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CHAPTER 1
THE CIVIL WAR AND TEXAS VETERANS

Official records of the Civil War did not provide exact numbers of casualties on either side, much less the exact number of deceased soldiers from Texas. Nearly 150 years later, prominent Texas historian Ralph A. Wooster placed Texas fatalities at approximately 24,000 men. According to Wooster, this estimation of casualties represents roughly 28 percent of the 86,000 men who served from the state. These assessments indicate that the number of Texans who survived the war came to more than 60,000. While it would be incautious to assume that all of these veterans returned to Texas after the Confederate surrender, a safe estimate would be that a large majority of this number made their homes in the Lone Star State in the later part of the nineteenth century. These returning veterans, wounded or not, would face hardships in their post-war lives, whether in their health conditions, financial status, or other areas. The state of Texas employed a number of methods to ease the burdens of those who had risked everything in the name of the Lost Cause. This work focuses on one aid to elderly veterans, the Confederate Home for Men, located in the state’s capital city of Austin, Texas.¹

The home has been covered in few studies at any length, and it has never been the primary focus of any examination. Studies on Civil War veterans, particularly Confederate veterans, were spearheaded by William White’s The Confederate Veteran (1962). White briefly discussed the veterans’ need for institutions like the Texas Confederate Home for Men, referring

¹ Ralph A. Wooster, Texas and Texans in the Civil War (Austin: Eakin Press, 1995), 185. In addition to the state’s returning native sons, many veterans from other southern states also flowed into Texas after the war. This would greatly increase the number of aging veterans in the state and have a profound effect on the Confederate Home.
to the Austin establishment directly a few times. Nevertheless, White focused primarily on the organizations of Confederate veterans and their impact and involvement in politics after the war.²

Author Larry M. Logue has compiled two important contributions on Civil War veterans, *To Appomattox and Beyond: The Civil War Soldier in War and Peace* (1996) and *The Civil War Veteran: A Historical Reader* (2007), the second of which he edited with Michael Barton. The first is composed mainly of chapters on the experiences of soldiers during the war, but the final two chapters focus on veterans and their plight following the surrender. These chapters provide a general overview of the South’s struggle to provide aid to its men in gray, as well as a discussion of the impact that northern and southern veteran organizations had on politics. Logue and Barton conclude that Confederate veterans ultimately held more political power than their Union counterparts, due to the fact that they possessed a common goal in their pursuit of racial supremacy. They were able to band together under this common goal to produce more measurable results based on their actions. *The Civil War Veteran* is composed of more than thirty articles on all aspects of the lives of veterans, both Union and Confederate. These essays, written by prominent historians including Gaines M. Foster, David W. Blight, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, cover the development of veteran care in the South and the behavior of veterans once they entered their respective homes. The book includes a wealth of information on the general welfare and troubles that veterans on both sides of the war faced years after its conclusion.³

A forthcoming book from historian James Marten promises to provide some surprising information on Union and Confederate veterans. *Sing Not War: The Lives of Union and Confederate Veterans in Gilded Age America* (2011) will feature many topics relevant to the

---

Confederate Home. Two chapters will focus on veterans’ homes, though largely on federally run facilities. Marten discusses the experiences of the men while they lived in the homes as well as the intricacies and interactions between the homes and the towns where they were located.⁴

On the particular subject of disabled veterans, a work edited by David A. Gerber provides insight on veterans from a multitude of countries and times. Despite its wide range of topics, *Disabled Veterans in History* contains several essays that focus on the plight of Civil War veterans. One article penned by James Marten discusses the relationship that many crippled veterans maintained with alcohol during their time at the National Home, a federal veteran facility. The most relevant work was composed by R. B. Rosenberg and covers the differences between the realities of disabled Confederate veterans and how they have been portrayed in the past. The men were depicted as armless, legless men who were quickly becoming extinct and needed to be protected. Rosenberg holds that some thought that veterans were often exploited for the monetary gain of others. He concludes that many of the veterans did not wish to celebrate their sacrifices and be remembered for their heroism, rejecting the aid that individuals and state legislatures sought to provide them. It was this sense of pride that, ironically, caused aid workers to want to protect the veterans even more fervently.⁵

Studies of veterans’ homes themselves provide another angle on postwar life. The earliest analysis on soldiers’ homes of the era is “A History of Veterans’ Homes in the United States, 1811-1930” (1977), a dissertation written by Judith Gladys Cetina at Case Western Reserve University. It concentrates on federally-supported institutions with only brief mentions of

---


Confederate homes in general. Cetina’s examination is important for its coverage of the federal homes as a counterpoint to those in the former Confederacy.  

R. B. Rosenberg’s *Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers’ Homes in the New South* (1993) is a standard source on southern veterans’ homes. It covers all Confederate homes at length, including the Texas Confederate Home for Men. Yet, its focus is not on any particular institution, but on the overall rise and fall of the Confederate home movement phenomenon. Rosenberg divides the movement into three distinct periods, which signify major changes in the development and management of the various homes. He argues that the establishments hold a significant place in Southern history due to the devotion and consideration shown by the southern people for the homes.

*Take Care of the Living: Reconstructing Confederate Veteran Families in Virginia,* written by Jeffrey W. McClurken, sheds light on the hardships that veterans in that war-torn state faced in relation to their families after the war’s end. Though the book’s primary subject is the family, it does briefly discuss the founding of the state’s home facility and its impact on the town surrounding it, as well as the veterans themselves. This institution is of particular significance to the Texas Confederate Home for Men because its founding inspired the men of the Lone Star State to duplicate the facility in their capital. McClurken contends that the book details a gradual shift between a reliance on family members for assistance and relying on government-funded programs to support veterans. He also argues that, despite the good intentions of those who had

---

sought to provide for veterans and their families, not all forms of financial assistance were a clear fit for every family who needed help.\(^8\)

An interesting and effective example of a study that focuses on one Confederate home is Rusty Williams’ *My Old Confederate Home: A Respectable Place for Civil War Veterans* (2010). It concentrates on the Kentucky Confederate Home, telling the story of the home’s progression from its inception to the death of its last remaining veteran. In the edition’s introduction, the author states that the book stands as a testament and tribute to the service of military men, though he cautions that such service should never “define, ennoble, or excuse the rest of their existence.” The book briefly mentions the Texas Confederate Home for Men, comparing it to the situations that the Kentucky Confederate Home faced and explaining how each withstood various challenges.\(^9\)

As previously stated, the Texas Confederate Home for Men has never been the primary focus of a historical study. Despite this gap in historiography, several works have been written on topics that are connected in some way to the facility’s story. One such work is Thomas Miller’s “Texas Land Grants to Confederate Veterans and Widows” (1966). The article briefly explains the land grant system that Texas employed in an effort to aid Confederate veterans and their widows. It also analyzes the troubles that the program faced, including the fact that many of the veterans and widows sold their land grants rather than make their homes on the land as the program had originally intended. This land policy served as a precursor to the Confederate home project. The problems experienced with the land grant program opened the eyes of the public to

---


the fact that many of the surviving veterans and widows were beyond the age of being able to work their own homesteads.¹⁰

A study that discusses the home in relation to some of those who worked to initiate the project and eventually came to be residents is Harold B. Simpson’s *Hood’s Texas Brigade in Reunion and Memory* (1974). The author talks of the home as an endeavor that the Hood’s Texas Brigade Association fully supported, even to the point that they used their political influence in the state to continue funding for the home. Though the majority of the book discusses the association and its history, the account briefly surveys the home’s history and the association’s interactions with its residents.¹¹

Another history relevant to the Texas Confederate Home for Men centers on some of the women who helped to establish the institution. “From Lost Cause to Female Empowerment: The Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, 1896-1966” by Kelly McMichael Stott details the history of the Texas branch of the national heritage society. Though they were not formally organized as a group until after the home had been founded, many of its early leaders were essential to fundraising efforts to open and maintain the facility. The organization also spearheaded the establishment of the Texas Confederate Women’s Home in north Austin. They continued their patronage of the men’s home with frequent visits to the institution to cheer up its residents. Stott recounts that the organization was founded with two goals in mind: to care for Confederate veterans and their families and to become cultural shapers of women in the state.

She ultimately concludes that, while the group failed to reach the second goal, they were essential to the care of veterans and their families in the Lone Star State.\(^{12}\)

One of the most recent accounts that touch on the Confederate home is in the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. This journal features a study conducted in the 1990s during a renovation of the Texas State Cemetery, where many of the home’s residents were laid to rest. The article “Dental Health of Elderly Confederate Veterans: Evidence from the Texas State Cemetery,” written by Helen Danzeiser Wols and Joan E. Baker, was published in 2004. Extensive studies were conducted on the remains of fifty veterans, most of whom had resided at the home, to shed light on dental health in institutionalized settings during that period. The authors ultimately concluded that the dental health of the residents studied was much better than those in similar institutions at the time. Such conclusions have implications for a multitude of areas, including diet and dental care. Some of these areas will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.\(^{13}\)

Finally, “The Confederate Pension Systems in Texas, Georgia, and Virginia: The Programs and the People,” a dissertation by Mary L. Wilson, compares the pension systems employed by three different states. The author explains the choosing of these particular states as representatives of the three regions of the former Confederate states: the Southwest, the deep South, and the upper South. By tracing the evolution of Confederate pensions as a whole, Wilson highlights the link between the rise of pensions and the emergence and strengthening of the Lost Cause movement in the South.\(^{14}\)

---


The Texas Confederate Home for Men is an interesting specimen of a Confederate home. It holds many distinctions that set it apart from its fellow institutions. The facility housed the highest numbers of Confederate veterans born in other Confederate states. It also had the highest average enrollment from the year 1902 onward, as well the lowest percentages in the number of veterans who spent one year or less in the home. One could also argue that the state of Texas made an extraordinary effort to take care of its veterans, because the home had the highest numbers of institutional employees of all the homes from 1902 onward and the highest public appropriations from 1903 onward. The facility was not free of errors and controversies. Among its darker stories were allegations of neglect of the veterans, unsafe physical facilities, the assault on a superintendent by a resident, a destructive fire, the murders of residents by their fellow residents, and more.¹⁵

Though these previous studies are relevant to the Confederate Home story, they do not provide a complete portrayal of the institution. More often than not, the basic facts of the facility’s establishment are provided without further analysis and details explaining the situation. Prior volumes have characterized the home in a particularly negative light, finding fault in the actions of the staff and administrators at every turn. Rosenberg’s study in particular portrays Confederate homes in general as being elitist and welcoming only to those men who had served in the Confederate army. This view is inaccurate in relation to the Texas Confederate Home for Men, which accommodated veterans from the Spanish-American War and World War I. He also contended the majority of the homes were closed by the 1920s, when the Texas home stayed in operation until 1965. A more accurate and less biased assessment of the impact of the Home is greatly needed.

---

Using a variety of sources, this study addresses many of the important moments in the history of the home, including its inception, daily routines, and its eventual closure. It traces the institution through its entire journey, with a focus on the care of the residents and the upkeep of the facilities in which they were housed. Beyond that, it examines controversial incidents that occurred in the institution. State records and business records from the home, among other sources, are assessed in an effort to corroborate or refute claims made in several sources of general negligence on the part of staff and administrators. Newspaper articles are referenced in order to present insight into the opinions expressed by members of the community. It is also the intent of this survey to assess the institution’s impact on the Austin area through its interactions with the general public. Such interactions can be used to determine the views of fellow citizens toward the Civil War and its veterans at any given time.

Much of what is included in this survey has not appeared in any other histories of the region or state and paints a new picture of the many years that veterans spent in the home. It seeks to establish a solid foundation for future inquiries into both the Texas Confederate Home for Men and Texas Civil War veterans’ affairs in general. The variety of circumstances that led to the veterans being admitted to the facility will be assessed. Many volumes identify only an individual’s age as a criterion for his admittance. More often than not, factors other than this were the reason for a veteran’s need for assistance in this manner. In addition, the survey intends to establish the validity of allegations of misconduct in caring for the veterans, as well as outline the reasons for such accusations and actions, if they did indeed occur. Beyond providing a history of the institution, this thesis intends to shed light on the lives of institutionalized patients at the time and determine the ways that the state was successful in providing for the men, as well as the areas in which the state decidedly failed.
CHAPTER 2
THE FOUNDING OF THE HOME

In the years following the Civil War, Texas and its soldiers were left to pick up the pieces of the lives they had once led. Though no large battles had taken place on its soil, the state did not emerge from the war unscathed. Nevertheless, the Lone Star state fared much better than many of the other states of the former Confederacy. Without having to rebuild homes, shops and farms devastated by war, businesses were able to recover, and even flourish, much more quickly than one might have expected. In fact, two of the major supports of the Texas agricultural economy, livestock and cotton, survived the war with few setbacks. The economy continued to flourish after the war when the state government began to encourage further construction of railroad lines throughout the state.¹

As the state prospered economically, it also experienced a rapid increase in population in the years after the war. In 1860 the population of the state was 604,215, and it climbed to 1,591,749 twenty years later. Various private agencies in the state did their part to encourage immigration to the state, as the Constitution forbid the use of public monies to promote immigration to the state. Among the new residents were many men who had served in the Confederate Army from other southern states. When they returned to their homes after the surrender, some were met with devastated economies and few opportunities for financial prosperity. With its steady economy, Texas was a place for former Confederates to begin their

¹ Carl H. Moneyhon, *Texas After the Civil War: The Struggle of Reconstruction* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 9, 152.
lives again and thrive. Postwar settlers spread over the western and northwestern regions of the state in a steady influx over the next two decades. ²

Though the economy remained strong for the most part, some individual farmers were not as fortunate. With a burgeoning population, the Texas legislature sought to cash in on the immigration onslaught, implementing a tax plan in 1870 that levied increasing fees on landowners while land values rose as well. In addition to exorbitant taxes, farmers faced multiple years of poor weather conditions, which greatly affected crop production. Bad weather and the cotton worm created major losses in the cotton industry in 1866, 1867, 1868, and 1869. Even though production would recover in the mid-1870s, prices did not. A nationwide depression caused by the Panic of 1873 would keep prices to a minimum through the end of the decade. The downturn of the cotton industry in addition to the pressure of the new taxes caused many farmers to suffer, even to the point that some lost their lands to foreclosure. ³

To make a bad situation worse, especially for renters, the 14th Legislature passed the Landlord and Tenant Act in 1874. This statute gave landlords ultimate control over crops grown on their land and allowed for the seizure of a tenant’s personal items to settle a debt with the landowner. On the other hand, renters had few options if a landowner committed any grievances against them. Ultimately, these events spelled tough financial times for small farmers, many of them Confederate veterans. ⁴

---

² Moneyhon, Texas After the Civil War, 163; Barbara J. Rozek, Come to Texas: Enticing Immigrants, 1865-1915 (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2003), 119-120.
³ R. B. Rosenberg identifies farming as the occupation that the majority of the Texas Confederate Home residents took part in while they were able-bodied. R. B. Rosenberg, Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers’ Homes in the New South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 165; Moneyhon, Texas After the Civil War, 153, 158; Alwyn Barr, Reconstruction to Reform: Texas Politics, 1876-1906 (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1971), 38-39; John S. Spratt, The Road to Spindletop: Economic Change in Texas, 1875-1901 (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1955), 56.
⁴ Moneyhon, Texas After the Civil War, 203; Spratt, Road to Spindletop, 56.
Many Texas veterans were in dire straits by the 1880s. There had been no statewide medical care for wounded soldiers when they returned. In addition, the federal government refused to pay pensions or provide care for soldiers who had served in the Confederate Army.

The government of the Confederacy had attempted to provide for its wounded soldiers during its short tenure. In a bill introduced to the Confederate House of Representatives in December 1863, the establishment of an institution similar to what the Texas Confederate Home for Men would become was proposed. Confederate President Jefferson Davis vetoed the act in February 1864, not because he did not support the idea of a soldiers’ home, but due to some of the wording of the act that established the board of managers that would run the institution. He felt that the powers given to the board in the act were powers that the Confederate Congress did not have the authority to give. At the war’s conclusion, the southern states were left to provide what they could afford for their veterans, which was generally very little.  

Although Texas had promptly rewarded veterans of the Texas Revolution with land grants in 1837 and pensions in 1876, the state made no effort to provide relief for its Civil War veterans until 1881. This effort was hampered by the fact that the new state constitution, written in 1876, forbade public monies to be used to aid an individual except in the case of public calamity. In March 1881 a bill was introduced into the state senate that, if passed, would provide those who were permanently disabled due to Civil War wounds a land grant of 1,280 acres. The bill went through a multitude of changes, specifically the inclusion of Confederate widows to receive grants and the stipulation that a recipient must prove himself to be indigent in order to obtain the land. It was approved in April 1881, but the program would last less than two years. 

---

February 1883, with the state’s public land holdings growing ever smaller, a bill was passed to cancel the program. The program had granted over 2.6 million acres of land to the state’s Confederate soldiers, but the men needed more than just a parcel of land by this point. State pensions for the veterans would not be granted until 1899, well after the establishment of the Confederate Home for Men.6

The state’s initial reluctance to provide aid for its Confederate veterans created a vacuum that various veterans’ organizations and individuals sought to fill. Many of the men were aged, crippled by various ailments (including war wounds), and indigent. Unable to care for themselves financially or physically, some were lucky enough to be taken in by relatives, while others had no one willing or able to care for them. The spark that started the Confederate home movement has been attributed to Major Joseph H. Stewart, who obtained a copy of the constitution and by-laws of the Confederate home being established in Richmond, Virginia. Later becoming one of the original promoters of the State Fair of Texas, Stewart sought to duplicate that organization and its efforts in Texas, and he shared his ideas with local newspapers. Initially, it was reported that the home would be located somewhere in Austin, though it was not clear why Austin was chosen as the site. The reasons probably included proximity to the state bureaucracy and the city’s central location in the state.7

A series of articles in the Austin Daily Statesman in late 1884 showcased the earnestness with which Texans were trying to gain support for the Confederate home movement. One such piece called for the compassion of Texans across the state to support the cause of the Confederate home. It also stated that the home should be for Confederates of any state and not

---

7 Wilson, “Confederate Pension Systems,” 46; Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 32.
just from Texas. A series of meetings in the Austin area, planned by Stewart, a veteran himself, organized the effort. One conference on November 10 laid out the intentions of the group, including the establishment of the home and the creation of a fund to support widows of Confederate soldiers and the education of Confederate offspring. A resolution created a committee of eleven members charged with drafting a charter, constitution, and by-laws for the organization. The committee appointed Major Stewart to serve as chairman and decided that the home would be run by a group of former Confederates themselves because they would be better able to understand the residents. They did not discuss what would happen when all ex-Confederates were too old and feeble to perform such duties.⁸

The charter, constitution, and by-laws were adopted on December 2, 1884, by the organization’s members at an assembly that would also elect officers for the positions of commander and quartermaster among others. The group officially adopted as its name the John Bell Hood Camp, hoping to use the name of the great Civil War hero to inspire citizens all over the state to donate to the cause. The constitution outlined the aims of the group, which included perpetuating the “memories of our fallen comrades” and caring for those brothers who could no longer provide for themselves. The camp would eventually become a chapter of the United Confederate Veterans (UCV) organization, a fraternity of Confederate veterans founded in 1889 that sought to perform many of the same functions as the John Bell Hood Camp.⁹

After the formation of the Hood Camp, fundraising for the Confederate home began in earnest. Fortunately, the men from the camp were not the only organization to take up the cause of the Confederate home movement. They were joined by the United Daughters of the

---

⁸ Austin Daily Statesman, November 1, 6, 9, 11, 1884.
⁹ Austin Daily Statesman, December 3, 1884; Herman Hattaway, “Clio’s Southern Soldiers: The United Confederate Veterans and History,” Louisiana History 12 (Summer 1971): 214-215; John Bell Hood Camp Constitution and By-Laws, John Bell Hood Camp Collection, Haley Memorial Library and History Center, Midland, TX.
Confederacy (UDC), particularly the Albert Sidney Johnston chapter located in Austin. This group organized fundraising efforts for the home, including tours of the state to solicit donations and charity concerts. Though not organized on a state level at the onset of the Confederate home movement, the women who would later constitute the UDC organization, along with their UCV counterparts, spent much of 1885 on a well-publicized donation tour, brainstorming with their fellow womenfolk all over the state on ways their own communities could contribute to the Confederate home effort. The group would prove instrumental to the foundation of not only the Texas home, but others across the South as well.¹⁰

Tours for donations were highlighted in various state newspapers. One trip to Mexia in October 1885 resulted in the women in the town deciding to throw a supper-and-show charity event at their local opera house. The report of the stop called on anyone who was a “true Southerner” to support the endeavor. A stop in Calvert, a small town located between Waco and College Station, found the citizens there donating “liberally to the deserving cause in the way of cash donations.” During an outing in Dallas, Mrs. Lou Giles, a UDC activist, praised the generosity of the people, particularly the Union veterans she had encountered during her travels. She stated that she had failed to come across one who did not contribute to the efforts of the home movement. Giles’ appearance in Dallas led the local government to organize a committee that would canvass the city for further donations to the institution. A similar charity opera concert was scheduled to take place in the Dallas area as well. Dozens of additional stops across

the state took place for the benefit of the Confederate home. Other fundraising efforts included the pledging of a portion of the sales of a book on Robert E. Lee to the home movement.\textsuperscript{11}

Though most accounts note the general public’s acceptance and support of the home movement, this was not always the case. In an opinion piece that appeared in the \textit{Dallas Herald} in November 1885, a gentleman who referred to himself as the “Four Years’ Soldier” rejected the idea of Confederates receiving any type of aid and disparaged the individuals who had been put in charge of the fundraising for the effort. A rebuttal article appeared in the next day’s edition of the \textit{Dallas Morning News} singing the praises of the committee for their honorable nature and commendable actions. Earlier that year, Fort Worth citizens appeared to have been disinterested in assisting veterans, as scheduled speeches expounding on the positive aspects of the Confederate home project had to be postponed several times on account of low attendance numbers. Despite the disapproval of some, most Texans seemed to support the cause wholeheartedly.\textsuperscript{12}

By November 1885 the movement had raised approximately $1,600, and its leaders began their search for the perfect property to purchase to construct the home. At a gathering that month, the committee considered several tracts of land. The decision was originally scheduled to be made by the committee when they assembled on December 17, 1885. However, when the date arrived, no quorum could be reached, and the decision was postponed. Fundraising efforts continued while the committee persisted in their search for the perfect location for the home. In June 1886 the committee selected a plot of land on the banks of the Colorado River. Located at 1600 West Sixth Street in Austin, the property included sixteen acres and a two-story, seven-

\begin{footnotes}
\item[11] \textit{Dallas Morning News}, October 4, 16, 17, 30, November 1, 4, 1885; \textit{Austin Daily Statesman}, November 3, 1886.
\end{footnotes}
room residence with a price of approximately four thousand dollars. Three thousand dollars were paid in cash, and the remaining balance was placed on a note. Some reports suggest that the land was selected for its picturesque views of the nearby river. By November of that year, the facility admitted its first residents. In that same month, the staff experienced the first loss of a veteran with the passing of Sam Everett on November 10. A native of San Antonio, he had been a member of Company K in the famous Eighth Texas Cavalry. At the time of Everett’s passing, the home was able to accommodate twenty veterans, according to newspaper reports.\textsuperscript{13}

In order to provide needed equipment and cover daily operating expenses, the people of Austin decided to hold a gift concert in the city to solicit donations for the home with the chance to win a prize from the drawing of donated items from local vendors. Originally set to take place in October, the concert was postponed to December 27, 1886, due to low ticket sales. The drawing of prizes would commence the morning after the concert gala. Tickets to the occasion were sold throughout the state. A twenty-dollar donation to the effort even came in from then-President Grover Cleveland, along with a letter expressing his sympathies for the plight of the veterans. Ultimately, organizers hoped that enough money would be raised by the gift concert that they would be able to expand their facilities and care for more veterans at a time.\textsuperscript{14}

In the weeks prior to the concert and prize drawing, the organizers went out of their way to assure the public that the drawing would be as fair as possible, but they also cautioned individuals against thinking that everyone would win a prize. In early December 1886, it was reported that approximately 30,000 tickets had been sold to the event. Only about 2,000 prize items were collected for the drawing, ranging across the spectrum from baby dolls to full-size

\textsuperscript{13} Dallas Morning News, November 15, December 16, 18, 1885; April 25, November 11, 1886; San Antonio Daily Light, June 24, 1886, November 12, 1886; Fort Worth Daily Gazette, November 14, 1887; Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 32; Confederate Veteran Magazine 4 (May 1896): 156-157.

\textsuperscript{14} Fort Worth Daily Gazette, July 29, 1886; San Antonio Daily Light, September 13, October 21, 1886; Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 185; Dallas Morning News, October 6, 20, 1886.
wagons to $500 in gold. The drawing was to be conducted with two wheels of numbers symbolizing the ticket number and the item number. A blind girl would be assigned to each wheel, where they would select numbers simultaneously to indicate which ticket holder received which prize. This process would of course continue until all of the prizes had been given out. The management committee repeatedly reiterated their desire for a fair and honest drawing, even going as far as to say that anyone who thought otherwise would be better served not to purchase a ticket at all.\(^{15}\)

The concert was transformed into a two-night gala event at Millett’s Opera House in Austin, with recitations, songs, instrumental pieces, and dramatic scenes of the war on the first night. The second night would consist of a performance of the opera “Pirates of Penzance” by the Austin Musical union. Though the first night’s events were well-attended, they were not without their problems. Box seats were restricted to those visitors who had traveled to the concert from great distances, upsetting many who had hoped to get better seats for the festivities. Reports insinuate that scalpers were at work before the event. One man in particular made a handsome profit from this operation. The venue was standing room only and became so crowded that men had to be brought in to control the crowds. Accidents due to mass overcrowding were recounted, some of which resulted in injury. One woman was pressed roughly into a door jamb. Another lady’s dress was torn, and a child was bruised in the crush of people. Others were simply unable to obtain entry into the opera house at all. The management of the concert expressed regret for the mistakes made on some of the details of the concert, but it also demanded that some of the crowd take responsibility for their own actions as well. In a statement the morning after the concert, they referred to the “hoodlumism” of some audience members,

\(^{15}\) Fort Worth Daily Gazette, June 29, 1886; Dallas Morning News, October 20, 1886; Austin Daily Statesman, December 5, 1886.
alleging that they did not know how to conduct themselves in public no matter where they were. Despite the many problems that developed with the running of the concert, the performances were said to be superb.\textsuperscript{16}

The drawing for the multitude of prizes began at approximately 11 a.m. on the morning after the first concert. Conducted precisely as the management had previously stated, the process employed several blind girls from a local asylum to withdraw numbers. The large number of prizes forced the drawing to take place over the course of two days rather than be completed in a single gathering. The results of the drawing were published in the \textit{Austin Daily Statesman}, along with a description of each day’s proceedings. The process came to a close at 10 p.m. on the second night with every prize having been assigned to a winning ticket number.\textsuperscript{17}

Despite their best efforts, the committee was unable to please everyone. In response to the critics of the event, an editorial appeared in the \textit{Fort Worth Daily Gazette} which chastised those who spoke out against the concert. The piece stated that everyone who had purchased a ticket went into the drawing with the realization that they might fail to win any prize. Those who did not think so were only deceiving themselves. It also praised those who purchased tickets merely to support the cause, without a thought to what they might gain from the scheme. Although the article praised the success of the endeavor, it also suggested that the committee develop an alternate avenue of raising funds for the home rather than hosting another lottery. The gift concert raised approximately $10,000 for the Confederate home. Though this concert was a

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Austin Daily Statesman}, December 27, 28, 1886. Located on East Ninth Street in downtown Austin, Millett’s Opera House has been the setting for many historical events over the years. It served as the venue for the first commencement ceremonies for the University of Texas in 1884. Added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1978, it now serves as the headquarters for the Austin Club and is rented out for social events. The Austin Club, “The Austin Club: History: Millett Opera House,” http://www.austinclub.com/index.html (accessed May 3, 2011).

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Austin Daily Statesman}, December 29, 30, 31, 1886.
success, the same cannot be said for a subsequent concert that would lead to allegations of fraud and misdealing that would threaten the reputation of the Confederate home movement.\textsuperscript{18}

Despite the triumph of the Austin event, the committee decided shortly after it concluded that they would prefer not to hold any further concerts. Instead they would cultivate donations through other methods. Before this decision was made public, a Judge John A. Harrington had put together the foundations of a similar concert in Dallas. After an exhaustive correspondence exchange between Harrington and the committee, the members decided that he could use the Confederate home name and that they would accept the proceeds from the event. However, they made it clear to Harrington that the committee would have nothing to do with the organization of the event or the management of its funds. It is likely that they took this stance because the majority of the committee members were based in the Austin area and felt they could not properly manage such a large event from such a long distance.\textsuperscript{19}

Harrington, a former assistant postmaster, began to plan the concert in earnest and announced that the concert would be held on May 6 and 7, 1887. A major difference between the Dallas concert and the event in Austin was that the ticket prices for the Dallas affair were more expensive than those in Austin. The discrepancy was explained by the fact that ticket holders for the Dallas event would also be provided with tickets to the Louisiana State Lottery that was scheduled to take place in late May 1887. Donations to the cause included such items as a china set, lumber, and a buggy. The last item was donated by the Gainsford Carriage Company of Cincinnati with the permission of Ohio Governor Joseph B. Foraker. Though the governor clearly stated in a letter to Harrington that he did not support the Confederate cause, he respected

\textsuperscript{18} Fort Worth Daily Gazette, January 4, 1887; San Saba News, January 28, 1887.

\textsuperscript{19} Dallas Morning News, August 17, 1887.
men who fought for their beliefs and felt that they should be taken care of in their dwindling years.\textsuperscript{20}

In spite of Harrington’s lengthy planning, May 6 and 7 came and went without a concert. A week later, the date of the concert was rescheduled for June 1 and 2 with the explanation that agents around the state who were soliciting donations for the cause had requested more time to get the money and items to Dallas. The postponement did not dampen the spirits of the people looking to attend the event, and it was to be the musical event of the social season. Though plagued with warm temperatures due to the mass of people in the opera house, the concert part of the event was well received. The program consisted of a variety of plays and vocal performances that were applauded by the audience. Interestingly, the date and time for the lottery drawing was not mentioned in any press for the event, and Harrington did not go to any effort to assure the public that the drawing would be fair or honest in any way. No mention was made of the promised Louisiana State Lottery tickets either. By 1893, the Louisiana State Legislature banned lottery operations in the state amid similar allegations of bribery and corruption.\textsuperscript{21}

After the brief article on June 2, 1887, telling of the success of the concert, the event was not mentioned in the press again until almost two weeks later when people began to question the management of the drawing. Newspapers began pressing Harrington to present a report on the drawing, including the amount raised for the Confederate home. The judge spoke out in his own defense, stating that he was preparing such a report to be published shortly but was waiting to hear back from agents across the country before finalizing the numbers. He continued to defend himself by explaining that the state attorney general had called the Louisiana State Lottery tickets illegal, ending their inclusion in the ticket purchases. He contended that ticket prices were

\textsuperscript{20} It is unclear what judgeship Harrington ever held, if any. In all reports, he is referred to as Judge Harrington. \textit{Dallas Morning News}, April 24, December 1, 1887.

adjusted at that point and buyers were charged only one dollar for their vouchers from that time forward.\textsuperscript{22}

Harrington’s repeated excuses created a backlash toward the judge and anyone who was perceived to be involved with the event. Citizens who had made contributions to the effort began to doubt whether the money would ever reach the Confederate home. Editorials began to appear in local newspapers in which individuals expressed that they did not care about not winning a prize in the drawing but wanted to make certain that their money had reached those they had intended to help. In addition to these accusations, reports surfaced that Harrington had failed to pay many of the bills for the concert, including costs for the venue, advertising, and music. Some citizens wanted to know who had been awarded the buggy donated by the Ohio governor, one of the largest prizes in the drawing. The Confederate home proceeded to issue a statement to newspapers, making it clear that they had not yet received any monies from the Dallas concert or Judge Harrington, though they had already made plans to use the money from the concert to expand their current facilities. Those who had been named as associates of the judge in the lottery scheme released statements of their own to the press, distancing themselves from the scandal and placing all accusations of misdeeds firmly on the shoulders of Harrington. A report of which tickets had been awarded which prizes was finally published on June 26; nearly a month after the drawing had taken place.\textsuperscript{23}

The emerging report attempted to pull at the heartstrings of the public, with Harrington confessing that the concert effort had put him out financially and that he was only a simple war veteran covered in battle scars, though he failed to produce any service records that confirmed his story. Moreover, he declared that the concert had been a failure. Its expenses totaled over

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Fort Worth Daily Gazette}, June 17, 1887; \textit{Dallas Morning News}, June 18, 1887.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Dallas Morning News}, June 21, 23, 26, 1887; \textit{Fort Worth Daily Gazette}, June 22, 1887.
$3,000 but it had raised only $2,200. He vowed to pay any unpaid debts with his own funds as soon as he could. However, this did little to garner sympathy for his cause. Newspapers reported that Harrington had resigned his position as assistant postmaster to operate the Confederate home drawing, arousing suspicion that he had had less than honorable intentions all along. Some alleged that Judge Harrington had been the lucky winner of the Ohio buggy, further angering those who sought the truth in the matter.24

Though the scandal did not permanently damage the reputation of the home, it did cause people to pause before donating to the facility in the months following the incident. Opinion pieces appeared in local newspapers chastising the home for associating itself with such criminals as Harrington. The judge eventually served time in jail but not in connection with the Confederate home drawing. He was arrested for embezzling post office funds from his job as assistant postmaster. Though records indicate he spent time in jail prior to his trial due to his inability to secure a bonded release, they do not shed light on whether he was convicted or if he spent further time in jail. The much-coveted buggy was eventually awarded to a milkman named Hickman. Though the man made use of the vehicle for over a month, he felt compelled to return the buggy as it reminded him of too many unpleasant incidents. Officials with the Confederate home were later interviewed about the concert. They stated that gift concerts had been ruled against by the committee due to the objectionable nature some of their contributors had against lottery schemes and the fact that the agents who collected the donations cost almost thirty percent of the earnings to employ. They expressed their regrets over the incident, saying that it had been a mistake to agree to the event at all.25

24 Dallas Morning News, June 27, 28, 1887; Forth Worth Daily Gazette, June 27, 28, 1887.
25 Dallas Morning News, July 4, August 17, 1887; Fort Worth Daily Gazette, August 12, 1887.
Prior to the scandal that came out of the Dallas gift concert, the John Bell Hood Camp thought it proper to hold a dedication ceremony for the home, officially opening the facility to those who needed its services. On March 13, 1887, festivities were held at the home to celebrate the occasion. Both Texas Senator William H. Pope and Governor Lawrence “Sul” Ross had been invited to speak at the event but were unable to attend. Speeches were given by Texas Senators John M. Claiborne and William T. Armistead and other legislators. In his absence, the governor’s personal secretary, Henry M. Holmes, a Union veteran, gave a short speech. A large number of Confederate veterans, both well and sick, attended the ceremony, along with some members of the Grand Army of the Republic of Austin, a fraternity of Union veterans similar to the United Confederate Veterans.26

After the dedication of the home, its management would continue their movement to secure the future of a comfortable existence for their charges. As money would always be the primary concern of those who ran the facility, this remained their focus. Some felt that this problem would be satisfied with the establishment of state appropriations for the home to cover its general operating expenses. This became the goal of many involved in the movement, who believed that the state should take care of the men who had risked so much to defend it. A few short weeks following the dedication ceremony, they set forth to make this hope reality, though success in that department would be several years away.27

---

26 Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 32; Fort Worth Daily Gazette, March 14, 1887; Dallas Morning News, February 25, 1887.
27 Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 32.
Managers of the veterans’ home focused for several years on securing funding in order to admit the rising number of veterans who were unable to care for themselves. Although they frequently made calls for donations in Texas newspapers, they became aware that being able to sustain a facility properly on donations alone was unlikely. They realized very early that the institution had only a small chance of surviving without state appropriations. Within a week of the facility’s dedication, Senator Richard H. Harrison of Waco introduced a bill into the state legislature that would provide money from public land sales as an endowment for the home. Though fellow Confederate veterans occupied almost half of the seats in the state legislature at the time, Harrison’s bill quickly stalled in the legislature. Questions about its constitutionality became one of the bill’s biggest stumbling blocks. In the Texas Constitution of 1876, one article prohibited the state from providing monies to any “individual, association of individuals, municipal or other corporations whatever,” except in cases of “public calamity.” The legislators circumvented this statute with the Land Grant Program of 1881 because they were providing land grants and not money to the men.¹

Despite the failure to secure state funding in late 1887, the facility still had veterans to care for and they continued to do so. An oculist, or eye disease specialist, paid frequent visits to the home, performing operations on the residents at no charge. A number of local pharmacists and physicians also provided their services without requiring payment. Housing a total of

¹ R. B. Rosenberg, Living Monuments: Confederate Soldiers’ Homes in the New South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 32-33; Texas Constitution (1876), Art III, Sec. 51. Interestingly, Harrison also resigned from the Senate on April 20, 1887. Reasons for his departure are unclear, but could be considered a factor on the failure of his proposed bill on the home.
twenty-seven ex-Confederates in November 1887, the facility was under the direction of an executive committee. A matron who lived at the home and a cook became the only employees of the home to be paid a wage for their services at the time. The average cost to take care of a single veteran for one month was $7.78. Applications to enter the institution continued to arrive in numbers that were well beyond the capacity of the facility. This forced the management to purchase a tent to lodge the additional residents during the winter months. During a donation tour of the Northeast, one member of the committee gathered contributions from individuals in New York and Boston. Appeals for such gifts appeared in multiple newspapers, stating that the committee hoped to erect a building to accommodate 250 to 400 veterans. Some appeals played on the public’s Christmas spirit, materializing in publications just days before the holiday and referring to the facility as a “touching tribute” that Texas owed to its veterans.²

Although the legislature did not believe they could legally provide funding directly to the home, they still made an attempt to help fill its coffers. A new capitol building had been completed in early 1888, leaving the temporary capitol building that was used in the interim empty and unused. The legislature agreed in March 1889 to rent the building to the home for five dollars per year for ten years. The facility could then rent out the office space to businesses in order to generate income to care for its veterans. The Confederate Home served as a part of many candidates’ platforms in the 1890 senate race. Politicians like James S. Hogg frequently spoke out in support of the facility in their campaign speeches, hoping to win the veteran vote. Men from across the state formed The Texas Railroad and Traveling Men’s Aid Association to solicit donations around the state to aid the home. The men sought to collect contributions during their trips and give them to the association’s officers, who would then turn the monies over to the

² *Dallas Morning News*, November 17, December 14, 1887; August 21, 1889; *Fort Worth Daily Gazette*, November 14, 1887; *Sherman Daily Register*, December 15, 1887; *New York Times*, February 7, 1889.
state. They hoped to raise $50,000 from the kindness of the Texas people, but were careful to say that they hoped to receive funds from those who were able to afford to give and did not wish to impose on those who were in dire straits themselves. Unfortunately, the association did not last long, and it held its final meeting in May 1890. The limited records of the association do not indicate how successful they were at raising funds or why they disbanded the organization less than a year after it was formed.³

Attempts to raise funds to enlarge the home could not keep up with the growing numbers of veterans who sought refuge there. According to the census bureau, Texas served as the residence of approximately 15.5 percent (or 66,000) of all Confederate veterans in 1890. In June 1890 the management of the home reported that there were eighteen applications to the facility that were considered urgent, in addition to approximately one hundred other applicants. The institution, at capacity with forty residents, was unable to accommodate any additional veterans at the time. Overwhelmed by applicants, the managers felt it necessary to print a statement in papers statewide outlining the conditions that a veteran must meet before being admitted to the facility. The admission regulations required the potential resident to swear a statement in front of a county judge or clerk confirming that he was a Confederate veteran and possessed good character. Applicants then provided proof of their service, often war records or sworn statements by their comrades. Then the veterans underwent a physical examination, after which they were declared capable or incapable of providing a living for themselves. If veterans met all of these conditions, they became eligible to enter the home. At this point, the veteran signed an affidavit in which he agreed to abide by the rules of the facility or face expulsion. The home often experienced surges in applicants that coincided with the growing seasons. Veterans migrated to

³ *Dallas Morning News*, April 2, August 26, September 1, May 8, 1890; *Fort Worth Weekly Gazette*, August 17, 21, 1890.
the facility in numbers that were frequently lower from July through September, when the men were more likely to be able to obtain temporary employment.\textsuperscript{4}

As the struggle over the constitutionality of providing state funds to the home continued, supporters of the idea took to penning appeals to the public in newspapers to support only political candidates who favored the home. They argued that the facility could be maintained by state funds through a series of fees levied by several state departments, particularly those from the secretary of state. The governor’s race of 1890 resembled the senate campaigns, making the home a topic of debate at many campaign stops. Candidates frequently argued over whether state funding for the facility was constitutional. One association of Texas veterans, Hood’s Texas Brigade Association, pledged not to vote for any politician who did not support the facility’s bid for state funding. The promise seemed to help as candidate James S. Hogg led a campaign supporting the Confederate home and was rewarded with the governorship. He mentioned the facility in his inaugural speech, stating that it was a “noble cause” and that, when a state called on its men to fight, it accepted the obligation to care for them.\textsuperscript{5}

The long struggle for state funding bore fruit just two days after Hogg made his address. House Bill 242 proposed that, in return for $75,000 of the state’s money, the John Bell Hood Camp would transfer the facility to the state. The statute also required that the home would be placed under the direction of a board composed of five ex-Confederates, who would serve two-year terms and provide an annual report on the facility to the state each December 1. The transfer also ended the facility’s lease on the former capitol building, reverting control back to the state. Funds to maintain the home would be collected from rents on state-owned vacant lots in the city of Austin. A yearly salary of $1,500 was ordered to be paid to the home’s superintendent.

\textsuperscript{4} Rosenberg, \textit{Living Monuments}, 100, 162; \textit{Dallas Morning News}, June 4, September 7, 1890.
\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Dallas Morning News}, October 25, 29, 1890; Harold B. Simpson, \textit{Hood’s Texas Brigade in Reunion and Memory} (Hillsboro, TX: Hill Junior College Press, 1974), 109; Rosenberg, \textit{Living Monuments}, 33-34.
Conditions for entry into the home were also outlined. Though they remained largely unchanged, the rules now required that the veteran be a resident of the state as of January 1, 1891. Finally, the institution’s name was changed to the Texas Confederate Home, as it had just been referred to as the “ex-Confederate home” previously. In early February 1891, the bill passed with a combined vote of 101-16. The few holdouts explained that their misgivings focused on the constitutionality of the endeavor. On March 6 Governor Hogg signed it into law. The deed transfer, dated March 21 of that year, defined the boundaries of the property and specified that the current staff would keep their jobs, including Superintendent Charles D. Barnett, a veteran of the 8th Texas Cavalry known as Terry’s Texas Rangers. The bill also set maximum expenditures at $100,000 in a single year. By this time, the Confederate home property consisted of five buildings (nearly all of which were wood frame cottages) and a barn.6

The Board of Managers, consisting of local newspaper editor Frank T. Roche, Confederate Brigadier General Henry E. Shelley, Isaac Stein, a member of the 4th Texas Infantry with Hood’s Texas Brigade, Confederate veteran Lee Shackleford from Alabama and Reverend W. B. Walker, released their first annual report in January 1892. The men defined many of the rules of the home in the account and explained why such guidelines were necessary for the smooth management of the facility. These rules were essential for “proper discipline and happiness” of the residents, often called inmates in such reports. The objective of the home was not to take care of the state’s drunkards or insubordinates, and the board promised to remove those men who were found guilty of repeated offenses.7

---

6 Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 34, 134; Dallas Morning News, May 29, 1891; Texas Confederate Home for Men, Deed Transfer, Texas Secretary of State Statutory Documents Collection, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX.
In the few months that the state had been in control of the facility, it had expanded greatly, with the addition of four brick cottages, each containing three rooms. Ten acres adjacent to the original property were also purchased in order to expand the capacity of the institution. Though a cemetery for the deceased Confederates had been established on the grounds, the state set aside a portion of the State Cemetery for the veterans of the home, and those who had been buried in the facility’s graveyard were reinterred in the new plot. The board also reported that the remaining residents, approximately ninety-one in number, were well taken care of and happy, though they pointed out that the board was also charged with protecting the interests of the state and thus did not provide extravagant accommodations. The average cost to care for a veteran for a month was estimated to be $14.35, almost double what it had been in 1887.8

Much of the first report outlined the rules and regulations to be followed by the residents, the members of the staff, and the Board of Managers. A set of nearly thirty regulations controlled various aspects of the veterans’ daily lives in the facility. From forbidding the use of profanity to requiring each resident to take a full bath at least once a week, the management expected the men to maintain a “gentlemanly and orderly manner” at all times. The regulations placed restrictions on what areas of the home the men were allowed to enter and what time meals were to be taken. Those physically able were required to perform tasks around the home, usually sweeping and cleaning duties. At each veteran’s admission, policy required the superintendent to both read the rules and provide a written copy. The local chapter of the UDC aided in the creation of the standards that the men would live by while in the home. They based the strict code of conduct on their ideal of Texas society and their beliefs on how a proper Confederate soldier should act. Their beliefs differed greatly from the reality of the men they were dealing with and their strict rules led to increasing tensions between the heritage organization and the aging men at the home.

---

8 Annual Report, December 1891.
The sometimes stringent limits placed on the veterans also caused some to look to alternatives for assistance in their dwindling years. Despite the tension between the two groups, the UDC continued in their efforts to assist the institution in ways beyond simply raising funds.\(^9\)

Despite the restrictions placed on them, the veterans were certainly not prisoners in the home or repressed in any way. The large and open facility allowed the men to leave the grounds during the day or apply for furlough or discharge to remove themselves from the home as they wished. While maintaining involvement in politics and daily happenings, the residents served as frequent contributors to publications such as the *Confederate Veteran Magazine*. One such contribution came from Irish Confederate veteran Mike Carr, who disagreed with a previously published article on the battle of Sabine Pass and wrote in to clear up the inaccuracies since he claimed to have firsthand knowledge of the events of the day. Carr would later die at the Confederate home. Those who fought in Hood’s Texas Brigade also took part in events with the group’s veteran association and often attended reunions held in the area.\(^10\)

The home experienced a sharp increase in the number of residents with 200 men in the facility by January 1893. Reports made by Superintendent Barnett placed the institution’s expenditures for 1892 at just over $57,000, including salaries and building improvements. The latter included a new store room, new stables and carriage house, an underground cistern, and a three-story brick administration building that would become the symbol of the home for years to come. The statement outlined the proposed appropriations for the home for 1893 and 1894. Barnett suggested that a yardman, a laundress, and three waiters for the dining room be added to the staff at the home. In his report to the governor, the superintendent stressed the need for a


\(^10\) *Confederate Veteran Magazine* 1 (July 1893): 196; Simpson, *Hood’s Texas Brigade in Reunion and Memory*, 110-111.
separate hospital building on the property in order to segregate the ill from the general population. In addition, he suggested further improvements to the property, such as the moving of a barn to make way for more resident cottages and creating a better driveway to accommodate travel throughout the property. The cost per month to accommodate each veteran was then estimated to be $15.50.\textsuperscript{11}

According to the Board of Managers, trouble sometimes invaded the home when disobedient men were admitted. Some residents were nursed back to health, but refused a discharge from the facility because they did not wish to make a living on their own. In January 1895 the board called for changes in their powers, including the ability to re-examine residents every three months to determine if they still were eligible to remain in the home. They also requested the authority to investigate in cases of fraudulent entry into the facility. They sought to replace all oil lamps with electric lights for safety purposes, but the decision to ignore this request would prove costly to the home later.\textsuperscript{12}

In spite of the general success of the Texas Confederate home, some legislators continued to argue over its constitutionality. The politicians finally put the issue to rest with an amendment to the state constitution that allowed the state to levy a special tax to support the home, as well as other veterans, their wives, and widows. Adopted in April 1895, the measure was passed by a vote of 109-2. When considering the bill, five members of the legislature paid a visit to the home. At the conclusion of the visit, the men agreed with the Board of Managers that they needed to possess the discretion to rid the home of any residents who were ineligible. An article

\textsuperscript{11} Annual Report, January 1893.
\textsuperscript{12} Annual Report, January 1895.
in the *Confederate Veteran Magazine* at the same time placed the projected property value of the home at over $60,000.\(^\text{13}\)

Dissension between legislators and the Board of Managers over the way that appropriations were being spent prompted the Board to itemize expenditures down to the nearest dollar in 1895. Every section of the allotted funds was documented and included information on what items were purchased and the names of the employees on salary. Even the $28.40 spent on apples was noted in the document. In addition, the work included a listing of information on (presumably) every veteran who had ever resided in the home since the time of its inception. Those still living in the facility at the time of the report were recorded and their particular disabilities, if any, logged. Rheumatism and paralysis made up the overwhelming majority of disabilities suffered by the institution’s residents.\(^\text{14}\)

Despite the state having taken control of the home, the UDC continued to show their support in a variety of ways. Their fundraising efforts continued to help cover improvement expenses. The group’s leaders referred to the home as “sacred” and stated openly that each chapter in the state should work to assist the facility. In 1896 a number of chapters made assisting the institution a goal of their group. The women also made an effort to visit the veterans and sometimes provided dinners at Thanksgiving and presents at Christmas to bring joy to the lives of the men.\(^\text{15}\)

By the mid-1890s, a growing number of residents were slowly becoming senile. Confederate Brigadier General William P. Hardeman, the new superintendent and an original founder of Texas A&M University, sought some settlement of the issue. He proposed that either


\(^{14}\) Annual Report, December 1895.

\(^{15}\) *Confederate Veteran Magazine* 4 (July 1896): 202-203; Stott, “Lost Cause to Female Empowerment,” 34.
a special ward be constructed for these men where they could be properly taken care of, or that they be transferred to one of the state’s asylums, which were experienced in handling such residents. The facility’s surgeon, on the other hand, applauded the sanitary conditions of the home, stating that fewer than thirty men had died in the preceding year. Only one of those deaths could be traced to an acute disease, and none was linked to a preventable cause.\(^{16}\)

As the veterans aged, more and more continued to pour into the home. However, entry into the facility was not always granted. With the stringent admission rules, management was sometimes forced to deny needy men a bed due to problems with their applications. One frequent challenge for veterans was proving their service in the Confederate army. After the war, many Confederate records had been lost or destroyed, including those that documented the service of untold numbers of soldiers throughout the South. Unable to provide official service records, the veterans had to provide sworn statements from two comrades who were willing to go on record to confirm that the applicant had actually served the Confederacy. The men often resorted to placing ads in local, state, and national publications, hoping to locate comrades who were willing and able to vouch for their service.\(^{17}\)

In the summer of 1897, residents accused Superintendent Hardeman of misappropriation of facility funds and general inability to perform his duties. Overcrowding and poor conditions in the home were held up as examples of his ineptitude. However, reporters praised Hardeman for his work in the facility and deflected blame for the institution’s shortcomings to the state for not providing adequate funds to renovate and expand the home. One article stated that the

\(^{16}\) Annual Report, December 1896.
\(^{17}\) Dallas Morning News, March 26, 1897.
superintendent had suffered a great injustice, as had the facility. Up to $40,000 in appropriations had been requested, but the legislature had approved only $28,000.\textsuperscript{18}

In spite of those who supported Hardeman, a special committee was convened by the legislature to investigate the allegations. The subsequent reports declared that many of the residents expressed dissatisfaction with the way the home was being run and that they lacked confidence in the management of the facility. The committee blamed Hardeman’s age and own physical limitations as reasons for the home’s condition. Food was plentiful but poorly prepared and generally disliked by the institution’s residents. Living quarters were unclean and the hospital area unsanitary. The committee recommended in the conclusion of the report that Hardeman be relieved of his duties immediately and that a suitable housekeeper should be hired to keep the rooms in order. Hardeman and the board released a statement to local newspapers defending their management of the home. They placed the blame mostly on the investigating committee, stating that committee members had “greatly exaggerated” the home’s problems. They also faulted the government for failing to provide enough funds to repair the physical imperfections in the facility and implied that the committee had insufficient time to gain correct knowledge because they spent little time in the home and only talked to a few unsatisfied residents.\textsuperscript{19}

Despite the problems the committee found with the facility, Hardeman did not lose his position as superintendent and filed his annual report on the home with the Board of Managers that December. He highlighted the improvements he had overseen in the past year, which included a new kitchen and the enlargement of the main dining room. No mention was made of the problems that he had experienced, but he made a point to thank the board for their “kindness,

\textsuperscript{18} Dallas Morning News, August 22, November 12, 1897.
\textsuperscript{19} Texas State Legislature, Journal of the House of Representatives, 25\textsuperscript{th} Legislature, 1\textsuperscript{st} Session, (March 23, 1897); Houston Daily Post, April 14, 1897.
co-operation and careful and patient attention.” Hardeman died in 1898 of Bright’s disease and was buried at the Texas State Cemetery.\(^{20}\)

As state pension programs for veterans became common throughout the South, Texans began to debate whether such measures should be taken in their state as well. Some even contemplated closing the home in order to provide pensions to the veterans. Supporters argued that the pension system would save the state money and the property could be used to extend the capacities of other institutions. Additional debates called for the existing home to be demolished and a new one constructed, labor for which would be furnished by convicts. This created an outcry among many in the state who did not wish to have their cherished veterans being associated with convicts. The legislature eventually approved a pension system that began in 1899 without severely altering the home in any way.\(^{21}\)

Though the home appeared to flourish as it became better funded and supported by the state, things did not always run smoothly within its brick walls. On September 30, 1898, the Board of Managers discharged a resident, Alonzo T. Logan, due to misbehavior. A former sergeant in the famous Terry’s Texas Rangers, Logan sought an injunction against the board to allow him to stay in the facility. This was the first time that the board’s decision had been challenged in the courts, and it had the potential for long-lasting effects on the power of the board. In the court proceedings, the nature of Logan’s misbehavior was revealed to include the propositioning of a twelve-year-old girl. Surprisingly, Logan did not deny making the proposition, but only that it did not happen on the grounds of the home, and should not be used against him to discharge him from the facility. Judge F. G. Morris of the fifty-third judicial district ruled that the board had the discretion to make such decisions about their residents.

\(^{20}\) Annual Report, December 1897.

However, he also concluded that the board could not discharge a resident based on behavior conducted outside of the facility. Logan was allowed to re-enter the home, despite the misgivings and objections of the board.\textsuperscript{22}

Although the case was not mentioned by name in the home’s records, Henry E. Shelley, the superintendent of the home and former president of the Board of Managers for the facility, implored the legislature to make changes to prevent a similar situation from occurring. A Confederate Veteran himself, he called for amendments that would allow the board to discharge those individuals who were repeatedly intoxicated. Shelley based his argument on the belief that any drunk would be able to provide a livelihood for himself if he were to remain sober. Restrictions on behavior both inside and outside were proposed in order to rid the facility of the class of people who might commit disgraceful or outrageous behavior such as Logan’s. Shelley, who had been instrumental in the state’s takeover of the home, served as superintendent of the home for nine months before he died.\textsuperscript{23}

Given the numerous complaints about the home, the legislature made a point to call for investigations into its condition frequently. One such investigation in May 1899 found that the new Superintendent that year, Rufus Y. King, a Confederate veteran with Terry’s Texas Rangers, seemed to be doing his job well. The investigative committee found no wrong in the institution and the way it was being run. They noted that the only complaints from the veterans were that they missed their families, something the home could hardly be held responsible for.\textsuperscript{24}

Of course, not every veteran enjoyed his time at the home. One, George Gautier, referred to the facility as “hell’s half acre” in his autobiography. He stated that it was far from the place

\textsuperscript{22} Dallas Morning News, October 12, November 3, 1898.
\textsuperscript{23} Annual report, December 1898.
\textsuperscript{24} Texas State Legislature, \textit{Journal of the House of Representatives}, 26\textsuperscript{th} Legislature, 1\textsuperscript{st} Session, (May 23, 1899.)
of peace that the public perceived it to be. According to the residents, it was overcrowded and virtually lawless. They speculated that it would get worse without a change in management of the home. Gautier seemed to contribute to the unruly nature of the facility, as, by his own words, he engaged in physical altercations with at least two other residents of the home. While these scuffles were relatively minor and the engaging parties emerged with only scrapes and bruised egos, similar quarrels did not always end as quietly.\textsuperscript{25}

Tragedy struck the home in September 1900 when an apparently long-smoldering grudge between two men reached its flash point. John W. Singleton and J. G. Mills, both very old men, argued (for reasons unclear) in the afternoon of September 17. At some point during the argument, Mills pulled out a pistol and shot Singleton three times at close range. The victim died almost instantly. No records exist as to why Mills was at the facility, as he is not listed on any available Confederate home rosters. After a fourteen-hour deliberation, the jury in Mills’ trial convicted him of murder in district court and sentenced him to serve a two-year sentence in the state penitentiary.\textsuperscript{26}

For the superintendent and board of managers, resident conduct continued to be a constant source of trouble within the home. The 1900 report did not mention the Singleton murder except to note that he was killed by three shots. Mills’ name is not in the report at all. While it is unlikely that incidents such as these escaped the ears of legislative members, the decision to omit the incident from the report made political sense. Despite the board’s desire to

\textsuperscript{25} George R. Gautier, \textit{Harder than Death: the Life of George R. Gautier, an old Texan, Living at the Confederate Home, Austin, Texas} (Austin: self-published, 1902), microform, p. 53, MicF 412 TX:18, University of North Texas, Denton, TX.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Dallas Morning News}, September 18, November 3, 1900; \textit{Houston Daily Post}, November 3, 1900.
paint the home in the best light, they did include a surgeon’s report that documented fourteen residents who suffered from drug dependencies.\textsuperscript{27}

Death always held an important position in many of the reports involving the Confederate home. Prior to 1900, the average number of years the men spent at the home was slightly over five years, about average when compared to similar facilities. The home also had the lowest percentage among the various Confederate homes of men who lasted a year or less in the institution, which stood as a testament to the work of the superintendent and medical staff. Although the percentage of short tenures went up slightly in the years between 1901 and 1911, the overall average length of tenure also increased. This change can be explained by the increasing number of residents in the home, as well as the wide range in ages of the incoming veterans. Records indicate that the facility served some men as young as forty-five, and that the oldest resident at the time was approximately ninety years old.\textsuperscript{28}

As the years passed, the resident population continued to grow. At the turn of the century, the legislature appropriated $15,000 to construct a new on-site hospital building, something long hoped for by those connected to the facility. The structure was completed and occupied in July 1900. King estimated that he would have a hundred new applicants within six months, men he would not be able to accommodate without additional buildings. He asked the legislature for $5,000 to construct such dwellings. The Superintendent adamantly defended this request, stating that he would not ask for funds for projects that he did not honestly believe to be necessary for the “care and comfort of these old soldiers,” now numbering nearly three hundred.\textsuperscript{29}

When admission to the home soared after the completion of the new hospital building, money became a source of problems once again. An emergency appropriation for the home had

\textsuperscript{27} Annual report, November 1900.  
\textsuperscript{28} Rosenberg, \textit{Living Monuments}, 165, 168.  
\textsuperscript{29} Annual report, November 1900.
to be ordered by the legislature in April 1901 for just over $22,000. The situation became more complicated when it was revealed that there was no money to pay board members to attend quarterly meetings and regular visits to the home. Funds for board members were soon forthcoming. After these appropriations, the Texas home became the highest funded of all Confederate homes and would remain so for most of its existence.\(^{30}\)

Despite the board’s constant attempt to police the actions of the home’s residents, they could not control events that had taken place prior to the veterans’ arrivals at the facility. In May 1902 George G. Gardenhire, a resident of the home, was arrested for a murder he had allegedly committed forty-one years previously in Collin County, Texas. The seventy-two year old had been accused and arrested in the murder of Sam Houston Hall near McKinney at the time of the incident. He managed to escape from custody at the time and had been at large ever since. Gardenhire was transferred to McKinney to stand trial for the murder. The court eventually dropped the charges against him and he was allowed to return to the Confederate Home, where he died in 1925.\(^{31}\)

The superintendent and the board continued to experience problems with unruly residents. In 1904 Charles H. Lyster was attempting to serve as a peacemaker between two arguing comrades when one of the men grabbed a chair and beat Lyster over the head with it. After the attack, the assailant, John Ratley, attempted to escape but was found in the streets of Austin and placed under arrest. Lyster succumbed to his injuries later that same night. While awaiting trial, Ratley suffered a heart attack and was expected to die within days. Despite the

---
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odds, he survived the heart attack. Acquitted of all charges in 1905, Ratley returned to his life at the home shortly after.  

Resident misconduct also led to a court battle between the board and an insubordinate veteran in which the authority of the board would be called into question once again. The veteran John T. Bowden reportedly criticized the establishment continuously in a supposed calculated effort to incite insubordination. Already warned that similar actions would result in his dishonorable discharge from the facility, he continued his agitation. The superintendent, Confederate veteran James Q. Chenoweth, placed Bowden under arrest in 1904 and confined him to the grounds of the home, where he was brought in front of the board. The board decided to dishonorably discharge Bowden from the facility, whereupon he filed an injunction to prevent his dismissal.  

In the suit, Bowden alleged that his imprisonment had been illegal and unjust. He argued that he had not committed the acts that he was accused of and had always obeyed the rules of the institution. The state attorney general became involved in the case when he filed a motion to dissolve Bowden’s injunction, which would allow the board to dismiss the veteran permanently. Although the injunction was dissolved, the district court also ruled that Bowden could not be removed from the home unless he was taken to trial and convicted for the alleged rule violations. Due to the call for a trial, the case was set to continue when the courts resumed session in January 1905. In the meantime, Bowden was ordered to remove himself from the home until the case could be decided. He would not be gone from the facility for long because Judge Norman G. Kittrell of Houston granted Bowden a new injunction that allowed him to return to the home in time for Christmas. This decision came after the district courts in Austin failed to grant

32 *Dallas Morning News*, September 8, 1904.  
33 *Dallas Morning News*, November 5, 1904.
Bowden his desired injunction. The men were provided with a Christmas feast prepared by the
UDC, but it is unclear whether Bowden was allowed to join them. In May 1905 the two parties
settled the case with Bowden agreeing to apologize to the home’s management in exchange for
his full reinstatement to the facility.\textsuperscript{34}

Since the new hospital building had been completed, the number of residents had grown
by at least fifty men. By late 1904 an average of 350 veterans made their home at the facility.
Despite the large numbers, the death rate (5.5 percent) was “exceedingly low” when compared to
previous years and similar facilities.\textsuperscript{35}

In addition to regular inspections by special committees of the state legislature, members
of the UDC and UCV often visited the home to examine the home’s conditions for themselves.
Hood’s Texas Brigade Association members also visited their comrades when in town for
veteran reunions. Based on their observations, they often lobbied the legislature in support of the
facility. The organizations frequently donated much needed items to the home, including walking
canes, chairs, and books. They made frequent visits during the holidays and hosted special
dinners for the residents. One surprise inspection conducted by the UDC found the home to be in
exceptional order with only a few minor complaints. A library and a club room had been opened
in the administration building and stocked with volumes of “well-selected literature.” The few
complaints that were voiced were minor in nature, and the inspector stated that the particular
complainants were likely to be dissatisfied no matter what situation they encountered.\textsuperscript{36}

A later state inspection in May 1905 also concluded that the home was well managed, but
it also found that the facility had several problems that needed to be addressed by the state. The
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\textsuperscript{35} Annual report, August 1904.
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way that discharges were being handled was a particular source of concern. The House resolved that a committee be appointed to handle such incidents. The committee was given the authority to speak to witnesses and render verdicts that were final. The legislators also recommended that the rule requiring the superintendent to be a veteran be repealed so that the position could be filled by an individual with the “greatest executive and administrative ability.” The state was beginning to recognize that even the youngest of the veterans would soon need care and that shortly there would be none left capable of filling the demanding position.\(^\text{37}\)

The home became a source of controversy in the public sector once more in 1906 when debate emerged over the legality of providing rides to polling places for veterans who might not be able to vote otherwise. State law strictly prohibited the practice, but others thought that the physical condition of the voters should be taken into account. The movement of veterans was also scrutinized when they asked for free passage on railroads in the state. Although the local Austin Street Railway had provided their services free of charge in years past, the state assistant attorney general declared that veterans were not entitled to such special treatment in 1907. The issue would later be resolved with a new law stating that such offerings were legal and that nothing in any other state laws prohibited the veterans from receiving the service.\(^\text{38}\)

Overcrowding in the home reoccurred in 1907. More than one hundred applicants who had been approved for admission to the home were awaiting rooms to be made available to them. In an effort to combat the problem, the superintendent proposed to construct a tent complex to accommodate the majority of the waiting men. Governor Thomas Campbell vetoed the plan, disapproving of the men being exposed to the elements in the winter months. When it was argued that the men had spent four years in tents during the war, the governor responded that the

\(^{37}\) Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 29\(^{th}\) Legislature, 1\(^{st}\) Session, (April 3, 1905, May 13, 1905.)

\(^{38}\) *Dallas Morning News*, July 26, 1906; September 10, 1907; July 16, 1908.
men they were caring for were not the same men they were during the war and would not be able to handle the conditions. The superintendent promised that he would attempt to make room for sixty of the men.\textsuperscript{39}

In 1908 the focus of the UDC shifted to the formation of a similar home for the wives and widows of Confederate veterans. Despite their efforts with this new endeavor, they continued to care for the men as well. The women’s home, situated in north Austin, would come to house many of the wives of the men residing in the Confederate home. Formally opened in 1908, the facility was purchased by the state in 1911.\textsuperscript{40}

By 1910, due to physical improvements, the waiting list for the home had been cleared, and the facility was capable of handling even more residents. The annual report that year praised this development and highlighted the improvements made recently, including the screening in of many of the rooms, the landscaping of much of the grounds, and a reduction in the number of pests and vermin that had been prevalent in the home for some time.\textsuperscript{41}

In the years since the home’s founding, it had served hundreds of needy veterans in their waning years. It also became a lightning rod for debate across the state on a number of issues. With the fiftieth anniversary of the war’s end fast approaching, the home would experience changes in almost every aspect of its management. Meanwhile, the number of veterans statewide began to dwindle at an unprecedented rate.

\textsuperscript{39} Dallas Morning News, September 11, 1907.
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Although the Confederate Home had cleared its long wait list, the facility remained crowded with almost four hundred residents by 1911. In addition to the cramped conditions, some of the men suffered with a variety of illnesses while at the home. Occasionally the veterans traveled to be with their families and the homesteads they had worked the majority of their adult lives to build. Though most of them made the best of their situations, some were not able to cope as well and took matters into their own hands.¹

A. H. Mason, a sixty-five-year-old resident, committed suicide while in the home. The management reported that he had been ill for years, though what type of ailment he had was not disclosed. At around noon one day in 1911, Mason retired to his room at the facility and shot himself in the head with a borrowed firearm. Prior to doing this, he wrote a note to the superintendent instructing that his body not be carried to the chapel, but instead straight to his grave. The note also asked the management to return the gun to its rightful owner and to dispose of Mason’s belongings.²

In an effort to prevent such events, legislators suggested hiring people to entertain the residents and keep their spirits up. The politicians specifically requested individuals to read to and write for blind veterans since they were the men most cut off from the world. They also proposed funding to provide a band and weekly concerts for the general population of veterans. The home implored the legislature to provide $300 a year to supply these services to the men. At Christmas in 1911, the festivities held at the home lifted the spirits of many of the men. The

¹ Texas State Legislature, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, 32nd Legislature, 1st Session, (March 11, 1911).
² *Dallas Morning News*, March 18, 1911.
UDC provided egg nog to the men in the morning, and then held their annual holiday feast later in the day. Superintendent Richard M. Wynne, who took charge of the home in 1909, stated that the men enjoyed the meal greatly and were as merry as a bunch of schoolboys.³

Additional tools employed to bring contentment to the residents at the home included sitting areas around the property so that the men could enjoy the outside world as much as they were physically able. The UDC supplied the home’s porches and pavilions with rocking chairs and tables so that the residents could engage in playing games like dominos and checkers. The staff credited these diversions with building a sense of camaraderie among the men, though they stated that the games sometimes created tension with the residents if there was a disagreement with the rules or outcome. In addition, the property’s chapel held regular religious services.⁴

Free railroad transportation was provided to the men from virtually every rail company in the state. This service covered the entire state and extended out of state when the men needed to travel to veteran reunions and other special occasions. One company, the International and Great Northern Railroad, sent a private car for veterans to travel in, in addition to providing the transportation free of charge. Those companies that did not offer the service, the Katy and the Frisco, were ridiculed by the public for their perceived indifference to the plight of the Confederate veterans.⁵

A newspaper the men began in early 1912 served as another source of creative freedom. Titled the Confederate Home News, the weekly publication covered the general news connected to the facility, including stories on the UDC, UCV, and the Confederate Woman’s Home. The periodical also featured death notices of comrades. The newspaper struggled financially,

---
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soliciting donations in each edition to continue the paper’s production. Few copies of the
newspaper remain in existence, making the task of determining the publication’s tenure quite
difficult. The men’s affections towards the newspaper were undeniable, however, as they came
to refer to it as “our paper.”

Meanwhile, the Board of Managers maintained close control of the home. In May 1912
an unnamed resident, suspended from the facility for a period of one year for bad behavior, filed
a court case against the board, hoping to receive an injunction that would allow him to remain in
the home. The state assistant attorney general contended that the courts had no jurisdiction in the
matter and that the board had exclusive authority to make such rulings in their facility. The
twenty-sixth district court agreed, giving the board the authority they needed to enforce the
home’s regulations.

The board could not control all events, however, as evidenced by another incident in the
facility just six months after the ruling. The tragedy was the result of a long simmering feud
between residents Joseph Welch, eighty years old, and Moses B. Tyler, seventy, that flared up
after Welch reportedly pushed Tyler off the steps of one of the facility’s buildings. Months later,
the two men ran into each other in the laundry room while picking up their clothing for the week.
Witnesses stated that words were not exchanged between the men and that Tyler simply shot
Welch twice with a small-caliber pistol without warning. Medical staff removed Welch to the
facility hospital, where he died shortly after, and Tyler was subsequently arrested and transferred
to the city jail. Within weeks of the event, the state decided that Tyler was insane and ordered
him to be incarcerated at the state “lunatic asylum,” where he died in 1914.

---
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The year 1913 was a low point for the home. The legislature conducted its customary investigation of the facility in February of that year. Inspectors found discipline in the home to be lacking and alcoholism prevalent among the residents. The committee reported the sanitary conditions of the facility to be “most deplorable” with dirt visible on every surface. They suggested that if the problem was not remedied shortly by management, the administrators should be replaced. In July the superintendent of the home, Major Richard Lyles, who had taken over in 1912 when Wynne died, tendered his resignation from the position effective immediately. His reasons for doing so remained uncertain since he left Austin immediately after resigning without explaining his actions. According to journals of the state legislature, disagreements between Lyles and the home’s residents led to his departure, especially Lyles’s strict enforcement of the rules. In all likelihood, this turmoil originated from a dispute between one of the residents, Samuel F. Green, and Lyles. Green was discharged from the facility in December 1912 by the superintendent for insubordination. The veteran brought suit against the home and Lyles and asked for $5,600 in damages. The courts later dismissed the suit, and the veteran was allowed to return to the home in May 1913. Just days later, an unnamed home resident caned Lyles on the steps of the Travis County Court House. The culprit was probably Green, and this altercation was followed by Lyles’s resignation shortly afterward. Captain Ben McCulloch also resigned his position as storekeeper and accountant for the home in August, and Captain W. O. Harris, a member of the board of managers, joined them in resigning as well. The board later appointed Dr. A. C. Oliver to replace Lyles as superintendent.9

Furloughs of the home’s residents became a source of debate for the legislature in 1913 as well. Although a state pension had been implemented in 1899 for Confederate veterans, legislation prohibited those who resided in the home from receiving such aid. Some in the state began to raise the point that the home residents should be entitled to pensions during their furloughs to visit family members. These furloughs lasted anywhere from a few days to a few months, depending on how far the relative lived from the home. Legislators suggested pensions as a way to help offset the extra cost. This raised a problem with the veterans, who wondered if the short-term pension would affect their ability to return to the home at will. After some investigation by a legislative committee, they determined that the men would receive funds, but not from the general pension fund. Their pensions would originate from the maintenance fund for the home since the home would not be using the funds to take care of the men while they were on furlough. However, legislators required the furlough to be at least three months long for the men to receive financial assistance. They also recommended that these privileges be extended to the residents at the women’s home as well.10

Fire was always a concern at the home. Early in 1914 one of the hospital’s boilers cracked and nearly started a fire that could have destroyed the building and likely killed many of the invalids who resided there. After this tragedy was averted, the Board conducted an inspection of the grounds and found the results to be unnerving. The review found the hospital’s fire protection in particular to be completely inadequate to prevent even the smallest of fires. Improvements began immediately with the extension of water mains and installation of fire plugs, extra hoses, and reels. Unfortunately, the improvements proved insufficient; a subsequent inspection found that the property lacked independent fire protection and was located too far

away from fire hydrants for the hoses to connect to them in an emergency. The wooden shingle roofs on most of the buildings also posed a problem and led the inspector to comment that one fire could probably destroy 75 percent of the institution. Such fears intensified in 1916 when a fire broke out at the home in the early morning hours of November 22. Though no veterans were hurt during the small fire, it did create a lot of excitement in the facility and caused some damage to the property.\textsuperscript{11}

Though more than one hundred residents died in the home during 1913 and 1914, the home’s surgeon T. F. Moore remained undeterred by the development and reported that the general health of the remaining men was “as good as can be expected considering their age” and ailments. He pointed out that part of the admission requirements was to prove that the veteran was incapable of supporting himself on his own. The men came to the facility in poor shape to begin with. He also noted that only one man during the period died of non-natural circumstances. The man, W. C. Young, died at his own hand, committing suicide by slitting his throat with a knife. Staff remained puzzled as to exactly why he did so, and Young left no note behind to explain his actions.\textsuperscript{12}

The next legislature dealt with another issue that plagued some of the men in the home. More than 60 percent of the men who entered the home were widowers at the time they were admitted, and about 17 percent remained married while in the facility. For many veterans, leaving their wives to live in the home proved to be a difficult decision, though some had had no choice. The legislature thought it proper to consider allowing the men to live with their wives, many of whom resided at the woman’s home across town. Some politicians suggested that an extra building be constructed at the woman’s home to accommodate eight or more couples in this

\textsuperscript{12} Annual Report, August 1914.
situation. They also approved furloughs for the men to visit their wives across the state. Though the married couples’ building would not be constructed, several wives eventually resided at the home with their husbands.\textsuperscript{13}

After having barred Confederate veterans from receiving federal assistance for years, the federal government opened debate on whether to change the policy concerning the care of ex-Confederates in 1916. The Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs held hearings to investigate the matter in August of that year. They proposed that the government finance the existing Confederate homes, though pensions were left off the table. Captain Perry de Leon, a former Confederate naval officer, insinuated in his testimony before the committee that his fellow Confederate veterans would never accept a federal pension due to their pride. He also contended that their numbers were dwindling anyway and the issue should be put on hold for the time being. Though the subcommittee met to debate the issue several times, they failed to agree, and the hope for such aid dwindled away. The matter would never be raised again at the federal level, and national funds would never help to finance the Texas Confederate Home for Men.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1916 the facility spent nearly twenty dollars per month on its residents. During the previous two years, the home averaged 365 residents throughout the year. The general population of the home was required to keep their own living spaces clean, but some of the men had grown feeble and were unable to do so. The home’s surgeon J. M. F. Gill reported that their debilities had led to an infestation of bed bugs that needed to be removed from the facility. In addition, the hospital building proved to be too crowded to take care of the men. He proposed that these veterans be moved to a single building to be used as a hospital annex, where attendants
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could look after them closely. He cautioned that this arrangement would not last forever. The surgeon recognized that the men were only getting older, and he predicted that the home would most likely function strictly as a hospital facility within a few years.\textsuperscript{15}

A customary investigation in 1917 resulted in a legislative backlash against the home and its management. The investigating committee once again found the facility’s sanitary conditions severely lacking and the bookkeeping inefficient. Furthermore, many past food orders had included large quantities of alcohol. The employment of a number of native Germans at the facility caused the legislature some concern and was a sign of the times. The country was embroiled in fighting against Germany in World War I. National security became a top concern at the time, and native Germans were looked upon with suspicion. This controversy with the staff was the only documented effect that this war had on the facility. Accusations regarding abusive staff members, an alcoholic surgeon, and an uncaring superintendent led the committee to recommend the replacement of the home’s management and staff. Despite their suggestion, Superintendent James C. Loggins and his officers remained at their posts.\textsuperscript{16}

The worst fears of the management became a reality in 1917 and 1918. A fire in February 1917 destroyed much of the roof of the hospital building. Although reports do not mention casualties, the damage cost the home more than $1,000 to repair. Another fire broke out in January 1918, completely destroying one of the resident cottages. The facility paid about $1,400 in repairs for this destruction. Only the floors and some bricks were salvageable. Superintendent Loggins also reported a minor fire in a building near the administration building, though the

\textsuperscript{15}Annual report, August 1916.
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repairs set them back only $100. The Superintendent of course pleaded for more funds to continue fireproofing the facility to prevent the outbreak of a potentially deadly inferno.\footnote{Annual report, August 1918.}

Loggins and the board of managers spent much of 1919 embroiled in a battle with the very men they were charged with caring for. This clash made its way from the legislature to the court system and even to the various veterans’ organizations throughout the state. Sixty-seven of the home’s residents signed a petition to state legislators that called for a committee to investigate the home’s conditions at once. The committee reported that conditions at the home were most deplorable and that the institution was a disgrace to the state. They provided the legislature with a list of the problems they found in the facility and a set of suggestions to fix the many problems there. The immediate resignation of Superintendent Loggins and the entire board of managers made the top of their list. The grounds of the home had been untended for some time, and the resident quarters were allegedly unsuitable to be occupied by any human being. The state Speaker of the House, Robert E. Thomason, recommended an interrogation of Loggins to uncover the reasons why the facility had been allowed to fall into such a state of disrepair.

When approached for comment by newspapers, the Superintendent adamantly denied the allegations of the investigating committee. He requested the opportunity to be heard before any decisions were made. With accusations flying back and forth, the board of managers assembled at the end of July for their regularly scheduled meeting. During the proceedings, they considered the charges against two of the veterans for rule violations and agreed to expel the men from the home. Immediately after the decision was handed down, the two residents secured an injunction against the management, preventing them from carrying out the expulsion. A judge agreed to extend the injunction after the men alleged that the expulsion was retribution for publicizing the
problems the facility was encountering. The men were allowed to remain in the home indefinitely.\textsuperscript{18}

Hearings on the controversy by local UCV camps led to an outcry concerning the home’s conditions and questions about whether the management should remain at their posts. While they debated both sides of the problem, their main concern was the well-being of the veterans. Though they did not openly express their support for the residents, the organizations appealed to both sides to remedy the situation to the veterans’ benefit as quickly as possible. The residents eventually won when Loggins resigned in late January 1920, though no members of the board followed suit.\textsuperscript{19}

Instead, the state Board of Control replaced the board of managers as the organization primarily responsible with implementing care and social control in the home. The Board centralized all such direction in the state’s eleemosynary institutions in a public corporate organization as a way to maintain and streamline the maintenance and running of these facilities. Their first order of business concerning the home led to the appointment of Judge E. Winfree as the new superintendent. Like Loggins, Winfree had served in Hood’s Texas Brigade, and he was 78 years old at the time of his appointment. The appointment made many question whether the position was becoming a symbolic honor rather than a legitimate administrative job. Shortly after his appointment, the facility began to refurbish the property. While no dollar amount on the cost of the work was provided, the renovations proved to be extensive, with new beds, tubs, and toilets among other improvements. Despite their upgrades, a fire in December 1920 destroyed

\textsuperscript{18} Texas State Legislature, \textit{Journal of the House of Representatives}, 36\textsuperscript{th} Legislature, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Session, (July 6, 1919); \textit{Dallas Morning News}, July 26, August 1, 1919.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Dallas Morning News}, August 18, 1919; January 30, 1920.
much of the laundry area of the home and caused more than $3,000 in damages. Nevertheless, the home reached its all-time peak of enrollment in 1920 with 441 residents.\textsuperscript{20}

This peak may have been a result of a major depression in the state’s farming economy. Cotton crops had been selling at satisfying figures for a number of years, and land values had more than doubled in the last decade. Due to this prosperity, farmers planted their largest crop in over five years. This decision proved to be disastrous to the market, and prices plummeted across the state. Because many of the veterans made their livelihoods as farmers, this directly impacted their financial stability and caused a number of them to enter the home. By the end of the decade, this depression would have a tangible effect on the home and particularly its state appropriations. In 1918 the state had designated more than $155,000 for the support of the home for that year, including all care of veterans, the salaries of its employees, and maintenance on the facility. Conversely, legislators cut the funding to the home by almost $30,000 in 1928.\textsuperscript{21}

In 1924 the Board of Control rewrote and published the rules and regulations of the home. These new guidelines spelled out the duties and expected behaviors of everyone from the residents to visitors to the facility. One section of the rules dictated the strict code of “gentlemanly conduct” that the veterans were expected to live by. A system of mutual respect between the superintendent and the men was outlined as well, possibly an attempt to thwart further battles between the two parties. The policies outlined the regimented lifestyle that the men were expected to lead, including specific times that they were allowed to enter the dining room for meals and when they were expected to be in bed at night. Although the regulations


were extensive and thorough in nature, the Board of Control maintained that the rules were in place not to interfere in the lives of the men in the home, but to make the facility run as smoothly and effectively as possible.22

In September 1925 the Board of Control replaced Winfree as superintendent with A. W. Taber. His appointment broke the tradition of Confederate veterans holding the position, as Taber was the son of a Confederate veteran but had not fought in the war himself. Unfortunately, his tenure would not be without controversy. The state labor commissioner, Charles McKemy, fined Taber fifty dollars and court costs for violations of labor laws relating to the women employees of the home. McKemy alleged that the women were forced to work more than nine hours a day and over fifty-four hours a week, conditions that violated labor regulations. Taber defended his actions, stating that he did not do so deliberately and planned to appeal the fine. Although the case against Taber was later dismissed, the charge led the Board of Control to appeal for more than one thousand dollars to hire more women attendants in order to comply with labor laws.23

Regrettably, Taber’s troubles as superintendent did not end with the labor dispute. In November 1930 the state auditor found a number of irregularities in the accounting books of the home and began to investigate immediately. Taber maintained that no misappropriations had been made, but rather funds had been borrowed from one area of the budget to cover other areas, employee salaries in particular. Taber continued to deny any wrongdoing, but offered his resignation for the board to accept if they no longer wished to have him run the facility. The home’s accountant, H. S. Lawson, and the home surgeon, Dr. J. S. Hairston, also tendered their resignations to the board. The UDC opposed Taber’s resignation, pleading with the board to

---

22 Texas Confederate Home for Men, Rules and Regulations, 1924, State Board of Control Collection, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX.
refuse to accept it. They stood behind his years of service to the facility and his commitment to
the old soldiers and their wives. Ultimately their confidence did little to alter the minds of the
board, and all three resignations were accepted on January 2, 1931, ending Taber’s tumultuous
tenure at the facility. The Board of Control appointed Dr. E. P. Shelton to fill the superintendent
position days later.²⁴

Although the Great Depression had hit the nation at the end of the 1920s, much of Texas
would not feel the effects of the crisis until 1932 or later. The home saw no such depression in
their appropriations and, despite the slowly dwindling numbers of veterans at the facility, the
state appropriated almost $200,000 to cover costs in 1930. This level of funding remained steady
until 1936 when it plunged more than $100,000 to rest at less than $90,000 per year. By this
time, the facility’s enrollment had dropped to less than 100 veterans.²⁵

Despite the severe drop in overall appropriations for the home, the cost per capita of
caring for an individual veteran more than doubled in nearly twenty years. In 1918 the facility
spent slightly over $300 a year on each veteran residing there. Two decades later the amount rose
to a little less than $800. Though these numbers seem to be at odds with the financial times they
took place in, they are justified by the fact that the numbers of veterans in the facility had
dropped significantly in the two decades from approximately 450 to less than 50.²⁶

With fewer than 2,800 Texas veterans living at the time, state newspapers made an effort
to share the stories of those that remained. “Stories from the Confederate Home” became a
regular column published in a number of newspapers throughout the state. Each article focused
on one home resident and his particular story. Their narratives put emphasis on their experiences
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²⁴ Dallas Morning News, November 15, November 16, 1930; January 3, 1931; Orange Leader, November
18, 1930; Breckenridge American, January 2, 1931.
²⁵ McKay and Faulk, Texas After Spindletop, 118-119; Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 171; Texas
Confederate Home Appropriation, Laws of Texas, 41st Legislature, 1929.
²⁶ Annual report, August 1918; Audit report, 1938; Rosenberg, Living Monuments, 171.
during the war and the battles they participated in. Many of the men talked candidly about the war and did not downplay the hardships they endured in those four years. Their accounts provided valuable firsthand descriptions of events they had witnessed.27

By now, many of the old veterans were weak and frail. One, George W. Pittman, fell victim to tragedy in a chance encounter with three young siblings who were out looking to rob a vulnerable individual. Two brothers beat the eighty-eight-year-old to death while their sister looked on. Pittman sustained multiple head injuries and was left for dead by his assailants. Though reports stated that he died as a result of his injuries, they did not specify whether or not Pittman was alive when he was discovered. Authorities found his wallet near the scene and were able to apprehend all three siblings involved in the crime. The incident showcased both the freedom of movement that the veterans enjoyed and the vulnerable state that they were in when mingling with those who could take advantage of them.28

Rumors persist that conflicts also occurred between the men of the home and the residents of the nearby African American neighborhood known as Clarksville. Created in 1871 by emancipated former slaves, the settlement was already in existence when the site for the Confederate home was chosen. Documents mentioning the home’s site did not mention the settlement at all. A modern internet exhibit for an Austin museum cites several interviews with former residents of the community and their descendants as sources for the little information that is available. Although recollections of distant events are not always reliable, valuable details can be learned from the stories passed down through the generations. Those who grew up in the Clarksville community confessed that they had never been inside the Confederate home, but had been warned at church every Sunday to steer clear of the facility. Those interviewed recalled

28 Dallas Morning News, October 9, 1932.
being verbally assaulted by residents of the home and hearing the sirens sound when an inmate went missing. With no dates attached to such stories, authenticating them proves difficult, and the possibility exists that some or all of the men the community encountered were not Confederate veterans at all. The erratic men that they encountered may have been the senile patients at the home instead.29

With the number of Confederate veterans in the home dwindling to approximately 150 by the late 1930s, space had become abundant at the facility that once held over four hundred men. Legislators suggested that the extra rooms be turned into office space to be rented by the state to garner extra revenue. The superintendent identified ten buildings that were no longer needed by the facility and could be rented out. These buildings included the old hospital structure and several cottages on the property. Legislators recommended that the women’s home be consolidated with the men’s home or that some of the empty space be used to accommodate inmates from the Insane Asylum to save that facility from having to construct new buildings. Despite the declining numbers of veterans in the home, the legislature appropriated nearly $140,000 for the maintenance of the facility to be used for 1938 and 1939.30

Other efforts to use the space at the Texas Confederate Home for Men resulted in a bill to establish a soldiers’ and sailors’ home that would extend care to World War I veterans. Veterans of the Spanish-American War had been housed in small numbers at the home for some time. The bill stipulated that the inclusion of the new veterans would not be paid for by the state, but rather be funded by the American Legion and the federal government. Legislators also insisted that the
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home’s current Confederate residents should not be discriminated against or disturbed in any way by the changes being made at the facility.\footnote{31}{Dallas Morning News, March 7, 1939; Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Home, The Laws of Texas, S.B. 78, 46th Legislature, 1939.}

At the close of the decade, fewer than fifty Confederate veterans still resided at the home, their numbers decreasing as each year passed. In the preceding few years, a number of changes to the home had been implemented that allowed the men to live out their remaining years in a relatively comfortable manner. In 1921 the state allowed pensions to be paid directly to a bank account for the men and their families. These payments were not dependent on the men’s furloughs, but were provided year round. The pension fund paid the men one-half of the amount paid to those veterans who resided outside of the facility since the state was already providing them with a place to live. The men used the funds to obtain various goods of their choosing, and anything remaining after the veteran’s death was divided among living descendants.\footnote{32}{Wilson, “Confederate Pension System,” 63; Audit report of the State Board of Control, 1939.}

As time passed, it became apparent that the facility would not remain a Confederate home forever. Though the Texas home had once employed the highest number of workers among all Confederate homes, the facility used fewer than twenty workers and had a similar estimated population among its veteran residents by the end of 1940. Though little was noted in the annual report of the rising numbers of inmates from the insane asylum, the two groups began to mingle on the property, creating the potential for danger. Management also mentioned that although the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Home bill had been passed the year before, nothing had been done to place those new veteran residents in the home. They thought this lack of progress was peculiar and needed to be addressed. On the eve of World War II, the futures of both the
Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Home and the Texas Confederate Home for Men were cloudy and uncertain. \footnote{Audit Report of the State Board of Control, 1941; Rosenberg, \textit{Living Monuments}, 172.}
CHAPTER 5
THE FINAL YEARS, 1941-1970

By the time the United States entered the Second World War, the Confederate home in Austin housed only seven veterans, now in their nineties or older. Some members of the state legislature suggested that the ample space in the home be used to provide temporary quarters for soldiers of World War II on leave in Austin. This proposal was not pursued, however, and nothing came of it. On the other hand, the Board of Control did consign large numbers of senile patients from state asylums to the veterans’ home so that mentally ill inmates in state prisons could be moved into the asylums for treatment. Some Texans disapproved of placing confused elderly patients in the same facility with the few remaining Confederate warriors, but other citizens saw the advantage of using state facilities efficiently. The legislature approved the practice in early 1943 and, in order to calm the fears of the public, ordered the senile patients to be segregated from the veterans. Lawmakers also gave Confederate veterans first claim on space in the home and offered quick admission for any who might wish to move into the facility.¹

The Board of Control continued to improve upon the property during the war, combining several small huts into single buildings and erecting a new building to house employees. These improvements were sometimes very difficult to complete because the war effort soaked up so many needed materials. Items such as matches, trucks, and vehicle tires were in very short supply, for example. Complaints to suppliers and numerous cancelled orders from the home did little to ease the problem. These circumstances forced the facility to limp along until the supplies could be procured from their manufacturers. The single remaining Confederate veteran at the

¹ Dallas Morning News, September 23, October 23, 1942; February 5, 1943; Texas Confederate Home Appropriation, Laws of Texas, 48th Legislature, 1943.
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facility died in January 1945, though the home continued to reserve twenty beds to house Confederate veterans. Only nine veterans from the Civil War remained on state pensions at the time.²

For a number of years, the facility served the mentally ill while retaining the Texas Confederate Home for Men name. By 1947, 527 men resided at the home, almost one hundred men more than the highest number of veterans who ever inhabited the home at one time. The legislature specified that the men who were moved to the facility must be non-violent with no criminal records. Various inspections by state agencies found the hospital to be in “immaculate” condition with the residents well cared for and apparently content.³

Despite the facility’s use to house senile patients, the public called for its closure in 1949 since it no longer housed any Confederate veterans. In fact, only a handful of veterans remained on the pension roll throughout the state. Legislation required that the home maintain twenty beds to house Confederate veterans, though none had been occupied since 1945. Those who sought the facility’s closure argued that it had outlived its usefulness.⁴

The home served Confederate veterans once again in January 1950 when one of the few remaining veterans was admitted to the home. Thomas Riddle, 103 years old, had served as a private in the 22nd Tennessee Infantry Regiment and told everyone that he had fought in the Battle of Gettysburg. He also claimed to be related to Confederate General Robert E. Lee and allegedly cared for Lee’s famed horse Traveller. These claims appeared to be the harmless embellishments of an old man, however, as the 22nd Tennessee never served under General Lee. In 1950 doctors diagnosed Riddle with tuberculosis (often referred to as TB) and moved him to
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² Audit report of the State Board of Control, August 1944; Texas Confederate Home, 1944-45, vertical file, State Board of Control Collection, Texas State Library and Archives, Austin, TX; Audit report of the State Board of Control, August 1948.
the county ward that housed those with the disease near his home in Wichita Falls. This move brought protests from UDC members, who felt that Riddle should be housed at the Texas Confederate Home for Men. The superintendent of the TB ward transported the veteran to the home in a station wagon specifically outfitted for the journey.\(^5\)

In an effort to save money, the state closed the Confederate Women’s Home in June 1950. Politicians estimated that the move would save the state approximately $100,000 a year in appropriations. The remaining women, approximately thirty in number, were moved to an annex on the grounds of the Confederate home. The care for these women was reassigned to the superintendent of the men’s home, and the staff at the women’s home lost their employment. The state decided to rent out the now-vacant women’s home to state agencies for office space. In the same month the number of surviving veterans in Texas dwindled to three, including Riddle.\(^6\)

As the home’s remaining veteran and one of the few surviving veterans in the nation, Riddle lived a comfortable and interesting life at the facility. He occupied a large room to himself in the hospital building of the home. Still active in his advanced age, he spent much of his time playing dominoes or listening to the radio. For a time, he took frequent walks around the home property but had to abandon them after rheumatism set in. He also enjoyed reminiscing about his younger years and his three marriages. He often joked that, once he left the home, he would like to marry again.\(^7\)

Riddle made headlines in 1953 after he filed a claim against the estate of the late Samuel D. Riddle. Samuel, a Pennsylvania businessman, was the owner of the famous horses Man o’ War and Triple Crown winner War Admiral, and his estate was estimated to be worth four million dollars. Thomas Riddle claimed that he was Samuel’s elder half-brother and entitled to
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\(^6\) *Dallas Morning News*, June 1, June 29, 1950.  
\(^7\) *Dallas Morning News*, April 17, 1952; January 16, 1953.
inherit some of the man’s vast fortune. Samuel had willed his estate to finance the construction of a new hospital in Media, Pennsylvania. As many as twenty-one other individuals filed suit, asserting that they were relatives of the horseman as well. While the case languished in the court system, Riddle became the recipient of multiple proposals from women across the country who wanted to share in the wealth he expected to gain from the suit. So many letters poured in that staff members began a “love letter file” to keep them all. In March 1953 doctors at the home denied Riddle permission to fly to Pennsylvania to take part in the suit, explaining that the trip would be a “serious danger” to his life. Lawyers settled for a deposition from the 106-year-old man who reportedly flirted with a young court reporter during the questioning. Ultimately, Riddle and his fellow plaintiffs lost their bid for Samuel Riddle’s estate, and the fortune went to endow the hospital, as Samuel specified in his will.\footnote{Wichita Falls Times Record News, August 16, 2008; Dallas Morning News, February 11, March 15, 1953.}

State newspapers frequently wrote of Riddle’s life and health after he gained near celebrity status because of the court case and because he was one of two surviving veterans in the state. When he contracted pneumonia in January 1954, periodicals published updates on his condition and sent their good-wishes. After recovering from the illness, his aged heart began to fail, weakening his already frail condition. Doctors placed him under an oxygen tent and fed him intravenously when he became unable to hold down food or drink. Riddle eventually passed away on April 2, 1954, only two weeks shy of his 108\textsuperscript{th} birthday. Family members rejected plans for an elaborate burial service in Austin and opted to bury Riddle near the rest of his family in Burk Burnett. Walter L. Williams, 111, of Franklin, outlived Riddle to be the last surviving Texas veteran, but he never lived at the home and died in December 1959. The facility would never
again serve the men for which it had been founded. At the time of Riddle’s death, the state was spending more than $100,000 annually to finance the home.⁹

In the home’s remaining years it continued to house senile patients and the few surviving Confederate widows. With all the state’s veterans gone and the home’s condition deteriorating, the public began to call for the facility’s closure and for the senile patients who resided there to be moved to other state facilities better equipped for their care. An exposé in a newspaper highlighted the dilapidated conditions of the various buildings on the property. The article referred to the facility as a fire trap, claiming that fourteen of the major buildings had been built prior to 1920 and that some dated back to the nineteenth century. Pictures that accompanied the piece showed sagging ceilings and other problems. As a result of the article, administrators sought funding from the state to eliminate the multiple fire hazards in the home. The governor’s office disagreed, advising the facility to use money from the Board of Control’s emergency fund to remedy the problems. The Board attempted to resolve the situation by installing an automatic sprinkler system in the home to extinguish any fires quickly. Ultimately, they failed to implement the plan, and the system was never installed.¹⁰

In May 1965 the Texas Confederate Home for Men ceased to exist. The legislature reassigned the property to be used as an annex for the Austin State Hospital. The same legislation also transferred all of the appropriations designated for the home to the state hospital. The state moved the three remaining Confederate widows to Villa Siesta Retirement Village in Austin, where they could receive better care at less expense to the state. They continued to care

¹⁰ Texas Observer, February 28, 1959; Aspermont Star, September 10, 1959; October 6, 1960
for senile male patients at the facility for five years before the majority of the men were transferred to a state hospital in Kerrville.  

In 1970 the property was purchased by the University of Texas in Austin. Construction crews razed the remaining buildings on the property that December, eliminating all physical signs that the home had ever existed. The university built housing for married students on the site at 1600 West Sixth Street. A local construction supply company obtained the bricks from the property and sold them to a number of clients.

In the summer of 1995, the Texas State Cemetery underwent a multi-million dollar renovation during which fifty-seven graves were relocated to another site in the cemetery. Fifty of the graves were occupied by the remains of Confederate veterans, 90 percent of whom had been residents of the Confederate home. An archeological firm consulted in the renovations and was allowed to conduct a small study on the dental health of the veterans. The resulting report shed some light on the men’s time at the home and the state of care for the veterans in general. They found that the diet of the men at the home was much better than one might expect with the limiting budget restrictions of a state institution. Comparisons with similar institutions of the era found the men of the home to be in better dental health than those residing at its counterparts.

Today the housing development for married university students still occupies the property where the home once stood. The only sign that the facility ever existed is a historical marker erected by the Texas State Historical Association. Installed in 2010 at the intersection of
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Sixth and Campbell streets, the marker provides the reader a brief history of the home that once occupied the surrounding land.

For nearly half a century, administrators of the facility and the state legislature provided a welcome haven for the men despite a number of challenges. Although the management and the legislature seemed to quarrel frequently about the home, maintaining a proper place for these men always appeared to be a common goal, and the veterans were often the winners in any disagreement.

Texas appeared to be less generous than some other Confederate states in caring for its veterans. The state’s failure to provide any kind of assistance to Confederate veterans until some sixteen years after the war certainly contributed to this impression. Widows of the Confederacy would have an even tougher time receiving funds from the state. Though legislators voted to have the state take over the woman’s home in north Austin in 1911, they did not begin to maintain the facility for almost a year afterward. On the other hand, Texas did eventually come to the aid of its old soldiers, paying out more than five million dollars in pensions in one year at the program’s peak in 1932. The Texas Confederate Home for Men would also become the highest funded facility among the state-funded Confederate homes after 1901.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite the state’s slow start, they would provide assistance for Confederate veterans much more than they ever had for veterans of previous wars. The Constitution of 1869 granted pensions to veterans who had fought in the war for Texas independence, and this program was renewed when the constitution was rewritten in 1876. Running low on funds, the program switched to providing grants of land to these men, eventually parceling out 1.4 million acres in contrast with the 2.6 million that would be granted to Confederate veterans through a similar

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
system. Records do not indicate if such assistance from the state was ever granted to veterans of the Mexican-American War or to those that participated in the state-sanctioned Indian wars prior to the Civil War.\textsuperscript{15}

Limited in resources and subject to voters’ opinions, the legislature provided for the needs of the Texas home, even beyond the $100,000 cap that was placed on expenditures when the state took over in 1891. Toward the end of the home’s existence, legislators also made certain that any veterans that needed their help would be able to receive it by requiring the home to hold open twenty beds strictly for this purpose. Twenty living veterans did not exist in the entire state at the time, but the state was adamant that any Confederate veteran, regardless of circumstances, would be welcomed in the home if he chose to spend his days there. The legislature’s commitment to the veterans was also evident in the frequent inspections at the home. Conducted on a yearly basis, and sometimes more often than that, these visits insured that the men were being cared for in the best way possible. If anything appeared unsatisfactory during an inspection, legislators immediately called for an investigation to get to the root of the problem, if one existed at all. When conditions in the home were at their worst in the late 1910s, the legislature brought in new management to the facility in the form of the State Board of Control to establish better oversight and improve the general state of affairs.

The staff seems to have emerged with a tarnished reputation that is not deserved for the most part. Although occasional staff member chose to treat the veterans poorly in various ways, this was not common practice at the facility. If it had been, the frequent inspections and investigations by the state and various Confederate organizations would have complained loudly, and staff members would have been relieved of their positions. Firings did occur in the few

confirmed cases of patient abuse, showing that administrators of the home took their charge of
caring for these men seriously.

The restrictions placed on the men during their stay at the home caused friction at the
time and likely would give pause to anyone who read them today. Nevertheless, the management
maintained that the rules were placed on the residents for a number of good reasons. Although
set times for entering and leaving the dining room may be questionable to some, the staff
justified this by stating that this system provided a regular and predictable schedule. Such
limitations likely saved money in a number of areas, including food bills and wages of cooks,
who might have had to work extra hours to accommodate the veterans had meal time restrictions
not been in place. Similar rules for cleanliness in the living quarters and treatment of facility
property created a sanitary and comfortable home and saved money. Every rule in the set of
guidelines, no matter how restrictive it may have seemed on paper, had a practical purpose. Even
the “lights out” rule was designed to conserve expensive lamp oil and to prevent accidental fires.

During the war Texas soldiers had gained a reputation of being tough and fierce warriors.
Though statistical evidence could hardly prove this assumption wrong or right, others believed it
to be the truth and Texans did not bother to quell such rumors. The actions of veterans at the
Austin home, with their frequent violent altercations between residents and with staff members,
tend to support the image of Texas soldiers as hell-raising ruffians. Since the Texas home housed
unusually large numbers of men from other states, however, these postwar conflicts may have
had little to do with alleged Texas ferocity.\(^\text{16}\)

For all the home’s efforts, it was certainly not perfect and its endeavors were not always
successful. The lives of some of the men in the facility were lonely and cumbersome. To combat
such circumstances, entertainers and other guests often visited the facility. The UDC made a

\(^{16}\) Rosenberg, *Living Monuments*, 164.
particular effort to provide holiday meals and gifts to the men each year. Despite the best efforts of the home’s management and others, they would never be able to match the comforts of a real home and family members. Though many of the men had lost almost all contact with their own families, local Austin residents embraced the men much like family members of their own. In addition to raising funds for the home, the public was invited regularly to spend time with the veterans. Most of the contact between the two groups appeared to have been positive in nature.

Ultimately, those charged with caring for the state’s Confederate veterans successfully provided a pleasant and welcoming environment for the men to spend their remaining years. The State of Texas broke new ground in providing help for the helpless and lived up to its obligations to the boys of 1861, now fragile in their declining years several decades later.
APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF SELECT HOME RESIDENTS
The large number of veterans who lived in the Confederate Home prevents one from becoming familiar with all of them. Despite this hurdle, it is important to humanize some of the names that appeared on the ledgers of the institution. The majority of the thirty individuals featured in this appendix were chosen at random from boxes of applications to the Home now housed at the Texas State Library and Archives in Austin. Many of the surviving applications are from the later years of the establishment, causing an unintended focus on the residents of the Home during this time period. The few who were not picked at random were chosen for specific reasons, specifically the two women who lived with their veteran husbands at the Home for a time. The information on each individual was assembled with a combination of their applications to the Home, pension records, state reports on the Home, personal correspondence, ledgers from the Home, the Texas State Cemetery website, and the volume *Texas Confederate Home Roster*, compiled by Kathryn Hooper Davis, Linda Ericson Devereaux and Carolyn Reeves Ericson. Due to privacy restrictions, few records were accessible that would explain the residents’ individual ailments that led to their admittance to the Home and/or their passing.

**Henry Thomas Alexander**

Henry Alexander came to live in the Home on July 14, 1933, from San Antonio, Texas. Born in Barbour County, Alabama, he served as a private in Joe Prewitt’s Company as a part of Feagin’s regiment in the state’s militia during the Civil War. Migrating to Texas in 1876, he made his home in Mart, located thirty miles east of Waco, where he worked as a farmer and provided for a family that included two daughters. Widowed by the time he entered the institution, Alexander would live in the Confederate Home for less than two years, passing away on June 14, 1935 at the residence. Identified as a Baptist in faith, he was buried in the city cemetery in Mart, Texas.
George Washington Barr

George Barr came to live at the Home on April 9, 1930, from Sweetwater, Texas. Born in Calhoun County, Mississippi, he served as a private in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Mississippi Cavalry in Forrest’s Brigade in the Army of Tennessee. Barr participated in the Battle of Brice’s Crossroads in June 1864, where he was wounded in both legs. He and his company surrendered on May 10, 1865 at Gainesville, Alabama. Shortly after the conclusion of the war, he moved to Texas, where he worked as a farmer and worshipped within the Church of Christ denomination. His wife was deceased by the time he entered the residence, but he did have one living daughter, Ethel. His particular ailments are unknown, and he passed away at the Home on August 23, 1934. Barr was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate Section.

Henry Moses and Polly Ann Brown

Henry Brown was admitted to the Home on September 14, 1925. Born in Meriwheather County, Georgia, he served as a private in Joseph E. Johnston’s Brigade as a part of the Army of Tennessee. Employed as a farmer, he moved to Texas in 1883, where he made a home in Grapeland, fifty miles west of Nacogdoches, and had one son with wife Polly Ann. He applied for a pension from the state and began receiving one in 1922. Polly Ann would apply for and receive a widow’s pension after her husband’s death. Henry and his wife were one of a number of couples who were allowed to live together for a time at the Home. In his correspondence with the Home prior to their admission, Henry seemed rather adamant that his wife be allowed to live with him, rather than at the Confederate Women’s Home in the northern part of the city. Polly Ann, born in Fayette County, Georgia, was eventually transferred to the Women’s Home in June 1931 after several years of living at the Men’s Home. The practicing Methodist couple died
approximately seven months apart, Henry in September 1935 and Polly Ann in the following March. They were buried beside each other in Guiceland Cemetery in Grapeland, Texas.

Tom W. Burge

Tom Burge was admitted to the Home on September 4, 1941, from Kerrville, Texas. Born in Alabama, he served in the 27th Texas Cavalry Regiment during the war. Although records are unclear on exactly when Burge came to Texas, his involvement with this military unit suggests he did so prior to secession. While his unit was involved in such battles as Pea Ridge and took place in the failed attempt to defend Atlanta in 1864, he survived to return to Texas and worked as a rancher. Although he was married with at least three sons, records from the Home do not reveal his wife’s name or if she was still living when Burge was admitted. He applied for a pension from the state in 1931. Although he eventually received one, he had to contend with an abundance of legal ranglings, as no surviving members of his unit existed to serve as witnesses on his application. Apparently very ill when he came to live at the institution, he passed away on October 31, 1941, almost two months following his admission. He was buried in Kerrville, Texas.

Abraham Byrd

Abraham Byrd was admitted to the Home on October 13, 1935, from Franklin, Texas. Born in Sabine Parrish, Louisiana, he served in Company A of Cress’s Louisiana Infantry during the war. After the war’s conclusion, he was employed as a farmer and came to Texas in 1872. Widowed by the time he entered the Home in 1935, he also had three children who frequently wrote to the superintendent inquiring as to their father’s health and condition. In late 1943 he would suffer an injury to his hip from falling in one of the Home’s bathrooms. Reports indicated that he did not suffer a fracture, though he was administered morphine for his pain. Byrd died
from a cerebral hemorrhage on June 1, 1944. He was buried in Franklin, Texas, located thirty miles north of College Station.

Stephen Dekalb Cowan

Stephen Cowan was admitted to the Home on May 16, 1922, from Wichita Falls, Texas. Born in Jackson County, Georgia, he served as a private in Wade Hampton’s Brigade in the Army of Northern Virginia, which participated in many of the well-known battles of the war, including Fredericksburg and Gettysburg. He was present at his unit’s surrender at Hillsboro, North Carolina, in April 1865. An active Baptist parishioner, Cowan moved to Texas in 1871. While records list him as widowed at the time of his admission to the institution, it is unclear whether any offspring resulted from the union since his only contact person was listed as a brother who lived in Atlanta, Georgia. He applied for and received a pension from the state in 1917. Spending over a decade at the Home, Cowan passed away there on February 8, 1935. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

John Smith and Callie Drinkard

John Drinkard was originally admitted to the Home on June 16, 1925, from New Willard, Texas. Discharged and re-admitted multiple times over the years, he was eventually joined at the institution by his wife Callie in 1929. Born in Chambers County, Alabama, he served as a private in Ferrat’s Battalion of Artillery in the Army of Tennessee during the war. He was captured in 1864 and held in Ohio as a prisoner of war. While a prisoner at the Chase prison camp, John made rings, which he sold to visitors for fifty cents each. He sold a combined $12 worth of rings, one of which is in the possession of the Texas division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. (A picture of the ring is enclosed in Appendix B.) He migrated to Texas in 1869 as a farmer. The marriage was split on religion, with John a declared Methodist and Callie a
practicing Baptist. While it is unclear when the couple wed, Callie’s records indicate that she was married at least once prior to this union. John had one son, though Callie’s records do not mention whether the son was biologically hers as well. John applied for and received a pension from the state in 1908. The couple apparently became estranged at some point in their marriage. As a letter in John’s pension file, dated in 1931, states that John had “forsaken” his wife. When the pension office questioned him on this matter and threatened the amount that he was receiving, John presented records to indicate that he was supporting his wife, purchasing clothing items for her and putting her forsaken status in doubt. Callie filed for divorce from John in January 1931. John died at the Home on October 27, 1934, and was buried at Holly Cemetery in Friday, Texas. Records on Callie end in 1938 with her final discharge from the institution. No records of her exist under Drinkard or her first husband’s last name, Crow. While her date of death is uncertain, she did request to be buried in Gilmer, Texas beside her first husband.

Jerry Driscoll

Jerry Driscoll was admitted to the Home on January 31, 1894, from Houston, Texas. Born in Ireland, Driscoll came to Texas in 1859 prior to the Civil War and served in Company D of the 2nd Texas Infantry, which participated in such battles as Shiloh and Vicksburg. After the war, he returned to Texas, where he made a living as a farmer and remained a bachelor throughout his lifetime. Admitted to the Home for disabilities due to old age and rheumatism, he passed away there on March 3, 1894, less than two months after he entered the residence. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Martin Everhart

Martin Everhart was admitted to the Home on June 10, 1894, from Austin, Texas. Born in Kentucky, he served in the 3rd Kentucky Cavalry during the war. A single man with no
offspring, Everhart, a Presbyterian, came to Texas in 1858. Admitted for general debilities, he spent his life as a bachelor and died at the Confederate Home on August 20, 1909. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Charles H. Foote

Charles Foote was admitted to the Home on August 5, 1944, from Bomarton, Texas. Born in Chester County, South Carolina, he served in Company D of the 6th South Carolina Regiment during the Civil War. A practicing Methodist, he came to Texas in 1904, though records do not indicate where he was employed. Though widowed by the time he entered the Home, his marriage resulted in the birth of four children. Foote applied for and received a pension from the state in 1931. Enclosed in his pension file is correspondence in which Foote’s son expressed regret for having to place his father in the Home, but he could no longer properly care for his father. Further family correspondence discussed three men who appear to have been Foote’s grandsons and their participation in World War II. Such talk must have brought back painful memories to a Civil War veteran. Suffering from hypertension and kidney and heart disease, Foote made it known to his son that he wished to be buried only in his undergarments, shoes, and a shirt. Foote’s son relayed this to the Home’s superintendent Dr. Lawrence Smith in a letter dated November 1, 1944. Foote died the next day at the Confederate Home. He was buried at Willow Cemetery in Haskell, Texas, presumably with his requested attire.

John Hansford Francisco

John Francisco was admitted to the Home on November 21, 1928, from Midland, Texas. Born in Bath County, Virginia, he served as a private in Jubal Early’s Brigade during the war. According to his pension file, he was taken prisoner by the Union army toward the end of the war, but was released after the surrender. A farmer by trade, he came to Texas in 1910. Widowed
by the time he entered the residence, his records indicate that he did have one daughter. He
applied for and received a pension from the state in 1929. He passed away at the Confederate
Home on March 5, 1935, but it is not clear where exactly he was buried. Confederate Home
records do indicate that his remains were shipped to Atlanta, Texas, though they do not divulge
his place of burial.

John William Gilliam

John Gilliam was admitted to the Home on March 18, 1921, from Houston, Texas. Born
in Dinwiddie County, Virginia, he served as a member of Johnson’s Artillery regiment in the
Army of Northern Virginia. His service records indicate that he was absent from his regiment for
four months in 1864 due to illness, though the nature of his illness was not disclosed. According
to his pension file, he was paroled at Appomattox Courthouse on April 9, 1865, and took the
amnesty oath in Richmond, Virginia, a month later. A bachelor his entire life, he migrated to
Texas in 1871, where he worked as a dairyman and worshipped in an Episcopalian church. He
applied for and received a pension from the state in 1921. He passed away at the Confederate
Home on February 14, 1935, and was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the
Confederate section.

James Lacy Havins

James Havins was admitted to the Home for the first time on February 27, 1932, from
Ranger, Texas. Born in Wood County, Texas, he served as a member of Company C in Baylor’s
regiment during the war. A native Texan, he was employed as both a farmer and a Methodist
minister. Widowed by the time he entered the Home, he had at least one son. He applied for and
received a pension from the state in 1905. Discharged and readmitted several times during his
time at the residence, he passed away at the Home on June 26, 1941, and was buried at New Gordon Cemetery in Gordon, Texas.

Christian Jolle

Christian Jolle was admitted to the Home on August 1, 1898, from Seguin, Texas. Born in Germany, he served in Company F of Daly’s Battalion in the Trans-Mississippi Department. Migrating to Texas in 1856, he worked as a laborer and worshipped in a Lutheran church. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, he was admitted due to debilities as a result of old age. Records do not indicate whether he had any children. Jolle died at the Confederate Home on August 9, 1906. He was buried at the State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

John Wiley Leverett

John Leverett was admitted to the Home on March 25, 1929, from Austin. Born in Polk County, Georgia, he served as a member of the 1st Georgia Cavalry in the Army of Tennessee. The Baptist farmer came to Texas in 1881. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, he had fathered two daughters during his marriage. He applied for and received a pension from the state in 1929. While his ailments were not listed in his records, his apparent grudge with a fellow resident was documented. He specifically requested that the other gentleman, Marquis McCurdy, not be one of the residents to carry the flag over his casket at burial as was the custom at the time. Unfortunately, the reasons for the grudge are not documented, leaving one to speculate about the relationship. Leverett died at the Home on September 17, 1934. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section. Records do not note whether or not McCurdy was present at his funeral.
Lucius Marion McAdams

Lucius McAdams was admitted to the Home on June 5, 1939, from Teague, Texas. Born in Chariton County, Missouri, he served as a member of Company K in Shelby’s Brigade. He fought in the battles at Pleasanton, Kansas, and Newtonia, Missouri. Later in the war, he was captured by Union forces and held at Fort Smith, Arkansas. A letter in his Home records indicates that he had a homestead in Colorado. A teacher, farmer, and practicing Baptist, he came to Texas in 1930. He applied for a pension from the state in 1937, but was rejected due to the fact that he was not a resident of the state prior to 1928, which was a requirement at the time. He appealed to Governor W. Lee O’Daniel, who expressed sorrow in his inability to intervene on McAdams’ behalf. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, he had one daughter. He continued to fight for a state pension well into his stay at the Home, but he was never successful. Suffering from senility, he died at the Home on August 1, 1944. McAdams was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Marquis Lafayette McCurdy

Marquis McCurdy was admitted to the Home on September 18, 1927, from West, Texas. Born in Florida, he served in Hood’s Texas Brigade in the Army of Northern Virginia. This unit participated in such battles as Sharpsburg, Gettysburg, and the Wilderness and was present at Lee’s surrender at Appomattox Courthouse in April 1865. A railroader who came to Texas immediately following the war, possibly following comrades from his regiment, he was widowed by the time he entered the Home. Nothing in his records shed any additional light on an apparent feud with fellow resident John Leverett, who wished for McCurdy not to participate in his funeral. He applied for and received a pension from the state in 1922. A Methodist in practice, McCurdy was thought to have been the last known survivor of Hood’s Texas Brigade at the time.
of his death. He passed away on May 16, 1939, and was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Charles McIntire

Charles McIntire was admitted to the Home on February 18, 1931, from San Antonio, Texas. Born in Holmes County, Mississippi, he served as a private in Taylor’s Brigade of the Army of Northern Virginia during the war. His Confederate Home file contains a copy of his formal parole which he received in Memphis, Tennessee, in July 1865. In this “Parole of Honor,” he swore not to take up arms against the United States again, and was granted his freedom in exchange. The practicing Episcopalian migrated to Texas in 1875. Widowed when he entered the residence, he had one daughter. McIntire passed away while on furlough in San Jose, California on July 5, 1936. He was buried at Mission City Memorial Park in Santa Clara, California.

Enoch Morris

Enoch Morris was admitted to the Home on August 17, 1921, from Austin. A native Texan, he served in Gano’s Brigade in the Trans-Mississippi Department during the war. A farmer who stated his religious affiliation as “Christian,” he was married when he entered the residence. He was rejected for a state pension in 1925, presumably because he had not been a state resident for twelve years. The state legislature had to pass a joint resolution in 1921 for Morris and his wife Catherine to be admitted to the homes for men and women. This became necessary due to the couple’s inability to provide witnesses to verify Morris’ service in the Confederate Army. Morris died at the Home on January 14, 1928. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section. Catherine, while living at the Women’s Home, was granted a state pension in 1929 after Enoch’s death, though she passed away in April 1930.
Andrew Jackson Nicholson

Andrew Nicholson was admitted to the Home on June 4, 1920, from Montague, Texas. Born in Murray County, Georgia, he served as a private in the 10th Missouri Infantry during the war. Migrating to Texas in 1893, he was married with two children, whom he supported with his work as a farmer. He identified himself as a Cumberland Presbyterian. He applied for and received a pension from the state in 1913. Nicholson passed away at the Home on February 25, 1935. He was buried at Long Prairie Cemetery in Kerens, Texas.

Joseph Zachariah Taylor Reese

Joseph Reese was admitted to the Home on August 3, 1925, from Dallas, Texas. Born in Muskogee County, Georgia, he served as a private in the Georgia State Troops during the war. He moved to Texas shortly after the war ended and made his living as a farmer, worshipping in the Baptist church. He applied for and began receiving a pension from the state in 1924. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, he had two children. Reese died at the Home on September 16, 1936. He was buried at Gum Springs Cemetery in Longview Heights, Texas.

E. Manuel Samaniego

Manuel Samaniego was admitted to the Home on May 21, 1934, from San Antonio, Texas. A native Texan, he served in the cavalry of the Texas Home Defense unit. A laborer by trade, he remained a bachelor his entire life and worshipped in the Church of Christ. Reportedly born in the old Alamo Mission, his particular debilities were not revealed in his Home records. His pension records indicate that he began to experience mental health problems later in life. He applied for and received a pension from the state beginning in 1933. Prior to his admission to the Home, he had been cared for by his niece, though the financial strain of doing so eventually led to his placement in the Home. A letter in his file states that he spent some time in Cuba, where he
owned a ranch at one time. The letter discloses that this ranch was apparently burned and seized by Cuban rebels during a time of turmoil in the country. Samaniego died at the Home on January 15, 1935. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Robert P. Scott

Robert Scott was admitted to the Home on October 3, 1942, from Dallas, Texas. Born in Tallahassee County, Mississippi, he served as a member of Company C in McCoy’s Brigade as a part of the Army of Arkansas. A farmer by profession, he came to Texas in 1877. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, he had one daughter during his marriage. Home records indicate that he was discharged and readmitted to the residence multiple times. During one such discharge, he lived with his daughter and her family in Dallas, but correspondence between his daughter and the Home’s Superintendent do not indicate the reasons behind his leaving the institution. Scott was discharged for the final time on January 31, 1945, and records do not reveal what happened to him after that point.

Oliver Asberry Stanfield

Oliver Stanfield was admitted to the Home on May 2, 1931, from Dallas, Texas. Migrating to Texas in 1892, he served as a member of Company I in Forrest’s Brigade during the war. He made a living as a farmer and claimed allegiance to the practices of the Methodist church. Widowed by the time he entered the residence, his marriage had resulted in the birth of one daughter. Stanfield was discharged and readmitted to the Home several times over the eleven years he spent at the institution. He applied for and received a pension from the state beginning in 1929, though a previous application had been rejected the year before due to his inability to provide proof of his service. Before being admitted to the Home, he reportedly made his way
peddling candy to local businesses in the Dallas area. He passed away while at the Home on November 11, 1942. He was buried at Simmons Cemetery in Ben Franklin, Texas.

Johnison Tillman Taylor

Johnison Taylor was admitted to the Home on April 16, 1935, from Cuero, Texas. Born in Wilcox County, Alabama, he served as a courier during the war. He came to Texas in 1854 prior to the outbreak of the war and made his living as a farmer. A practicing Presbyterian, he was listed as widowed at his admittance to the residence and the father of at least one child. Taylor died on December 13, 1935, while on furlough from the Home. He requested to be buried in Roganville, Texas beside his wife.

Robert W. Tittle

Robert Tittle was admitted to the Home on April 16, 1935, from Granbury, Texas. Born in Cherokee County, Oklahoma, he served as a private in the 29th Texas Cavalry, which was eventually transferred to Walker’s Texas Division. Taking part in the Red River campaign, he eventually moved to Texas in 1876. He applied for and received a pension from the state beginning in 1925. Employed as a butcher, he was widowed by the time he entered the residence. Classifying himself as a “primitive Baptist”, he was also the father of one son. Tittle died at the Home on August 6, 1937. He was buried at Granbury Cemetery in Granbury, Texas.

John Thomas Wilcox

John Wilcox was admitted to the Home on November 1, 1927, from Waco, Texas. Born in Gadson County, Florida, he served as a member of Peel’s Company in Walker’s Texas Division for a time during the war. After being discharged due to illness, he would later rejoin the war as a member of Terry’s Texas Rangers. Migrating to Texas in 1858 prior to the beginning of the war, he made a living as a farmer. He applied for and received a pension from
the state beginning in 1910. Widowed prior to his admittance to the Home, he was the father of one son and was a practicing Baptist. Wilcox died at the Home on February 4, 1937. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.

Frank Lilly Woods

Frank Woods was admitted to the Home on May 2, 1927, from Houston, Texas. A native Texan, he served as a private in Magruder’s Brigade, which defended Galveston during the war. A lumberman by trade, he was a practicing Methodist. He applied for and received a pension from the state beginning in 1910. Records indicate that he was a widower and the father of one daughter at his admittance to the residence. Woods died at the Home on April 26, 1941. He was buried at the Texas State Cemetery in Austin in the Confederate section.
APPENDIX B

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE HOME AND RESIDENTS
The original stakes used to measure out the corners for the Texas Confederate Home for Men. The writing on the stakes indicates that they were handmade by Mr. Val C. Giles, who served in Company B in the Fourth Texas Regiment as a part of Hood’s Texas Brigade. Giles and his wife were heavily involved in the founding of the Texas Confederate Home for Men.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This artifact is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
Advertisement for 1886 Austin Gift Concert benefiting the Confederate Home for Men.

Credit: PICA 29237, Austin History Center, Austin Public Library.
The Main Building of the Confederate Home

Credit: Vertical File, Confederate Home for Men, Historical Research Center, Texas Heritage Museum, Hill College, Hillsboro, TX.
A hand-drawn plat of the Texas Confederate Home for Men grounds, 1905. The drawing is extensive and features all buildings on the property at the time, including several small cottages and the locations of resident laundry and barber shop. The map also indicates how many residents can be housed in each area.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This artifact is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
A photograph of the Governing Board of the Texas Confederate Home for Men, undated.

Credit: Photo of photograph taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
Group of veterans and guests taken in front of Main Building of Confederate Home for Men, undated.

Credit: Vertical File, Confederate Home for Men, Historical Research Center, Texas Heritage Museum, Hill College, Hillsboro, TX.
A photograph of the Texas Confederate Home for Men with veterans seated on the porch and bleachers, taken by Holland Studios in the 1920s.

Credit: Photo of photograph taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
A photograph of the Texas Confederate Home for Men with veterans and staff standing in front, undated. The original photograph was found in the basement of the Land Office in Austin.

Credit: Photo of photograph taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
Photograph of several veterans in front of the Texas Confederate Home for Men, undated.

Credit: Photo of photograph taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
Confederate Home and its Grounds, 1946.

Back porch of the Texas Confederate Home for Men taken by Russell Lee in 1959. It is likely that many of the veterans spent long hours in the chairs depicted, reminiscing about their war experiences.

The hospital building of the Texas Confederate Home for Men, built in the 1920s. Photograph taken by Russell Lee in 1959.

A wooden chair that came from the Texas Confederate Home for Men.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
Lucius M. McAdams, a resident of the Confederate Home who died there in August 1944.

Credit: Untitled newspaper article, Vertical File, Confederate Home for Men, Historical Research Center, Texas Heritage Museum, Hill College, Hillsboro, TX.
Abraham Byrd, a resident of the Confederate Home who died there in June 1944.

Credit: Untitled newspaper article, Vertical File, Confederate Home for Men, Historical Research Center, Texas Heritage Museum, Hill College, Hillsboro, TX.
Thomas Evans Riddle, resident of the Confederate Home for Men and thought by some to be the last surviving veteran of the Civil War. When this picture was taken in 1951, Riddle was 104 years old. He passed away in April 1954, just days shy of his 108th birthday.

A ring made by John Smith Drinkard while he was a prisoner of war at Chase Federal Prison Camp in Ohio during the Civil War. Made of gutta percha and set with silver from a dime, Drinkard handmade and sold similar rings to visitors for fifty cents each during his imprisonment. He made approximately $12 out of the rings and gave this one to Hortense Osbourn, who served as a nurse in the home. He spent the last years of his life in the Texas Confederate Home for Men, passing away there in October 1934.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
A cane made by H.W. Bryan, a resident of the Texas Confederate Home for Men. He served as a First Sergeant in the Georgia Cavalry during the Civil War and spent his last years at the home.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
A leather and wood statute made by W.W. Brown, a resident of the Texas Confederate Home for Men. Depicting General Robert E. Lee and his horse Traveller, the piece was carved using a penknife in 1906. The item was later given to a Miss Moore, who served as a nurse at the facility.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer with permission from the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. This item is a part of the Texas Confederate Collection, which is housed at the Texas Civil War Museum in Fort Worth, TX. The collection is owned and maintained by the Texas Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.
The Remains of the Texas Confederate Home for Men as it was Razed.

Credit: *Austin American Statesman*, December 20, 1970.
Confederate Field at the Texas State Cemetery, where many of the home’s residents were buried.

Credit: Photo taken by Amy Kirchenbauer.
This residence, built in Northwest Austin, is said to have been built in 1971 from bricks that came from the Texas Confederate Home for Men. The home owner, Jack Maidlow, was told this from the business where he bought the bricks. He also donated some of the bricks to the Texas Heritage Museum at Hill College.

Credit: Letter to Dr. B. D. Patterson from Jack Maidlow, Vertical File, Confederate Home for Men, Historical Research Center, Texas Heritage Museum, Hill College, Hillsboro, TX.
Historical Marker designating the former site of the Texas Confederate Home for Men, located at the intersection of Sixth and Campbell streets in Austin. The apartments pictured on the left are the student housing that was constructed after the Confederate Home was razed.
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