of Violence in America." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 45-84. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- _____. Strain of Violence: Historical Studies of American Violence and Vigilantism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- _____. "The American Vigilante Tradition." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 154-226. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Brownlow, William G. Helps to the Study of Presbyterianism, or an Unsophisticated Exposition of Calvinism, with Hopkinsianism Modifications of Policy, with a View to a More Easy Interpretation of the Same. To Which is Added a Brief Account of Life and Travels of the Author; Interspersed with Anecdotes. Knoxville: F. S. Heiskell, 1834.
- _____. Sketches of the Rise, Progress and Decline of Secession; with a Narrative of Personal Adventures Among the Rebels. Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1862.
- Buckingham, James Silk. The Slave States of America. 2 vols. London, 1842. Cited by Steve Humphrey, "That D----d Brownlow," Being A Saucy and Malicious Description of the Fighting Parson William Gannaway Brownlow, Knoxville Editor and Stalwart Unionist, Who Rose from a Confederate Jail to become One of the Most Famous Personages in the Nation, Denounced by his Enemies as Vicious and Harsh, Praised by his Friends as Compassionate and Gentle, 2:246-48. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978.
- Bumpus, Paul Franklin. Carmack: The Edward Ward Carmack Story. Franklin, Tenn.: By the Author, 1977.
- Burner, David, Marcus, Robert D., and Rosenberg, Emily S. America: A Portrait in History. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Caldwell, Joshua W. Sketches of the Bench and Bar of Tennessee. Knoxville: Ogden Bros. & Co., 1898.

- Capuzzello, Paul G., and Schlesinger, Mark A. Recent Trends in History, Curricula and Pedagogy: A Bibliographic Study. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University, 1976.
- Carmack, Edward Ward. Character, or the Making of the Man. Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1909.
- Carney, Thomas F. Content Analysis: A Technique for Systematic Inference from Communications. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1972.
- Cash, W. J. The Mind of the South. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.
- Chambers, William Nisbet. Old Bullion Benton: Senator from the West. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1956.
- Cisco, Jay Guy. Historic Summer County, Tennessee with Genealogies of the Bledsoe, Cage, and Douglas Families, and Genealogical Notes of Other Summer County Families. Nashville: Folk-Keelin, 1909; reprint ed., Nashville: Charles Elder, 1971.
- Clark, Thomas D. The Rampaging Frontier: Manners and Humors of Pioneer Days in the South and Middle West. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1939; reprint ed., Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Clayton, W. W. History of Davidson County, Tennessee. Philadelphia: J. W. Lewis, 1880.
- Coleman, J. Winston, Jr. Famous Kentucky Duels: The Code of Honor in the Bluegrass State. Frankfort: Roberts Printing Co., 1953.
- Commager, Henry Steele. "The History of American Violence: An Interpretation." In Violence: The Crisis of American Confidence, pp. 3-26. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971.
- Corlew, Robert E., Folmsbee, S. J., and Mitchell, Enoch L. Tennessee: A Short History. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1972.
- Coulter, E. Merton. William G. Brownlow: Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937; reprint ed., Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1971.

- Cunliffe, Marcus. Soldiers and Civilians: The Martial Spirit in America, 1775-1865. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1968.
- Current, Richard N., Williams, T. Harry, and Freidel, Frank. American History: A Survey. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.
- Curtis, James C. Andrew Jackson and the Search for Vindication. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.
- d'Armand, Roscoe C. DeArmond Families of America. Knoxville: Family Record Society, 1954.
- Day, Donald, and Ullom, Harry Herbert, eds. The Autobiography of Sam Houston. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.
- Dictionary of American Biography. S.v. "Carmack, Edward Ward," by Walter Lynwood Fleming. "Marling, John Leake," by Donald Davidson. "Zollicoffer, Felix Kirk," by Edd Winfield Parks.
- Dollard, John, Doob, Leonard W., Miller, Neal E., Mower, O. H., and Sears, Robert S. Frustration and Aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.
- Donald, David. Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.
- Dougherty, James E., and Pfaltzgraff, Robert L., Jr. Contending Theories of International Relations. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971.
- Drayton, John. A View of South Carolina as Respects Her Natural and Civil Concerns. Charleston: W. P. Young, 1802; reprint ed., Spartanburg, S.C.: The Reprint Co., 1972.
- Driver, Carl S. John Sevier: Pioneer of the Old Southwest. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1932.
- Eaton, Clement. The Freedom of Thought Struggle in the Old South. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- _____. The Growth of Southern Civilization, 1790-1860. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports for the United States--1976, issued by Clarence M. Kelly. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

- Feierabend, Ivo K., Feierabend, Rosalind L., and Nesvold, Betty A. "Social Change and Political Violence: Cross-National Patterns." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 632-87. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Folmsbee, S. J., Corlew, Robert E., and Mitchell, Enoch L. History of Tennessee. 2 vols. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1960.
- Folmsbee, S. J. "The Radicals and the Railroads." In Tennessee: A History, 1673-1932. 2 vols., 2:659-73. Edited by P. M. Hamer. New York: American Historical Society, 1933.
- Franklin, John Hope. The Militant South, 1800-1861. New York: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Frantz, Joe B. "The Frontier Tradition: An Invitation to Violence." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 127-54. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Friend, Llerena B. Sam Houston: The Great Designer. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1954.
- Freud, Sigmund. Beyond the Pleasure Principle. Translated by James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- _____. Collected Papers. Edited by James Strachey. Vol. 5: "Why War?", Miscellaneous Papers, 1888-1938. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Garraty, John A. The American Nation: A History of the United States. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- _____. A Short History of the American Nation. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Genovese, Eugene D. "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South." In Red and Black: Marxian Explorations in Southern and Afro-American History. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Gerald, Baydo. A Topical History of the United States. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

- Goodspeed Publishing Company. History of Tennessee, Knoxville Edition. Chicago: Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1887.
- Graham, Hugh Davis, and Gurr, Ted Robert, eds. The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Graves, John Temple. The Fighting South. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1943.
- Gruver, Rebecca Brooks. An American History. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.
- Guild, Jo. C. Old Times in Tennessee with Historical, Personal, and Political Scraps and Sketches. Nashville: Tavel, Eastman and Howell, 1878.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. "A Comparative Study of Civil Strife." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 572-626. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- _____. Why Men Rebel. Princeton: Princeton University University Press, 1970.
- Hackney, Sheldon. "Southern Violence." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 505-27. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Hale, Oron J. The Great Illusion, 1900-1914. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Hamer, P. M., ed. Tennessee: A History, 1673-1932. 4 vols. New York: American Historical Society, 1933.
- Heiskell, S. G. Andrew Jackson and Early Tennessee History. 3 vols. Nashville: Ambrose Printing Co., 1918.
- Henry, Robert Selph. "First With the Most" Forrest. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1944.
- Hinde, R. A. Biological Bases of Human Behaviour. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

- Hoerder, Dirk, comp. and ed. Violence in the United States: Riots--Strikes--Protest and Suppression: A Working Bibliography for Teachers and Students. Berlin: John F. Kennedy Institut Fur Nordamerikastudien-Freie Universitat, 1973.
- Hoffman, William S. Andrew Jackson and North Carolina Politics. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.
- Hofstadter, Richard, and Wallace, Michael, eds. American Violence: A Documentary History. New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1970.
- Hofstadter, Richard, Miller, William, and Aaron, Daniel. The United States. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Hokanson, Jack E. "Psychophysiological Evaluation of the Catharsis Hypothesis." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 74-86. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Hollon, W. Eugene. Frontier Violence: Another Look. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- _____. "Introduction to 'Aspects of Inference from Content Data.'" In The Analysis of Communications Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques, pp. 109-121. Edited by George Gerbner, et al. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1969.
- Hovland, Carl I., and Sears, Robert R. "Minor Studies of Aggression: Correlation of Lynching with Economic Indices." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 67-74. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Humphrey, Steve. "That D----d Brownlow," Being A Saucy & Malicious Description of Fighting Parson William Gannaway Brownlow, Knoxville Editor and Stalwart Unionist, Who Rose from a Confederate Jail to become One of the Most Famous Personages in the Nation, Denounced by his Enemies as Vicious and Harsh, Praised by his Friends as Compassionate and Gentle. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978.

- International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. S.v. "Aggression," by Leonard Berkowitz.
- Isaac, Paul E. Prohibition and Politics: Turbulent Decades in Tennessee, 1855-1920. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965.
- James, Marquis. The Life of Andrew Jackson. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1938.
- _____. The Raven: A Biography of Sam Houston. New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1929.
- Jones, Howard Mumford. The Age of Energy: Varieties of American Experience, 1865-1915. New York: Viking Press, 1970; Viking Compass Edition, 1973.
- Kane, Harnett T. Gentlemen, Swords and Pistols. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1951.
- Kennett, Lee, and Anderson, James LaVerne. The Gun in America: The Origins of a National Dilemma. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1976.
- Kephart, Horace. Our Southern Highlanders. New York: Macmillan Co., 1926.
- Lester, Charles Edward, ed. The Life of Sam Houston, The Only Authentic Memoir of Him Ever Published. In The Autobiography of Sam Houston, p. 3. Edited by Donald and Harry Herbert Ullom. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.
- Levy, Sheldon G. "A 150-Year Study of Political Violence in America." In The History of Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, pp. 84-100. Edited by Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Littell, William. The Statute Laws of Kentucky. 2 vols. Cited by J. Winston Coleman, Jr., Famous Kentucky Duels: The Story of the Code of Honor in the Bluegrass State, pp. 2-3. Frankfort: Roberts Printing Co., 1953.
- Lorenz, Konrad. On Aggression. Translated by Marjorie Kerr Wilson. 10th ed. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.
- Lytle, Andrew. Bedford Forrest and His Critter Company. New York: McDowell, Obdensky, 1960.

- McCord, William, McCord, Joan, and Howard, Allan. "Familial Correlates of Aggression in Nondelinquent Male Children." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 42-65. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- McIlwaine, Shields. Memphis Down in Dixie. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1948.
- McKellar, Kenneth. Tennessee Senators as Seen by One of Their Successors. Kingsport, Tenn.: Southern Publishers, 1942.
- Manheim, Jarol B. Déjà Vu: American Political Problems in Historical Perspective. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.
- Masterson, William H., ed. The John Gray Blount Papers. 3 vols. Raleigh: State Department of Archives and History, 1952-65.
- Mathes, J. Harvey. General Forrest. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1902.
- Megargee, Edwin I., and Hokanson, Jack E., eds. The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Meigs, William M. The Life of Thomas Hart Benton. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1904.
- Montagu, Ashley, ed. Man and Aggression. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Morton, John W. "A Soldier Sums Up." In As They Saw Forrest: Some Recollections and Comments of Contemporaries, pp. 269-81. Edited by Robert Selph Henry. Jackson, Tenn.: McCowat-Mercer, 1956.
- Moulder, Rebecca Hunt. May the Sod Rest Lightly: Thomas O'Conner, Halifax Court House, Virginia, 1836--Knoxville, Tennessee, 1882. Tuscon, Ariz.: By the Author, Skyline Printing Co., 1977.
- Myers, Raymond E. The Zollie Tree. Louisville: Filson Club Press, 1964.
- National Cyclopedia of American Biography, 1901 ed. S.v. "Mabry, Joseph A.," "Marling, John Leake." 11:563-64, 13:272-73.

- Osterweis, Rollin G. Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1964.
- Parrington, Vernon Louis. Main Currents in American Thought. 3 vols. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1958.
- Parton, James. The Life of Andrew Jackson. 3 vols. New York: Mason Bros., 1859-61.
- Patton, James Welch. Unionism and Reconstruction in Tennessee, 1860-1869. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934; reprint ed., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1966.
- Pessen, Edward. Jacksonian American: Society, Personality, and Politics. Rev. ed. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1978.
- Pickens, Donald D., and Seligmann, Gustav L., Jr. America in Process. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1973.
- Ramsey, J. G. M. The Annals of Tennessee to the End of the Eighteenth Century. Charleston, S.C.: Walker and Jones, 1853; reprint ed., Knoxville, East Tennessee Historical Society, 1967.
- Reid, John, and Eaton, John Henry. The Life of Andrew Jackson. Philadelphia: M. Carey and Son, 1817.
- Remini, Robert V. Andrew Jackson. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966.
- _____. Andrew Jackson and the Course of American Empire, 1767-1821. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.
- _____. The Election of Andrew Jackson. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1963.
- Richards, Leonard L. "Gentlemen of Property and Standing": Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Rogin, Michael Paul. Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. Thomas Hart Benton. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914.

- Roucek, Joseph S., ed. The Teaching of History. New York: Philosophical Library, 1967.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. The Age of Jackson. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1945.
- Scott, Edward. Scott's Revision of the Laws of Tennessee and North Carolina, 1715-1820. 2 vols. Knoxville: Heiskell and Brown, 1821.
- Scott, Nancy N., ed. A Memoir of Hugh Lawson White: With Selections From His Speeches and Correspondence. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1856.
- Scott, J. P. Aggression. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Seitz, Don C. Famous American Duels: With Some Account of the Causes that Led up to Them & the Men Engaged. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1929.
- Sellers, Charles. James K. Polk: Jacksonian. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
- Shaffer, Jerome A., ed. Violence: Award Winning Essays in the Council for Philosophical Studies Competition. New York: David McKay Co., 1971.
- Sheppard, Eric William. Bedford Forrest: The Confederacy's Greatest Cavalryman. London: Dial Press, 1930.
- Simkins, Francis B. A History of the South. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Simon, Julian L. Basic Research Methods in Social Science: The Art of Empirical Investigation. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Slotkin, Richard. Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.
- Smith, Elbert B. Magnificent Missourian: The Life of Thomas Hart Benton. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1958.
- Sullins, David. Recollections of an Old Man: Seventy Years in Dixie, 1827-1898. Bristol, Tenn.: King Printing Co., 1910.
- Truman, Ben C. The Field of Honor: Being A Complete and Comprehensive History of Duelling in all Countries. New York: Ford, Howard, and Hulbert, 1884.

- Turner, Frederick Jackson. "Presidential Address, American Historical Association, 1910." Quoted in Barton J. Bernstein, ed., Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History, p. v. New York: Random House, 1967; Vintage Books, 1969.
- Twain, Mark. Life on the Mississippi. New York: New American Library, Signet Classic, 1961.
- _____. Mark Twain's Works. Vol. 19: Sketches Old and New, "Journalism in Tennessee." New York: Harper and Brothers, 1875; reprint ed., Grosse Pointe, Mich.: Scholarly Press, 1968.
- Van Deusen, Glyndon G. The Jacksonian Era: 1828-1848. The New American Nation Series. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Vandiver, Frank E. "The Southerner as Extremist." In The Idea of the South: Pursuit of a Central Theme, pp. 43-55. Edited by Frank E. Vandiver. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Walker, Hugh. Tennessee Tales. Nashville: Aurora Publishers, 1970.
- Waller, William, ed. Nashville, 1900 to 1910. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1972.
- Walters, Richard H. "Implications of Laboratory Studies of Aggression for the Control and Regulation of Violence." In The Dynamics of Aggression: Individual, Group, and International Analyses, pp. 125-31. Edited by Edwin I. Megargee and Jack E. Hokanson. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Ward, John William. Andrew Jackson: Symbol for an Age. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Wheeler, John H. Historical Sketches of North Carolina. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo and Co., 1851.
- White, Robert H., ed. Messages of the Governors of Tennessee, 1796-1821. 8 vols. Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1952.
- Wrightsmann, Lawrence S. Social Psychology in the Seventies. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1972.

Periodicals

- Abernethy, Thomas Perkins. "Social Relations and Political Control in the Old Southwest." The Mississippi Valley Historical Review 16 (March 1930):529-37.
- _____. "The Origin of the Whig Party in Tennessee." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 12 (March 1926): 504-22.
- _____. "Andrew Jackson and the Rise of Southwestern Democracy." American Historical Review 33 (October 1927):64-77.
- Alexander, Thomas B. "Strange Bedfellows: The Interlocking Careers of T. A. R. Nelson, Andrew Johnson, and W. G. (Parson) Brownlow." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 24 (1952):68-91.
- Bellamy, James W. "The Political Career of Landon Carter Haynes." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 28 (1956):102-26.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. "Impulse, Aggression and the Gun." Psychology Today 2 (September 1968):19-22.
- Bergeron, Paul H. "A Test for Jacksonians: Sam Houston on Trial." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 38 (1966):16-29.
- Busfield, Roger M., Jr. "The Hermitage Walking Stick: First Challenge to Congressional Immunity." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 21 (June 1962):122-30.
- Cardwell, Guy A. "The Duel in the Old South: Crux of a Concept." The South Atlantic Quarterly 66 (Winter 1961):50-69.
- Chambers, William N. "The Thwarted Warrior: The Last Years of Thomas Hart Benton in Tennessee: 1812-1815." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 22 (1950): 19-44.
- Corning, Peter A. "The Biological Bases of Behavior and Some Implications for Political Science." World Politics 23 (April 1971):321-70.
- Danger, M. Herbert. "Reply to Tuchman." American Sociological Review 41 (December 1976):1067-71.

- Driver, Peter M. "Toward an Ethology of Human Conflict: A Review." Journal of Conflict Resolution 11 (September 1967):361-74.
- Eaton, Clement. "Mob Violence in the Old South." Mississippi Valley Historical Review 25 (December 1942):351-70.
- Eichler, Margrit, and Nelson, Carol Ann. "History and Historiography: The Treatment in American Histories of Significant Events Concerning the Status of Women." The Historian 40 (November 1977):1-15.
- Fogel, Robert William. "The Limits of Quantitative Methods in History." American Historical Review 80 (April 1975):329-50.
- Goldman, Perry M. "Political Rhetoric in the Age of Jackson." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 29 (Winter 1970-71):360-71.
- Goodstein, Anita S. "Leadership on the Nashville Frontier, 1780-1800." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 35 (Summer 1976):175-98.
- Grantham, Dewey W., Jr. "Goebel, Gonzales, Carmack: Three Violent Scenes in Southern Politics." Mississippi Quarterly 11 (Winter 1958):29-37.
- Greer, Andrew. "Affadavit, 23 October 1803." American Historical Magazine V (July 1900):208-09.
- Grimsted, David. Review of American Violence by Hofstadter and Wallace. American Historical Review 76 (Summer 1971):1582.
- Gurr, Ted Robert, and Bishop, Vaughn F. "Violent Nations, and Others." The Journal of Conflict Resolution 20 (March 1976):79-110.
- Hackney, Sheldon. "The South as a Counterculture." American Scholar 42 (Spring 1973):283-93.
- Haskins, Ralph W. "Internecine Strife in Tennessee: Andrew Johnson Versus Parson Brownlow." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 24 (Winter 1965):321-40.
- Hesseltine, W. B. "Methodism and Reconstruction in East Tennessee." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 3 (1931):42-62.

- Hirschfelder, Arlene B. "Treatment of Iroquois Indians in Selected American History Textbooks." The Indian Historian 8 (Fall 1975):32-39.
- Horowitz, Donald L. "Direct, Displaced, and Cumulative Ethnic Aggression." Comparative Politics 6 (November 1973):1-16.
- Howington, Arthur F. "Violence in Alabama: A Study of Late Ante-Bellum Montgomery." The Alabama Review 27 (July 1974):213-31.
- Jones, Robert L., and Jones, Pualine H. "Houston's Politics and the Cherokees, 1829-1833." Chronicles of Oklahoma 46 (Winter 1968-69):418-32.
- Jordan, Philip D. "The Wearing of Weapons in the Western Country." The Filson Club Historical Quarterly 42 (July 1968):205-22.
- Kelley, Robert. "Ideology and Political Culture from Jefferson to Nixon." American Historical Review 82 (June 1977):531-62.
- Klein, Milton M. "The Face of Violence in America: A Historical Perspective." Social Education 37 (October 1973):540-45.
- McKee, James W., Jr. "Felix K. Zollicoffer: Confederate Defender of East Tennessee (Parts I and II)." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 43, 44 (1971, 1972):34-59, 17-40.
- McNeil, Elton B. "Psychology and Aggression." The Journal of Conflict Resolution 3 (September 1959):195-293.
- Milton, George Fort. "Edward Ward Carmack." North American Review 185 (June 1908):807-13.
- Molotch, Harvey L., and Lester, Marilyn. "Accidental News: The Great Oil Spill." American Sociological Review 81 (September 1975):235-60.
- _____. "News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents and Scandals." American Sociological Review 39 (February 1974):101-12.
- Owsley, Harriet Chappell. "The Marriages of Rachel Donelson." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 36 (Winter 1977):479-92.

- Parks, Edd Winfield. "Zollicoffer: Southern Whig." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 11 (December 1952): 346-55.
- Paschal, George. "Last Years of Sam Houston." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (April 1866), p. 631.
- Queener, Verton M. "William G. Brownlow as an Editor." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 4 (1932):67-82.
- Reed, John Sheldon, "To Live--and Die--in Dixie: A Contribution to the Study of Southern Violence." Political Science Quarterly 86 (September 1971): 429-43.
- Seawright, Sandy. "Ten 'Greatest Tennesseans'--A Reappraisal." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 35 (Summer 1976):222-23.
- Seller, Maxine and Trusz, Andrew. "High School Textbooks and the American Revolution." The History Teacher 9 (August 1976):535-55.
- Shearer, Ernest C. "The Mercurial Sam Houston." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 35 (1935):3-20.
- Sioussat, St. George L. "Tennessee, the Compromise of 1850, and the Nashville Convention." Tennessee Historical Magazine 4 (December 1918):215-47.
- Smith, Elbert B. "Now Defend Yourself, You Damned Rascal!" American Heritage 9 (February 1958):44-47, 106.
- Stamper, James C. "Felix K. Zollicoffer: Tennessee Editor and Politician." Tennessee Historical Quarterly 28 (Winter 1969):356-76.
- Stark, Cruce. "The Historical Irrelevance of Heroes: Henry Adam's Andrew Jackson." American Literature 46 (May 1974):170-81.
- Sydnor, Charles S. "The Southerner and the Laws." The Journal of Southern History 6 (February 1940):3-23.
- Taylor, Jerome G., Jr. "The Extraordinary Life and Death of Joseph A. Mabry." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 44 (1972):41-70.
- Tuchman, Gaye. "Objectivity as a Strategic Ritual." American Journal of Sociology 77 (January 1972):660-79.

Tuchman, Gaye. "The News' Manufacture of Sociological Data." American Sociological Review 41 (December 1976):1065-1067.

Wallace, Michael. "The Uses of Violence in American History." The American Scholar 40 (Winter 1970-71): 81-102.

Williams, Samuel Cole, ed. "The Executive Journal of Governor John Sevier." East Tennessee Historical Society's Publications 1 (1929):95-153.

Theses and Dissertations

Bass, Frank Embrick. "The Work of Edward Ward Carmack in Congress." M.A. thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930.

Bellamy, James W. "The Political Career of Landon Carter Haynes." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1952.

Crutcher, Robert Franklin. "The Career of Edward Ward Carmack and the Cooper-Sharp Trial." M.A. thesis, Western Kentucky State Teachers College, 1932.

Grant, Clement Lyndon. "The Public Career of Cave Johnson." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1951.

Haley, Nancy Marlene. "'Cry Aloud and Spare not': The Formative Years of Brownlow's Whig, 1839-1841." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1966.

Horton, James T., Jr. "The Evolution of a Whig Editor in Tennessee: Allen A. Hall." M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1966.

Hutson, A. C., Jr. "The Coal Miner's Insurrection, 1891-1892." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1933.

Neville, Lucille. "Edward Ward Carmack in the Fight for Prohibition in Tennessee." M.A. thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929.

Parks, Norman L. "The Career of John Bell of Tennessee in the United States House of Representatives." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1942.

- Queener, Verton M. "The Pre-Civil War Period of the Life of William G. Brownlow." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1930.
- Smith, Beatrice Merle. "Sam Houston in Tennessee." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1932.
- Smith, Will Dunn. "The Carmack-Patterson Campaign and Its Aftermath in Tennessee Politics." M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1939.
- Stamper, James C. "Felix Kirk Zollicoffer: Tennessee Editor, Politician, and Soldier." Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1967.
- Stanbery, George W., II. "The Constitutional Convention of 1870." Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1940.
- Taylor, Jerome G., Jr. "The Public Career of Joseph Alexander Mabry." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1968.
- Turner, Ruth Osborne. "The Public Career of William Montgomery Churchwell." M.A. thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1954.