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Boston capitalists Greenleif W. Simpson and Louville V. Niles created the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in 1893 after local efforts to build a stockyards and a packing plant failed. A reorganization occurred in 1902 which brought in meat packers Armour and Swift as two-thirds owners. They planned that their new market in the heart of the livestock producing area would surpass the largest market--Chicago. Success depended upon attracting enough animals to keep their new packing plants operating at full capacity. They needed three times as many hogs as cattle. Consequently, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company launched a campaign from 1909-1914 of "pig clubs" among young farm boys throughout the state to increase the hog supply. Boom years followed with both cattle and hog receipts reaching a million in 1917, although Fort Worth never achieved consistently higher than third or fourth among the nation's markets, for farmers did not raise enough hogs.

Company officials incorporated a separate town encompassing stockyards property and fought a court battle to prevent Niles City from being incorporated into the larger
Fort Worth but lost in 1923. Court contests also delayed the implementation of a federal law, The Packers and Stockyards Act (1921), which forbade meat packers from owning stockyards. By the mid-1930's both Armour and Swift had divested themselves of their Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock by creating separate corporations to own it. The Swift creation, United Stockyards, eventually bought out all other stock and became sole owner of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company (spelling changed in 1940's) by 1944, the yard's largest year with 5.25 million animals received.

Decentralization altered receipts after World War II because local country auctions and later large feedlot operations drew away trade. Despite advertising, receipts declined rapidly. In 1981 United leased its facilities to another company operating as the Fort Worth Stockyards, and the market continued with 150,000 annual receipts, but almost more tourists than livestock arrived.
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CHAPTER I

CITY FATHERS CONSPIRE

Big-boned Longhorn cattle milled about their pens as stockyard workers unloaded twenty railroad cars an hour of beeves and swine into their assigned pens. A hundred agents, either commission men or order buyers, swarmed over the 110 acres of pens to examine new arrivals prior to sale. Following the transfer of ownership, the livestock went to slaughter at either the large modern Armour or Swift packing house just east of the yards or became stockers and feeders at various locations. Before this scene became the normal activity at the Fort Worth Stock Yards during its boom years, much planning, hard work, and just plain old persistence prevailed.

The growth of Fort Worth into the major livestock market of the Southwest can be traced from many factors dating far back into the nineteenth century. Citizens of Fort Worth wanted a railroad, a stockyards, and a packing plant and worked diligently for these milestones of progress long before they achieved them. They donated land for them and reached into their pockets and bank accounts to capitalize corporations to make their dreams a reality. Success finally came after their nucleus of stock pens and packing facilities
induced outside capital including big meat packers Armour and Swift to Fort Worth.¹

One cannot appreciate the success the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company finally achieved without at least a glimpse into the heartbreaking failures of these early decades and the efforts of local men like B. B. Paddock, John Peter Smith, Ephraim M. Daggett, and others.² Without their efforts Fort Worth might not today be the major metropolitan area that it has become nor be known as "Cowtown" and "the city where the West begins." The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company ultimately became the instrument through which Fort Worth achieved much of its early growth and success.

Some suggest that Fort Worth was called "Cowtown" as early as 1862.³ After the Civil War, Tarrant County occupied


²B. B. Paddock, Early Days in Fort Worth Much of Which I Saw and Part of Which I Was (n.p. n.d.), p. 1. Paddock arrived in Fort Worth in 1872 and soon became the editor of the Fort Worth Democrat. He pushed for stockyards and meat packing plants as much as anyone else. In the 1890's he served four terms as mayor. "Our Literary Club in Bohemia," The Bohemian 1 (November 1899):2. John Peter Smith arrived in Fort Worth in the 1850's and was an early teacher and businessman. A contemporary referred to Daggett as a "giant" of Fort Worth because of his leadership but described him as a giant of a man as well, 275 pounds. J. C. Terrell, Reminiscences of the Early Days of Fort Worth (Fort Worth: Texas Printing Co., 1906), p. 18.

a strategic position as the cattle industry began to boom, for to the east of the little community lay the farming district of the Grand Prairie and Cross Timbers and to the west a ranching district of rolling plains. The village soon became a familiar cowboy meeting place. One oldtimer even professed that "Fort Worth was less conscious of her morals than some of her neighbors" and encouraged the somewhat boisterous cattle trade because of the money it would attract. More conservative citizens of the city remained displeased with what they considered disreputable elements, but a few merchants, recognizing a chance for profit since no stores of any size existed between Fort Worth and Abilene, Kansas, began catering to the needs of the trail drivers. Only one or two stores existed in Fort Worth in 1868 when some of the first herds passed through, but merchants quickly grasped the opportunity. Tarrant County already supplied a ranching district to the west as well. Aggressive cattle buyers from the North soon came to Fort Worth to meet trail herds on their way to Kansas to gain an advantage over other buyers. They would persuade some of the already weary drovers to sell out early and save themselves the trouble of going on into

---

4 He was T. C. Irby, a retired cattleman. Verna Elizabeth Berrong, "History of Tarrant County From Its Beginning Until 1875" (Masters thesis, Texas Christian University, 1938), p. 59.


the dangerous Indian Territory. The buyers then grouped several herds together and finished the trip.\(^7\)

Actually, a meat packing industry flourished in Texas during these early trail driving days, one which later generations mostly have ignored because it lacked the romance of the trail drives and excitement at railhead cattle towns. Longhorn cattle existed in such numbers for a time in South Texas that men slaughtered them solely for their hides and tallow. As early as 1854 Richard King and his associates slaughtered thousands of cattle for hide and tallow alone and shipped them from Corpus Christi and Rockport. Before the Civil War, two packing plants operated at Fulton; one canned fish and green sea turtle, and the other packed beef in salt. By 1868 a packing business began at Indianola.\(^8\)

The process of salting and packing the meat in large barrels to preserve it gave the meat packing industry its name. Census figures from 1870 reveal fifteen packing plants in Texas with their output accounting for over two-thirds of all factory packed beef in the United States. They grossed over a million dollars.\(^9\) A visitor to Texas just a year


\(^8\)"Texas' First Packing Plant," The Cattleman 16(January 1930):41-43.

later estimated, although he probably exaggerated, that twice as many packeries existed.\textsuperscript{10} Texas folklorist and folk historian J. Frank Dobie has estimated that in 1872 the two ports of Rockport and Corpus Christi sent out nearly 300,000 cow hides. He wrote that no possible way exists for knowing the correct figures of cattle sold for hides and tallow, and some of them for meat, but the total amounted to "many hundreds of thousands." In some years it amounted to more than were being driven north to Kansas, he believed.\textsuperscript{11}

By 1875 almost all of the dozen or more factories in South Texas that killed mostly for hide and tallow had disappeared, and by 1880 only three remained in operation.\textsuperscript{12} By the latter date the trail drives had become more popular, but mainly cattle had become too valuable to kill only for their hides and tallow. Also, the mildness of the southern climate precluded the use of natural ice as a refrigerant. Plants in South Texas existed too far away from the great consuming centers of meat, and railroad development came too late in that section to be of any help.\textsuperscript{13}


\textsuperscript{11} J. Frank Dobie, \textit{A Vaquero of the Brush Country} (Dallas: The Southwest Press, 1929), pp. 21, 24-27.


What really killed the fledgling Texas beef packing industry in the 1870's, some historians believe, was that cattlemen could make quicker profits by trailing cattle northward with little capital invested. Cattle traveled on their own power, ate free grass, and drank free water. Therefore, from 1867 to 1885, trail driving became important until finally barbed wire fences or state laws against Texas cattle brought it to an end. If barbed wire fences had become prevalent ten years earlier, these infant meat packing establishments in South Texas might have survived and given Texas a permanent lead in the beef packing industry of the United States.14

Of course, Fort Worth might not have obtained a share of that, for the direction would have been southward toward the coast. If enough Texas cattlemen, however, had not been blinded by the quick profits of trail driving to Kansas and had invested in packing plants at Fort Worth—as citizens of that city urged—then the city might have surpassed Chicago in meat packing. The trailing of herds, a business enterprise destined to cease, actually proved short-sighted economically.15 Ironically, Texas cattle, shipped or driven northward after the Civil War, made Chicago into a successful


packing town. If all those cattle had stayed in Texas and had been packed in the state, Texas would have become the packing center of the nation. Texas cattle, then, shipped or driven through Fort Worth, helped make Chicago the major cattle trading center. A quarter of a century later, however, a couple of successful Chicago packers, Armour and Swift, returned the favor as they came to Fort Worth and assured its success as a market center. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company became the largest livestock center in the Southwest and remained so for at least five decades.

While Texas cattlemen individually may have continued to drive herds northward to Kansas markets, the farsighted ones considered establishing packing plants in North or Central Texas and discussed this possibility at various cattlemen's conventions. The progressive business leaders of Fort Worth did not ignore the idea either. A railroad, however, had to be the first priority for the community already called "Cowtown."

As early as 13 November 1858 a dream of a Fort Worth railroad began forming when citizens in a mass meeting in the county courthouse adopted a resolution to ask the Houston and Texas Central and the Southern Pacific to bring their railroads to Fort Worth and make it a junction point. Ephraim M. Daggett served as chairman of the meeting and

---

Captain J. C. Terrell became the secretary. During the next few years, the rumors of a coming railroad helped double the population of Fort Worth. The United States Congress on 3 March 1871 granted a charter to a new railroad company, the Texas and Pacific, to be built along the thirty-second parallel route from Marshall to San Diego. The Texas legislature then authorized cities and counties the power to grant bonuses to railroads.

Colonel Thomas A. Scott, president of the Texas and Pacific, came to Fort Worth 20 June 1872 with one of the directors, John W. Forney, to look for roadsites and to get the citizens to pledge $100,000 to bring the train to their city. Colonel Scott told the Fort Worthians that he wanted 320 acres of land south of town. By that evening four citizens signed a note promising that amount.

Fort Worth people began bragging about having several proposed railroad lines going out from the city, and editor Paddock placed a map in the 26 June 1873 Democrat with Fort Worth as a large circle in the center of several North Texas

---


cities. Seven imaginary railroad lines led into the circle. Writers in many other Texas papers ridiculed Paddock's "tarantula" map, especially after the Jay Cooke failure in the fall of 1873 halted railroad building. Paddock called the Cooke failure a "dark day for Fort Worth" as people left the city in great numbers. In fact, the spring cattle drive remained as the only business left to the aspiring city. Business and development died. An 1873 population of four thousand dropped to one thousand within a few months.

Major K. M. Van Zandt headed a delegation of Fort Worth citizens to Marshall to interview the Texas and Pacific officials. The latter told the Fort Worth delegation that the work could not be completed since the railroad could buy rails on credit but did not have the money for grading. Major Van Zandt decided to direct the people of Fort Worth to do the grading, taking as their compensation a lien on the railroad. Several men created a company, the Tarrant County Construction Company, with Van Zandt as president.

---

20 Paddock, Early Days in Fort Worth, pp. 6-7.  
The State of Texas provided a land grant of sixteen sections to the railroad for each mile of track laid, conditioned on its being completed from Dallas to Fort Worth by 1 January 1874. The legislature later extended the time for a year. Then the Constitutional Convention of 1875 became impatient with the lack of progress, and issued an ultimatum that unless the railroad began serving Fort Worth by the day in 1876 that the first legislature held under the new constitution adjourned, the state would reclaim the right-of-way.\textsuperscript{23}

In order to meet the challenge, the Tarrant County Construction Company, organized in October, 1875, planned to grade the line of the railroad along the course of the survey from Fort Worth eastward until a junction was met with the existing railroad. By May, 1876, the Texas and Pacific Railroad had disposed of sufficient bonds so it could lay the rails and equip the part of the road constructed by the Tarrant company.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{23}1873 Tex. Gen. Laws, ch. 108, sect. 2 at 318, vol. 7; H. Gammel, Laws of Texas 1018 (1898). See also Paddock, Early Days in Fort Worth, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{24}Paddock, A Twentieth Century History, 1:183-84. The story persists in numerous secondary sources that the city government, fearing that the railroad would not make it to Fort Worth, passed an ordinance extending the city limits eastward by one-fourth mile to meet the railroad. No such ordinance exists, nor do minutes of city council meetings reflect such an action. Fort Worth, City Ordinances, A, (1873-1879), pp. 1-125; also Fort Worth, City Council, Minutes, Book A. (1873-1878), pp. 123-79.
Another threat to Fort Worth's dream of a railroad came when the Texas legislature neared adjournment in July before the railroad had reached the city limits. The Senate began debating a general railroad bill that would extend the time for completion to thirty days past adjournment. The Senate passed the bill and sent it to the House, but Fort Worth did not need it, for the train reached Fort Worth's Main and Front (now Lancaster) streets at 11:23 a.m. on 19 July 1876 with the legislature still in session. Most of the citizens had pitched in to help with the men working around the clock and the women bringing coffee and food to the workers. When the train arrived, a twelve-piece band and a huge crowd greeted it.

Apparently the first load of cattle ever shipped out of Fort Worth in a cattle car left 6 September 1876 and

25. The Fort Worth Democrat, 22 July 1876, p. 1; and ibid., 26 July 1876, p. 1.

26. Paddock, editor of the Democrat at the time the railroad arrived, should have looked back into his own newspaper files when he wrote his books about early Fort Worth some three decades later. He related the story that the representative to the state legislature from Tarrant County, Nicholas Darnell, was ill and had to be carried onto the House floor on a cot each day for fifteen days to vote "no" to adjournment until the railroad reached Fort Worth. Darnell may well have voted that way on something crucial, but not on adjournment. The legislature had much unfinished business which it did not complete until 21 August 1876, over a month after the first train arrived in Fort Worth. Paddock, Early Days in Fort Worth, pp. 11-12. See also The Daily Fort Worth Democrat, 23 August 1876, p. 1.

27. From Ox-Teams to Eagles. Texas and Pacific Railway Co., n.p. n.d., p. 22
consisted of twenty-three animals owned by Colonel J. F. Swayne who received a little over $10 per head for them.28 That same month the Texas and Pacific officials began building cattle pens in Fort Worth to take care of animals delayed in transit because of lack of cars. When drovers saw that a place to hold cattle existed, they halted herds that had started up the trail, ordering them to be sold and shipped from Fort Worth. Cattle commission businesses developed as men within the city bought and sold cattle.29 A stockyards had come to Fort Worth.

While the population of the area in 1876 had been so sparse that only one house existed between Fort Worth and Weatherford, Fort Worth trebled her population within ninety days after the arrival of the railroad.30 People continually thought about making Fort Worth a meat packing center, even

28 "Old Sales Slip Tells Story of First Carload of Cattle From Ft. Worth," The Stockman-Journal, 30 December 1908, p. 3.

29 Clarence Arnold Thompson, "Some Factors Contributing to the Growth of Fort Worth" (Masters thesis, University of Texas, 1933), p. 70. One of the earliest commission companies was that of E. M. Daggett, called by some the "Father of Fort Worth" because he did so much in the first four decades of the growth of the city to foster progress and make it a meat packing center. "E. M. Daggett, Veteran Cowman Reviews City's Early History," North Fort Worth Sunday News, 17 December 1911, p. 9.

though the city grew as a shipping point once the railroad came.

In 1877, the first full year Fort Worth had a railroad, 51,923 head of cattle left the city by rail, but that number represented only a small fraction of the trail herds that came through. The railroads did not have enough stock cars to carry them all. The major factor, however, was cost; it remained cheaper to walk cattle to Kansas.31

Gustavus Swift pioneered the idea of slaughtering cattle and shipping the meat eastward in a refrigerator car a decade earlier than the 13 May 1877 first attempt from Fort Worth occurred.32 That same year one of the largest cattle commission companies in the nation, Hunter, Evans and Company, opened a branch office in Fort Worth.33 With the railroad in town, things seemed to be looking up for Fort Worth, but not for long.

While in 1876 Fort Worth had twice as many cattle go through the city on trail drives as Fort Griffin, by 1877 and 1878, Fort Griffin emerged as a strong competitor. In 1879 half the cattle traveled through Fort Griffin. In the spring of 1879 Fort Worth leaders sent men down the trail to get

33 Skaggs, The Cattle-Trailing Industry, p. 82.
cattlemen to use the old Fort Worth route. Solicitors for the big grocery stores of the city met the herds on the trail several miles south of Fort Worth with bottles of whiskey and boxes of cigars as gifts.\textsuperscript{34} It would have been a shame for the city residents to work desperately for the railroad and then let the cattle traffic bypass them one hundred miles to the west. Fort Worthians still possessed dreams of larger stockyards and packing plants for their city, so they had to keep the cattle coming through.

Certainly the need existed for some type of packing plant in North Texas as northern quarantine laws against Texas cattle carrying Texas fever began to restrict the ability of herdsmen to drive their cattle into Kansas. In addition, the high shipping rate on the railroad lines hampered small shippers, and prices on northern markets often proved uncertain and unsatisfactory.\textsuperscript{35} Shrinkage also became a problem for cattle shipped long distances on the rails, but with a home market, this loss could be reduced. In addition, the Texas producers wished to escape from what they began to call the domination of the meat trust centered in Chicago.\textsuperscript{36}


\textsuperscript{36} Bennett, "History of the Cattle Trade in Fort Worth," pp. 31-33.
Newspaper editor Paddock had been begging for a packing plant to be built in Fort Worth since 1875 when he proclaimed in the Democrat that "there is no reason why Fort Worth should not become the great cattle center of Texas." First apparent attempts for a packing concern in Fort Worth came in 1881 when W. E. Richardson, an East St. Louis capitalist, first traveled to Dallas to establish a pork packery. Paddock heard he was there and went to Dallas to find Richardson and lure him to Fort Worth. Richardson wanted six acres of free land for his plant, but the people of Dallas apparently showed little interest. Paddock told Richardson that if he would come to Fort Worth, all he need do was select the site and the deed to the land would be in his hands in an hour. Paddock promised a $10,000 bonus as well. Richardson followed Paddock westward across the Trinity and picked out the land he wanted. Fortunately for Paddock and his promise, the land belonged to John Peter Smith, another city promoter who immediately deeded the land to Richardson. The packery got its first shipment of hogs on 11 December 1881. Since Richardson only planned to slaughter hogs and they were somewhat scarce in Texas, his plant soon closed.

37 "Texas Cattle," The Fort Worth Democrat, 21 April 1875, p. 3.

38 Charter No. 1490, The Fort Worth Packing Company, filed 29 December 1881, Office of Secretary of State, Austin, Texas. Richardson called his company The Fort Worth Packing
Getting a packing plant in Texas was not a notion held exclusively by Fort Worth businessmen. In 1882 cattlemen of a Central Texas cattle raisers association made a decision at their annual meeting held in Austin to build a refrigerated packing house somewhere in Texas.39

That same year David Higgs of Cincinnati proposed to ship refrigerated and slaughtered beef east from various points in Texas. One of his relatives, A. F. Higgs, would be involved in the Texas operation. Higgs agreed to build a refrigerator plant at Victoria at a cost of $50,000 and ship the processed meat to New Orleans. In July, 1883, the Victoria Packing Company agreed to establish a second plant in Fort Worth. The city proposed a subscription of $60,000, the actual cost of the Victoria works. Two months later the Continental Beef Company, Fort Worth's subsidiary of the Victoria plant, raised its capital stock to $120,000 and planned to erect the works at once. Slaughtering was to begin in January, 1884. The company purchased twenty-seven acres in the southeast part of the city and began construction.40

---

39 Jon McConal, "Smell of livestock was pleasant odor to city's economy," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 6 August 1978, sect. a, p. 1.

The Fort Worth plant was to be capable of turning out 300 dressed beeves, 100 sheep, and 100 calves per day to be shipped first to New Orleans and to points in the south-east. Six Fort Worth men, including John Peter Smith, served as directors for the Fort Worth branch of the company. It actually opened for business 4 February 1884 but went into receivership before the year was out. Later when the Victoria plant went broke, Fort Worth stockholders began to suspect that the Victoria plant already had been in financial trouble and only recruited the Fort Worth stockholders to use their money to prop their business up a little longer. Fort Worth men believed that they had been the object of misrepresentation. They also contended that excessive freight rates and discrimination against Fort Worth had hurt the refrigerator works.

Businessmen knew they had the cattle available if they could get a local packing company to process them. Some cattlemen estimated that 350,000 head left Texas by trail

drives in 1882 and that 240,000 would do so in 1883. The number kept dwindling because of fences, civilization, the railroad, and other factors.  

A local Fort Worth man named Isaac Dahlman leased the refrigerator works from the defunct company and planned to reopen it on 15 May 1885. It closed down in the latter part of the year and remained closed in 1886.

While Isaac Dahlman negotiated to buy the plant and reopen it, other local citizens became active. By June, 1885 they raised subscriptions to assure the construction of a railroad to Waxahachie to connect with the Huntington railroad system. They also planned a railroad to Brownwood. In addition, Fort Worthians furnished money to assure the erection of a cotton mill and induced other businesses to come to Fort Worth. More stockyards were built near the railroads as well. George and June Polk, two brothers, apparently built the first commercial stockyards during 1885, locating it about a mile south of the Texas and Pacific station, east of the railroad tracks and about three blocks.

46Texas Live Stock Journal, 5 May 1883, p. 12.
49"Fort Worth Enterprise," Texas Live Stock Journal, 13 June 1885, p. 4.
east of Main Street. In fact, four different stockyards existed near the railroads by mid-April, 1886. The city still did not have a meat packing concern in late 1887, but thirteen Texas cattlemen, ten of whom were from Fort Worth, attempted to remedy that fact by raising $100,000 to capitalize the Fort Worth Refrigerating and Export Meat Company which they incorporated at Austin, filing the charter on 16 June 1888. They were among the various Texas cattlemen who had experienced so much trouble with the railroads and Chicago markets that they practically declared a war of


51 Andrews Brothers and Company built the fourth one two blocks from Main St. covering an entire block. "New Stock Yards," Texas Live Stock Journal, 17 April 1886, p. 4. Other stockyards consisted of the pens constructed near the railroad.


independence from Chicago and swore they would campaign for a larger stockyards and a packing plant in Fort Worth.

Meanwhile, Isaac Dahlman kept trying. He talked to agents of a Metropolitan Trading Company of London, England that wanted to purchase 200 dressed Texas beeves a day. The agent negotiated with a packing plant in Columbus and the Victoria and Fort Worth Continental Beef plants. All three concerns discussed joining together to fulfill the British contract. 54 At a March, 1890 cattlemen's convention, Dahlman explained his situation and asked the men to help support his meat packing project. They agreed, formed a committee of Charles Goodnight, H. B. Stoddard, Ike T. Pryor, and R. E. Maddox, the latter of Fort Worth, to examine the three refrigerator plants at Victoria, Columbus, and Fort Worth. 55 They planned to buy all three plants and issue stock to the owners in a new company to be called the Texas Dressed Beef and Packing Company. The committee deemed Dahlman's plant less valuable than the Victoria and Columbus plants and offered him so little that he refused to sell. They then planned to build a new plant at the new Union Stock Yards in Fort Worth. 56 Dahlman pulled out of the combination and

56"The Refrigerators," Texas Live Stock Journal, 12 April 1890, p. 10. The creation of the Union Stock Yards will be discussed presently.
planned to carry out one-third of the London contract by himself. The cattlemen soon lost interest and gave up on the new company, especially after the owner of the Columbus plant was killed.\textsuperscript{57} This left Dahlman with the entire contract from the Metropolitan Trading Company of London to buy 200 head of dressed cattle per day. Since Dahlman could not get the backing in Fort Worth, he went East, got financing, formed the Dahlman Dressed Beef Company, repaired the old Continental Beef Company plant, and began operations the first week of November 1890.\textsuperscript{58} He shipped the dressed beef to Liverpool, via Galveston, but the meat spoiled and thus ended Dahlman's meat packing career.\textsuperscript{59}

Other efforts continued, however, which somewhat offset Dahlman's failure to bring a successful meat packing concern to the city. Local businessmen incorporated a Union Stock Yards and along with it chartered a packing company which

\textsuperscript{57}He was Col. R. E. Stafford. "Refrigeration in Texas," Fort Worth Daily Gazette, 5 November 1890, as cited in Research Data, vol. 39, pp. 15494-95.

\textsuperscript{58}Hendricks, "The History of Cattle and Oil in Tarrant County," pp. 17-18; also "Refrigeration in Texas," Fort Worth Daily Gazette, 5 November 1890; also "The Refrigerator Goes," Texas Live Stock Journal, 8 November 1890, p. 7. As a memento of the occasion of the slaughter of the first cattle for the Dahlman plant on 4 November 1890, Mr. George Barnum presented the Gazette reporter with the horns from the first steer slaughtered. They measured four feet from tip to tip. "The Dahlman Beef Refrigerator Company of This City Began Operations Yesterday," Fort Worth Daily Gazette, 5 November 1890, part 2, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{59}Hendricks, "The History of Cattle and Oil in Tarrant County," p. 18.
they called the Fort Worth Dressed Meat and Beef Company. Fort Worth businessmen guessed that 1.5 million cattle ranged within a 100 mile radius of Fort Worth, representing probably more than in any other such circle in the nation. So these difficult-to-discourage men worked from 1887 to 1890 to capitalize both a meat processing plant, which they often called a refrigerator, and a stockyards. Both efforts operated simultaneously, and many of the same cattlemen and businessmen contributed money to both. The efforts to establish the packing company, which cooperated partly with the cattlemen's association's efforts, and the creation of the Union Stock Yards are particularly important because they formed the nucleus in the North Side area of Fort Worth for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and for the big Chicago packers who would eventually come.

The Union Stock Yards obtained its charter first, on 26 July 1887. Organizers fought hard and gained a right-of-way from the Union railroad depot to the yards. By late December, 1887, businessmen and railroad interests raised $30,000 in a few hours to complete the $200,000


61 Charter No. 3402, Fort Worth Union Stock Yards Company, filed 26 July 1887, Office of Secretary of State, Austin, Texas. Incorporators included John Peter Smith, Morgan Jones, and J. W. Burgess.

capital fund for the yards. Officers of the Union Stock Yards Company included J. W. Burgess, president, and Colonel R. E. Maddox, secretary. Problems caused slow progress, forcing the company to reorganize late in 1888. The Fort Worth Union Stock Yards entered into agreements with railroads such as the Fort Worth and Denver City Railway to give them a right-of-way for one dollar if they would build to the Union Stock Yards. Officials made the same agreement with the St. Louis, Arkansas and Texas Railway in Texas on 22 January 1889. Not until mid-summer 1889 were the yards ready to receive stock for feeding purposes. New officers at that time were John R. Hoxie, president; H. C. Holloway, superintendent; and A. T. Byers, secretary.


65Copy of an agreement between Fort Worth Union Stock Yards and Fort Worth and Denver City Railway, 5 August 1890, Fort Worth and Denver City Railroad folder, Gary Havard Personal Collection, Fort Worth, Texas. Fort Worth gained materially when the Fort Worth and Denver City Railway completed its tracks through the Panhandle to Fort Worth in 1888 for it wiped out the cattle trails. While it aided materially the development of Fort Worth as a cattle concentration center, cattle continued to pass through the city to the packeries of the North, for the local packeries were not yet prepared to handle the volume. Thompson, "Some Factors Contributing to the Growth of Fort Worth," p. 78.

66"Union Stock Yards at Fort Worth, Texas," Texas Live Stock Journal, 13 April 1889, p. 10.
The Union Stock Yards occupied 258 acres of land with three-quarters of a mile of Trinity River frontage and a capacity of 5,000 cattle, 10,000 sheep, and 20,000 hogs. The two-story exchange building stood 64 feet wide and 174 feet long. In it operated a bank, livestock offices, a kitchen, dining room, a wash room, and accommodations for 100 men to remain overnight. Twelve offices existed for commission men. By 15 July electric street cars operated to the yards and on 1 September 1889 the sale of horses, mules, cattle, hogs, and sheep began. Two Fort Worth newspapers even called for a livestock show to be held at the new stockyards in mid-summer 1889, but apparently none materialized.

In the decade beginning in 1890, packeries became established in Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, Waco, El Paso, and many smaller places. The largest in the state was at Houston, and all existed independently of northern

---


interests. Contributing to this trend were desires to avoid dependence on the Chicago meat packers, the development of railroads, the establishment of cotton seed oil mills over the state, and the beginning and growth of the practice of feeding cottonseed cake as a cattle feed.\textsuperscript{69}

Even butchers urged localities like Fort Worth to establish packeries. The Butchers' National Association met in Cincinnati in 1890 and in a spirited address S. D. McCormick urged the organization to appoint a committee to try to "devise some concert of action between cattle producers and consumers, especially in counties or cities threatened by the combine,"\textsuperscript{70} meaning the Big Four meat packers. The butchers made arrangement with Texas cattlemen to establish "abattoirs and packing houses on a large scale in Texas."\textsuperscript{71} They talked of Dallas, Fort Worth, or Austin as possible sites. The project fell through, probably more because of the depressed condition of cattle than anything else.\textsuperscript{72}


\textsuperscript{70} The Big Four refers to the four largest Chicago meat packers, Armour, Swift, Morris, and Hammond. Hammond later was absorbed by the other three, and Cudahy became the fourth. These will be discussed in more detail in Chapter III. James Cox, ed., \textit{Historical and Biographical Record of the Cattle Industry and the Cattlemen of Texas and Adjacent Territory} (1895; reprint ed., New York: Antiquarian Press, Ltd., 1959), pp. 165-66.

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.  \textsuperscript{72} Ibid.
Fort Worth city fathers carried through with their own plans. The directors of the Union Stock Yards which had been operating only a short time, met on 6 February 1890 at the Mechanics and Farmers Bank and formed the Fort Worth Dressed Meat and Packing Company. The place of business would be at the Union Stock Yards, and the men agreed upon a charter that would run for fifty years, providing a capital of $500,000. Incorporators included Robert McCart, R. E. Maddox, John R. Hoxie, Tobe Johnson, J. C. McCarthy, M. G. Ellis, A. T. Byers, E. B. Harold, and S. D. Rainey. They voted that a majority of the capital stock should be held in Fort Worth "in order that no buying-out scheme" could be worked by enemies of the company. They planned to let the contracts in March to construct the largest fertilizer, smokehouse, and packery in the Southwest at an estimated cost of $350,000.

Seven men at the 6 February 1890 meeting subscribed $115,000 of the stock of the new company. After the meeting they called on enough other interested businessmen to swell

---

73 The men ran into problems getting the $500,000 in capital stock and never filed a charter for the Fort Worth Dressed Meat and Beef Company. Patricia Camtrell, Certifying Clerk, Secretary of State's Office, Austin, Texas, to Author 22 May 1981.

74 "It Is A Go," *Fort Worth Daily Gazette*, 7 February 1890, p. 3.

the total to $190,000. They at first saw no problem in getting the authorized capital, but apparently later problems developed, for most of the same men chartered a new company, the Fort Worth Packing Company 30 April 1890 with a capital stock of $200,000.  

Colonel Hoxie met a young man named Verner S. Wardlaw in Kansas City where the latter clerked in the Armour Banking Company. Hoxie persuaded Wardlaw to move to Fort Worth as office manager of the packing plant. The young man shortly thereafter arrived in Fort Worth to help oversee construction.

By 21 November 1890, only two weeks after the Isaac Dahlman plant began operations, the Fort Worth Packing Company opened for business but did not run to full capacity. In the first month, however, it processed 8,340 hogs worth $50,000 and some cattle. The local newspaper boasted that the plant gave "the stockraisers a market equal to Chicago or St. Louis."  


77 Written transcript of a 1915 interview with Verner S. Wardlaw (1861-1924) about the History of the Packing Plant Industry in Fort Worth. Copy in author's possession.

78 "Livestock News," The Fort Worth Gazette, 21 December 1890, p. 11.
Representatives of the Union Stock Yards met with Fort Worth Packing Company people on 17 April 1891 and agreed that all livestock shipped to the Fort Worth Packing Company would go through the stockyards which would charge them no "more than the prices charged the general public for handling such stock." The stockyards company gave land to the packing company in exchange for the agreement. The directors of both companies terminated the agreement 28 May 1892 because the Fort Worth Packing Company was trying to negotiate bonds and found the arrangement to be a hindrance.

As early as 1890-91 a problem emerged that indicated why Fort Worth did not become an even greater packing center than it eventually did. The problem: not enough hogs. The Fort Worth Packing Company considered slaughtering only hogs, abandoning beef packing to the refrigerator in the southeast part of the city, the Dahlman facility. Hogs, however, never materialized in sufficient numbers to keep a packing plant in full operation. A 17 May 1890 editorial urged "... if the farmers of Texas do not raise the hogs to keep their packeries running and maintain their markets, the loss will

79 Copy of an agreement between Board of Directors of Fort Worth Union Stock Yards Company and the Fort Worth Packing Company, 28 May 1892, Union Stock Yards Folder, Havard Collection.

80 Ibid.

be their own." Managers of the Fort Worth Packing Company sent circulars to the farmers and stockmen of Texas pointing out the advantages of the local market and urging them to go more largely into the swine business. They assumed that in a few years Texas would become one of the leading swine-producing states in the union.

Packing facilities also existed in Dallas. The plants in Fort Worth and Dallas had a combined capacity of one thousand to fifteen hundred hogs a day and could handle all the hogs offered for sale in Texas. The Fort Worth Packing Company did not completely abandon beef packing, for in December, 1890, they killed four hundred cattle and eleven hundred hogs.

A year later a local stock journal editor lamented that the Fort Worth packing concern reluctantly paid from $75,000 to $100,000 monthly to Kansas farmers for their hogs in order to keep the packing company open. They would rather pay the money to Texas farmers who "should plant less cotton and more corn."

---

84 Texas Live Stock Journal, 12 July 1890, p. 8.
Colonel Hoxie hired a man named Len Hackett to canvass Texas for hogs for the packing plant. He found a number in Llano County and shipped 250 to 300 head per car to Fort Worth. The native hogs were small and could escape from the pens, so the stockyards company had to rebuild all the pens to keep them enclosed.\textsuperscript{87} The company operated on borrowed capital at 12 percent interest.\textsuperscript{88}

Good news came early in April, 1891, when the Fort Worth Packing Company obtained a meat contract to supply beef to Texas military posts. On 11 April, work began on an addition to the local plant in anticipation of larger receipts. The market for cattle in 1891 remained poor, however, and the packing plant begged for more cattle in the stock journals all fall. Owners recapitalized the Fort Worth Packing Company at $400,000 on 28 November 1891 and added two more directors.\textsuperscript{89}

Clearly something else had to be done. The Fort Worth businessmen had poured a great deal of money into their projects. They had used the tactics of big business of overlapping directorships in the stockyards company, the packing

\textsuperscript{87} Wardlaw transcript, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., pp. 2-3.
\textsuperscript{89} Charter No. 1490, Fort Worth Packing Company, as amended, filed 28 November 1891, Office of Secretary of State, Austin, Texas.
company, and even a stockyards bank. By 1892, Fort Worth's old rival, Dallas, which owned smaller stockyards and packing plants, attempted to form a large packing plant and a stockyards with a capital stock of $500,000. A race had begun to see which city would be the most successful.

Yet the men of vision such as Daggett, Paddock, Van Zandt, and John Peter Smith knew that their hard work had changed Fort Worth from a frontier village to a city. Through the efforts of these men and many more like them they kept the trail drives from bypassing Fort Worth and brought a railroad to the city. In addition, they capitalized both a stockyards and a meat refrigeration plant that would be the forerunners of larger ones in the future. The success that the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company would ultimately achieve had not yet been realized, but it was getting closer.


CHAPTER II

NEW COMPANY FACES STRUGGLE

Fort Worth appeared to be a city on the move as the decade of the 1890's began. Property values boomed as newcomers recognized the city as the gateway to the Texas Panhandle. Besides the large Union Stock Yards two miles north of town and several smaller ones near the central railroad station, two packing plants planned to open within the year. Isaac Dahlman opened his plant in early November and the Fort Worth Packing Company began operations two weeks later. In 1890 five grain elevators existed with a capacity of 850,000 bushels a day.¹ The actual trade territory of Fort Worth in 1890 stretched some four hundred by six hundred miles, larger than that of any other Texas city.² The North Side began to shape up as the factory area of Fort Worth with the refrigerator and packery, a roller mill, a shoe factory, a wagon factory, and a barrel manufacturer.³ A Fort Worth

¹Fort Worth Gazette, 17 February 1890 as cited in Clarence Arnold Thompson, "Some Factors Contributing to the Growth of Fort Worth" (Masters thesis, University of Texas, 1933), p. 93.
²Ibid.
Board of Trade that began 31 May 1882 changed to the more permanent Chamber of Commerce in 1892.4

The 1880 population of 6,663 expanded to 23,076 by 1890.5 As the population increased in Fort Worth, so did the beef production of the state, by 51 percent.6 So much interest developed in livestock, that the Texas Live Stock Journal, published in Fort Worth, reached a circulation of eighteen thousand copies by September, 1890.7

Events of the decade, however, destroyed many of the high hopes Fort Worth businessmen held as the 1890's began. Perhaps the burning of the Spring Palace on 30 May 1890 in only its second cultural season provided a glimpse of the gloomy days to come for the city before things got better.8

---


8Colby D. Hall, Gay Nineties (San Antonio: The Naylor Co., 1961), p. 122. The Spring Palace was a two-story wooden structure of oriental and Moorish architecture built in 1889 to display Texas agricultural products raised by people from all parts of the state. When it burned 30 May 1890, the only casualty was Alfred S. Hayne who returned to the building to help others escape. Efforts to rebuild the Spring Palace failed because of the panic of 1893. See also B. B. Paddock,
A business depression, with its tight money, began a few months earlier than the 1893 panic that swept the entire country and lasted until at least 1898 in Fort Worth before things got back to normal. During that time the local men lost control of their packing plant and stockyards to outside interests, although the new owners possessed capital and influence that eventually brought in the big money that made the North Side of Fort Worth synonymous with stockyards and packing. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company emerged early in the decade as the stable and lasting business through which all of these efforts succeeded.

Uneven supplies of cattle plagued the stockyards and packing plant during the spring of 1892. The packing plant seemed at the mercy of the large Chicago packers who "not only control the principal markets of the United States, but also manipulate railroad rates to the detriment of our home institution," according to the local stock journal. The availability of refrigerator cars also often created a problem.


9 Charles Fred Laue, "Early Days in Fort Worth," typed manuscript, Local History Folder, Fort Worth Public Library, p. 63.

John R. Hoxie, who had been president of the Fort Worth Packing Company since its beginning, retired in April, 1892, citing health reasons. Mike C. Hurley, a prominent citizen and railroad contractor, replaced him. 11 Hurley apparently decided that the local plant needed more money than local interests could supply, so he traveled to Boston to urge a wealthy capitalist to visit, hoping that he would invest. 12

When Greenleif W. Simpson and his lawyer, W. O. Johnson, and others examined the yards the last week of October, 1892, more cattle than usual had accumulated in the pens. Several washouts and a railroad strike caused 500 cars of cattle to be housed in pens designed for only 150 carloads. Simpson and Johnson saw all the cattle and thought that Fort Worth was "some market." 13 Simpson served as trustee of the Bay State Cattle Company of Boston as early as 1884 and made frequent trips to Washington to urge legislation favorable


12 Ibid.

to the industry. He had apparently sold out to an English syndicate at a large price and quite possibly intended to buy the Fort Worth plant, build it up, and then sell to the same syndicate. The panic of the mid-1890's disrupted any such plans.

The local owners did not really want to sell, but a financial necessity forced them to do so. Hoxie held the entire note on the Union Stock Yards for $125,000 plus interest. Local citizens, however, realized the value to Fort Worth if someone could make a success of the stockyards and packing enterprises, so when the buyers and sellers of the Fort Worth Packing Company differed over the price by $100,000, the people of Fort Worth began to try to raise one-half the amount in hopes that would induce Simpson and his associates to accept the deal. By late December citizens had subscribed $40,000. Owners offered both the packing plant and the Union Stock Yards below cost. "It

---


15Copy of a history of the livestock industry in Fort Worth, W. L. Pier Correspondence, "Texas Industry" folder, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Hereafter cited as FWSY Co. Coll.


17"The Packing House Deal," The Texas Live Stock Journal, 16 December 1892, p. 3.
is now generally known that the packing company have lost heavily and that unless a sale can be made the establishment will soon close and suspend operation," stated the local livestock paper.  

Simpson attended a meeting of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas in 1893 and told them that many Texas cities had to secure their fresh pork and beef during the summer from Kansas City because of uneven markets in Texas. He implied that this lack of cooperation caused the preceding plant to fail and he determined not to make the same mistake. He said he wanted to build up trade within the state. Simpson promised the Texas cattle producers that if they would ship their cattle to the Fort Worth yards instead of to Kansas City, he would pay fifty cents a head more than the ruling market in Kansas City. He also promised to start a bank at the yards and to get experienced management for the stockyards and improve them. Simpson asked the cattlemen to sign pledges that they would market all their cattle at Fort Worth until 1 January 1895. Enough cattlemen signed

---

18 "The Packing House Deal," The Texas Live Stock Journal, 23 December 1892, p. 3

pledges to satisfy him.\textsuperscript{20} The Cattle Raisers Association even voted in 1893 to move its headquarters from Jacksboro to Fort Worth, apparently believing Fort Worth was destined to become the outstanding livestock center of the Southwest.\textsuperscript{21} Simpson promised that his bank would make ranch loans at 8 percent interest. Some banks had been holding out for 10 and 12 percent on cattle paper. Texas cattleman C. C. Slaughter made the motion that they sign the pledges and invite the "Yankee" entrepreneurs to Texas. "I say ask them to come here, and if we fail, we lose nothing,"\textsuperscript{22} he said.

In order to consummate the deal, and because they really had no other choice financially, the original stockyards and packing plant stockholders surrendered their stock without remuneration to the Farmers' and Mechanics National Bank of Fort Worth. They hoped that with the plant in successful

\textsuperscript{20}Proceedings, Cattle Raisers Convention, 14-15 March 1893, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., p. 8. The organization, which changed its name to Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association in 1921, is still headquartered in Fort Worth.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., pp. 6, 8, 10. Simpson and the cattlemen actually drew up a contract in which the cattle producers agreed to ship "all cattle, sheep, and hogs intended for market" to Fort Worth until 1 January 1895 and to pay customary yardage which Simpson agreed would not exceed the present rates at the Omaha Stock Yards. If the cattlemen did not ship to Fort Worth, they would pay fifty cents per head of cattle, six cents for sheep, and eight cents for hogs to Simpson for each head not shipped during that period of time. The contract would not apply until Simpson was in a position to fulfill the agreement. Ibid., p. 11.
operation they would make their money back in various ways, but apparently they did not.  

Simpson, meanwhile, set out to charter an entirely new corporation which he and his advisors chose to call the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. They chartered it in West Virginia because the tax laws for corporations proved more favorable in that state. Simpson's lawyer applied 11 February 1893 before the deal to buy the Fort Worth properties officially had materialized, but the five Chicago men who organized the new company subscribed only $500 capital stock with each holding a $100 share. If the deal had fallen through, they would not have lost much. The charter, issued 23 March 1893, authorized the company to increase the capital to one million dollars and allowed the officers to construct buildings, lease and operate railroads, electric light and power plants and waterworks—in other words, whatever they needed to do to operate. First stock certificates for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company,

---

23 Wardlaw interview typescript, p. 4.

24 Certificate of Incorporation, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Financial Records, FWSY Co. Coll.; also Corporate Record, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Fort Worth, vol. 1, pp. 1-2. Hereafter cited as Corporate Record. On 23 March 1893, the same five Chicago men also incorporated a packing company which they called Fort Worth Packing Company, a West Virginia corporation, for five hundred dollars capital stock which they planned to increase to one million dollars. Certificate of Incorporation, Fort Worth Packing Company, filed 23 March 1893, Office of Secretary of State, State of West Virginia. Copy in author's possession.
issued 29 April 1893, listed Boston as the headquarters. The
first five hundred shares went to Greenleif W. Simpson.25

When Simpson finally negotiated the deal to buy the Fort
Worth Union Stock Yards Company on 27 April 1893, he paid
$133,333.33.26 Meanwhile, the five Chicago men who chartered
the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in West Virginia met 24
April and selected Simpson as president. Two of the original
directors resigned, two Boston men replaced them, and four
other new directors joined the company, all quite possibly by
prearranged agreement. Among the new names added was
Louville V. Niles, a neighbor of Simpson in Boston.27

Simpson bought both the Fort Worth Union Stock Yards and
the Fort Worth Packing Company; then the newly organized Fort
Worth Stock Yards Company purchased both companies from
Simpson for a combined price of $350,066.66 in early
August.28 In keeping with another promise he made, Simpson
organized a new national bank, the Stock Yards National Bank,

25Certificates of Capital Stock, Fort Worth Stock Yards
Company, Havard Coll.

26Copy of an agreement by which G. W. Simpson bought the
Fort Worth Union Stock Yards 27 April 1893, Union Stock Yards
Folder, Havard Coll.

27Board of Directors Meeting, 24 April 1893, Corporate
Record, vol. 1, pp. 27-28. Niles became prominent in the
company and apparently spent more time in Fort Worth over-
seeing his interests than the other stockholders. Since the
1860's he had been a leader in the Boston meat business and
was president of the Boston Packing and Provision Company.

28Board of Directors Meeting, 8 August 1893, Corporate
Record, vol. 1, p. 36.
on 27 March 1893 with $250,000, and offered to lend money to stockmen. Citizens realized its creation was an outgrowth of the packery deal. 29

The packing company had been closed several weeks when Simpson finally concluded the deal. Simpson and his partners planned to begin operations in mid-May; 30 then they announced a 1 July date, 31 but the plant actually did not open until 4 December 1893. At that time Simpson and his associates appeared to local citizens to be "thoroughly familiar with all details of operation" and could buy all hogs offered. They could not buy all cattle, but promised to have buyers there from eastern markets who would be able to purchase them. The local livestock journal accurately predicted that "The success of this enterprise depends mainly on the cooperation of the stock raiser, and nothing which has ever been done in the state would be of such an advantage to the stock growers as the establishment of a permanent home market." 32


31 "Home Markets," Texas Live Stock and Farm Journal, 2 June 1893, p. 3.

Simpson also made contacts with commission firms to come to Fort Worth in 1893.\textsuperscript{33}

Some accounts show that producers responded so well to such pleas by the local stock journal and by the packing company that the plant could not handle all the trade and could not make cash payments the same day as the sale, so the producers began shipping to Chicago and Kansas City again.\textsuperscript{34} Stockmen apparently lacked the patience to be loyal to a home market long enough to help it succeed. The producers' self-interest and the Fort Worth market's welfare would have to coincide before they would support it completely.

As Simpson and his associates attempted to develop a Fort Worth market, they faced such problems as the management mistakes of the previous owners, financial depression, scarcity of hogs in Texas, unjust discrimination in railroad freight rates, opposition of rival concerns, and general lack of confidence among the public in any new enterprise until it proved itself. Many local people feared that Simpson and his friends had only bought the stockyards for speculation, which quite possibly was the case originally; however, Simpson claimed that he "took Omaha out of a worse position than the Fort Worth plant had ever been in and put

\begin{quote}

34Bennett, "History of the Cattle Trade in Fort Worth," p. 42.
\end{quote}
her on her feet." To complicate matters, rumors circulated that Armour planned to establish a packing plant in Dallas, just thirty miles to the east.

While Simpson continued to operate the packing plant at a loss, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company fared somewhat better because a stockyards made its profits from the feed sold while cattle remained in pens and from various other yardage fees. Commission houses and traders paid for use of the pens that the stockyards owned and rented out. The company also owned the central exchange building and leased office space. Large ranch owners preferred to sell to representatives of northern packing houses because they received better prices for their cattle, but they used the facilities at the stockyards. In fact, the lunch counter at the Stockyards Hotel remained open all night as of March, 1894.

Nevertheless, the directors worried about their ability to make their investment work. In the summer of 1894 they

---


37 Harold L. Oppenheimer, Cowboy Arithmetic Cattle As An Investment (Danville, Ill.: The Interstate, 1964), p. 130.

brought in a new manager for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, W. E. Skinner, formerly of the Union Stock Yards of South Omaha. Skinner immediately wrote a letter in the area stock journal urging Texas stockmen to support the Fort Worth market. He assured them that the owners wanted to build up the market, and the money they had poured into it proved this fact. A man referred to as Ward became the new head of the packing house.

Summer receipts in 1894 seemed promising, for on several occasions the Fort Worth market sold more livestock in one day than Chicago. Farmers in Texas, however, hesitated to go all out to raise hogs in 1894 because they could not be sure the packing plant would be permanent. The previous one had closed, they recollected. They feared no market would exist when their hogs became fat and ready, so many held off for a while.

Texas cattlemen from various parts of the state purchased stock in the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in 1894-95, but only for token amounts, usually only five to ten shares, with many purchasing only one. Ike T. Pryor of Columbus

40 Ibid.
bought one share; Winfield Scott and Samuel Burk Burnett of
Fort Worth purchased ten, as did Christopher Columbus
Slaughter of Dallas. These shares sold for $100 each.43
Greenleif W. Simpson and Louville V. Niles, both of Boston,
owned most of the shares.

One of the earliest local commission companies to incor-
porate for the purpose of buying and selling livestock on the
Fort Worth market originated as the Fort Worth Live Stock
Commission Company, organized in 1895 by William Hunter,
George Beggs, and James D. Farmer.44

Late in 1895 Simpson told the local stock journal that
Texas ranked as the largest cattle feeding state in the union
and in 1894 was fourth in hog production. He estimated that
in 1895 Texas would be second in hogs. Simpson believed that
in less than three years Texas could be first in hogs and
predicted that Texas would become a "second Chicago in the
packing and provision business."45 His words constituted a

43Certificates of Capital Stock, Fort Worth Stock Yards
Company, Havard Coll.

44William Hunter McLean to Tom B. Saunders, 7 February
1974, Tom B. Saunders Jr. Collection, Texas Christian Univer-
sity Special Collections, Fort Worth, Texas. Hereafter cited
as Saunders Coll. Descendants of these men still operated one
of the five commission firms in existence at the yards in the
summer of 1981. As of 1896 numerous commission firms existed
in Fort Worth according to comments made at the Twentieth
Annual Convention of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas,
10-11 March 1896, p. 16.

45"Texas Second in Hogs," Texas Stock and Farm Journal,
8 November 1895, p. 3.
pep talk to encourage more business and to usher in the new packing concern that Simpson intended to bring in to operate the old Fort Worth Packing Company. At the 30 October 1895 board of directors meeting of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, held as usual in Chicago, Simpson and the other directors drafted a contract between the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and a new company to be organized as the Chicago and Fort Worth Packing Company. William J. Dee of Chicago agreed to organize the packing concern on or before 1 January 1896.46

They arranged with the Chicago Packing and Provision Company, jobbers of packing house products, to organize the new company and to take over the Simpson and Niles plant. The contract provided that the Chicago concern operate the plant and stockyards for five years. At the end of five years plans called for the Chicago backers to receive the packing plant and Simpson and Niles the stockyards. Joe Googins, son of one of the vice presidents of the Chicago Provision Company, who had come south for his health about this time, became head buyer for the Chicago and Fort Worth Packing Company. Henry Botsford served as president of the parent company in Chicago, while Dee, one of the vice presidents, presided over the Fort Worth branch.47

46 Board of Directors Meeting, 30 October 1895, Corporate Record, vol. 1, pp. 66, 74.
47 "History of livestock industry in Fort Worth," FWSY Co. Coll., p. 5.
Dee wasted no time. By mid-November news circulated that the new packing company would employ three hundred people at $12 per week, or a payroll of $3,600 per week or $200,000 per year for the city. The plant would need one thousand cattle a week and one thousand hogs per day. The packing plant could handle twenty thousand hogs a week if it received them, so farmers need never fear not having a market, Dee explained. "North Fort Worth expects to be a city of 5,000 population within the next five years," stated a spokesman who even predicted, accurately as it turned out, that "In a few years Fort Worth will be the third largest livestock market in the United States." These statistics, however, remained dreams for a more distant future.

The four-story rock buildings of the Chicago and Fort Worth Packing Company sat on twelve acres near the stockyards and near a railroad. Dee employed two hundred people by mid-February 1896.

At a June 1896 board of directors meeting in Boston the president of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Simpson, gained authorization to build a belt railroad to connect with


the Texas and Pacific and the Missouri, Kansas and Texas railways at a price not exceeding $15,000. Directors also authorized him to spend $85 per week to publish a semi-weekly newspaper at the stockyards. Consequently, the first number of the Fort Worth Live Stock Reporter appeared 16 July 1896 with the general manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, W. E. Skinner, as ex-officio general manager of the newspaper. Simpson became president and Skinner became general manager of the newly-constructed railway.

The year 1896 became a red letter one in Fort Worth, for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company began a fat stock show which continues to the present day as the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show and Rodeo. Billed as the first indoor rodeo and the oldest and largest fat stock show in continuous existence in the nation, this prestigious show remains one of the largest attractions in the city of Fort Worth each year.

50 Board of Directors Meeting, 9 June 1896, Corporate Record, vol. 1, p. 85, also copy of an agreement between St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company of Texas and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Belt Railway Company, 25 September 1896, Havard Coll.


53 "Fort Worth Market," Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 10 July 1896, p. 2.
C. C. French became a solicitor or public relations agent for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company almost from its beginning. Early in 1896 French met Charles McFarland of Weatherford with whom he discussed a depressing cattle situation at that time. McFarland suggested a fat stock show to encourage business. French, who related the story later, remembered confessing that the idea did not appeal to him at first because they had no fat stock to put on exhibit at such a show. Few cattle were on feed at the time. McFarland overcame French's objections by agreeing to put in a couple of loads out of his herd and to induce others to do the same. The two agreed that if funds could be raised for premiums such as hats, spurs, bridles, boots, and windmills, they would do it.

French and McFarland met with Skinner, manager of the stockyards, and Skinner soon enthusiastically took the matter up with the owners. They made arrangements for a one-day show in March in conjunction with the Cattle Raisers convention. 54

Actually few exhibitors contributed to the first show. McFarland brought some of his cattle, as did Burk Burnett, W. S. Ikard, I. J. Kimberlin, J. W. Burgess, E. M. Daggett.

54 C. C. French, "The History of a Great Fort Worth Institution The Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show," C. C. French Manuscripts, as cited in Research Data, vol. 62, p. 24582. Skinner later was transferred to Chicago where he became instrumental in getting the great International Live Stock Show going in Chicago annually. Ibid., p. 24594.
James Day, J. F. Hovencamp, John Maloney, and B. C. Rhone.\textsuperscript{55} Hogs and sheep seemed conspicuous by their absence. The night before the show a great sleet storm came, and the cattle that had been tied under the trees along Marine Creek looked "a pitiable sight" the next morning. By noon, however, the sun had melted the ice, and the spirits of the promoters rose somewhat.\textsuperscript{56}

Actually, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company held two shows in 1896. Stockyards officials knew that the National Live Stock Exchange planned to hold its eighth annual convention in Fort Worth in October, touted to be the best attended in history. That would be a good time to hold a fat stock show "in order that those composing this important organization may have some idea of what Texas can do in the way of furnishing what there is most demand for in livestock markets."\textsuperscript{57} They planned to offer premiums for the best car-loads of cattle, steers, hogs, sheep, and also wagon lots of the same. Local cattlemen and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company invited the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas, the

\textsuperscript{55}"The Cattlemen's Convention," \textit{Fort Worth Gazette}, 10 March 1896, p. 4, also "Fifty Years of Rodeo in Fort Worth," vol. 2; Bound copies of rodeo programs at Amon Carter Museum of Western Art, Fort Worth, Texas, 1946 Program, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{56}C. C. French, "Blizzard Hit First Stock Show Exhibit Is Weatherford Man's Idea," \textit{Fort Worth Star Telegram} and \textit{Sunday Record}, 11 March 1928, \textit{Live Stock Section}, part 1, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{57}"Fat Stock Show," \textit{Texas Stock and Farm Journal}, 12 June 1896, p. 4.
Texas Live Stock Association, and the Texas Swine Breeders Association. They also invited livestock associations of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Arizona, and two associations from New Mexico. The convention gave them the opportunity to demonstrate to the thousands of visitors who would be in Fort Worth from other cities and states the progress Texas had made in the improvement of breeds. They wanted to show outsiders that they were not still "raising the long horn and the razor back of former days."  

Skinner reported to the members of the National Livestock Exchange when they came to Fort Worth 12-13 October that he had handled ninety-seven thousand hogs already that year, while three years earlier only five thousand hogs suitable for slaughter could be found contiguous to Fort Worth. The exchange elected Skinner as one of its seven vice presidents for the coming year and placed two Fort Worth men, J. D. Farmer and A. S. Reed, on the executive committee. These three men were the only Fort Worth people among the officers of the national organization.

In later years Mrs. Lillie Burgess Hovencamp recalled having driven around town in a buggy with her father to

59 Proceedings of the National Live Stock Exchange at Fort Worth, Texas, October, 1896 (Chicago: Harvey L. Goodall, Printer, 1896), p. 34.
60 Ibid., p. 3.
collect donations of merchandise for livestock prizes for some of these early fat stock shows. She said a parade opened the show and businessmen entered floats. Burk Burnett furnished steers for a free barbecue.\textsuperscript{61}

What made a livestock show successful for producers, besides having it during the National Livestock Exchange convention, consisted of the opportunity to buy good breeding stock from each other. At either the first or second show, accounts differ, I. J. Kimberlin made a deal with Robert Kleberg of the King Ranch to sell him all his bull calves for the next five years at $50 a head. This probably represented the first sale of "futures" in bulls ever known in Texas.\textsuperscript{62}

Prominent citizens met at the Worth Hotel in mid-June 1897 to consider the advisability of holding a fat stock show that year and to determine the most suitable time. They decided that a March date to coincide with the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas convention the following spring would be the most appropriate.\textsuperscript{63} No show apparently was held in 1897.

\textsuperscript{61} "Fifty Years of Rodeo in Fort Worth," vol. 2, 1946 Program, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{62} "Background of Stock Show," \textit{Fort Worth} 29(January 1954):15 says Kleberg made the deal at the first show. C. C. French in "The History of a Great Fort Worth Institution," p. 24586 says second show.

\textsuperscript{63} "Fat Stock Show," \textit{Texas Stock and Farm Journal}, 23 June 1897, p. 8.
and the second annual one was 8-10 March 1898 along with the convention.  

By 1897 construction workers finished the Fort Worth Stock Yards Belt Railway Company; the stockyards company ran it. The market that year on anything fat continued strong and "the demand far exceeds the supply," stated a stock journal. A feud developed in 1897 between the two rival livestock newspapers published in the city. The Texas Stock and Farm Journal, published since 1880, was closely associated with the Cattle Raisers Association. The Live Stock Reporter began publication in 1896, authorized and subsidized by the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. The Journal editor accused the Reporter editor of exaggerating the number of livestock handled by the Fort Worth market. The Reporter counter--

64"Cattle Raisers Association," Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 2 March 1898, p. 24. Some question still remains whether an 1897 show was held or not. G. W. Simpson reported at the 1898 Cattle Raisers Convention that the stock show was to be incorporated "and I am assured the city of Fort Worth will contribute $5,000 in premiums. Last year the premiums amounted to $500. This year $2,000; and next year $5,000." Proceedings of Twenty-second Annual Convention of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas, 8-9 March 1898 at Fort Worth. Simpson may have meant that when the "last" show was held the premiums were $500. This could have been October 1896, a little more than a year earlier, or he may have meant 1897.


charged that the Journal was trying to hurt the local market. The Journal claimed that it had supported the local market for years, but called the "habitual misrepresentation and exaggerations of the management" of the Fort Worth Stock Yards "notorious" which would make Fort Worth a "by-word and a laughingstock in the eyes of Texas cattlemen." Part of the information Simpson and Skinner released to the press obviously did consist of "hoopla" to obtain more business which would benefit both the owners of the local yards and in the long run the cattle producers. Texas farmers and cattlemen possessed the raw material to help create a better market, and the Reporter tried to persuade them to support their market more fully.

A distrust of big business and outside ownership still plagued Simpson and his associates in the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and its packing, banking, and railroad affiliations. C. C. French, as public relations agent, wanted farmers to build up the home market because they actually would be benefitting themselves, but Texas cattlemen proved difficult to convince.

Stockyards profits increased, however, for owners inserted into the minutes of their special stockholders meeting 1 May 1897 a motion that "... in order that rival companies

may not know how successful the Company has been . . . [it is] ordered that the same be not spread upon the minutes. 68

Stockholders who wanted to see figures, which presumably were profits, not losses, could view them at the Boston office where the accounts would be on file.

William N. Babcock of Omaha, Nebraska became the new manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in October, 1897 at a salary of $6,000 per year. His contract also called for him to get 4 percent of the net annual earnings of the company up to $150,000 per year and 3 percent of company earnings from $150,000 to $250,000. 69

Recognition came to the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in 1897 concerning its cooperation with the federal government in tick eradication. Earlier, farmers of Kansas, Missouri, and other states had complained that Texas Longhorns driven up the trails brought a disease to their domestic cattle, causing them to sicken and die. Although many ideas existed as to the cause of this "Texas fever," no one actually knew for sure in the early days. The federal government finally decided to take some measures about inspecting and quarantining cattle, rather than leaving it to the various states, when the British threatened to cut off

68 Stockholders Meeting, 1 May 1897, Corporate Record, vol. 1, p. 89.

69 Board of Directors Meeting, 11 October 1897, Corporate Record, vol. 1, pp. 90-91.
shipment of all American cattle because a shipload of cattle that arrived in England from Portland, Maine in 1879 had what they called "pleuro-Pneumonia." Federal action came slowly, and not until 1881 did Congress appropriate money for a study. The report came in 1882. 70 As the federal government considered a quarantine law, Texans opposed it, obviously, for it hampered their shipment of cattle northward. Petitions also came from Chicago cattle brokers and commission men against the proposed law, for they feared to see Texas cattle restricted because it would destroy competition between northern and southern cattle, placing Chicago at the mercy of the northern stock growers. 71 Then in 1883 the Germans threatened to boycott all United States meat shipments because of a shipment of diseased pork to Hamburg, Germany. As a result President Chester A. Arthur urged Congress to act. 72 An Animal Industry Act that became law 24 May 1884 prohibited the driving of diseased cattle from one state to another. The Bureau soon went to work to discover the cause of "Texas fever." Dr. Theobald Smith and Dr. Fred L. Kilborne, scientists of the Bureau of Animal


71 Ibid., p. 171

Industry, proved conclusively in 1889 and 1890 that particular cattle ticks caused it.\(^7\)

Dr. Victor A. Norgaard, who later became Chief of the Pathological Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry, began conducting dipping experiments in Texas. Robert J. Kleberg, manager of the Santa Gertrudis or King Ranch in Nueces County, designed and built the first vat used by the Bureau in its dip investigations. He had been using it to dip for mange and itch. Kleberg offered his vat to the Bureau early in 1895, together with the ticky cattle on the ranch. During the following five years, twenty-five thousand cattle passed through this vat in testing the tick-destroying properties of various disinfecting preparations. The best results during the first year came from the use of two coal-tar preparations.

In August, 1897, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company built a large cattle-dipping plant and placed it at the

\(^7\)U.S., Congress, House, Cattle Tick Fever, H. Doc. 527, 77th Cong., 2d sess., in 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 574; also Fred Wilbur Powell, The Bureau of Animal Industry Its History, Activities and Organization (Baltimore: The Johns-Hopkins Press, 1927), p. 4. This discovery is regarded as one of the greatest and most beneficial achievements in medical research, as it led to the discovery that other dreadful diseases including yellow fever, malaria, typhus fever, African sleeping sickness, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, magana, and others are carried through an intermediate host. Dr. Salmon Flexner of the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research stated in a lecture: "Our knowledge of the yellow fever would in all likelihood have been delayed if the work of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture on Texas fever had not been done." "Tick Fever Studies Were A Boon to Mankind," The Cattleman 6(March 1930):31.
disposal of the Bureau. The government then transferred the experiments from the South Texas ranch to the Fort Worth yards, testing some so-called paraffin lubricating oils. The results obtained at first with these oils proved so satisfactory that in September, 1897, officials called a meeting at Fort Worth to demonstrate dipping with this substance. Delegates attended from Illinois, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, and the Indian Territory. Although the results of the demonstration did not prove entirely satisfactory, the experiments continued.

Rancher Kleberg made a motion at the March 1898 Cattle Raisers Association convention to thank the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company "for providing and arranging for the Fat Stock Show, and especially for the dipping of cattle. They have gone to great expense; not less than $5,000 or $6,000 have been expended there in order to make these experiments."

On 1 April 1898 officials resumed the experiments with paraffin oil at the King Ranch, where they found more tick infested cattle available. They discarded paraffin oil. Next, they tried two oils with sulphur added, but these too failed to give the results desired. They again discontinued the experiments at the ranch.

74 Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Convention of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas 8-9 March 1898 at Fort Worth.
In June, 1898, government officials resumed experiments at Fort Worth, using "extra dynamo oil." After a few trials they added sulphur to this oil. The results seemed so promising that officials decided to test it on quite a large number of cattle and then ship them north immediately after dipping. Accordingly, they dipped 311 cattle on 22 July and shipped them to Rockford, Illinois the following day. The hot weather caused the cattle to suffer severely in transit. The oil killed the ticks, but eight cattle died en route and eight "downers" were left behind at unloading stations.

Scientists tried other dips containing carbolic acid, tobacco extract, sodium sulphate, glycerine, or a combination of lime and sulfur. Finally Beaumont crude petroleum oil gave better results generally than any other crude oil or dip, and cattlemen used it almost exclusively from 1903 to 1911 as a spray, a smear, and a dip in freeing cattle of ticks.75

The state of Texas made its own attempts to help solve the cattle tick problem, for on 20 April 1893 the state legislature created the Texas Livestock Sanitary Commission. The legislature gave the Commission so little power, however, that they accomplished little until 1917 when the legislature conferred upon the Commission the authority to enforce

compulsory dipping of cattle. When many of the counties neglected or refused to provide for the dipping of infested cattle, the Commission forced the issue by clamping a state quarantine on the counties until they dipped all cattle twice. The Fort Worth Stock Yards became the state headquarters for the Commission almost from the beginning. ⁷⁶

Conservative Texas cattlemen acted slowly to accept the scientific results of these tests at the Fort Worth Stock Yards and other places. They formed anti-dipping groups, and even blew up dipping vats in both Texas and Indian Territory. ⁷⁷

Texas ranchers, understandably, worried more about how many cattle died after being dipped than how fast the ticks disappeared. A man from Quanah reported that he dipped 321 head of cattle at the Fort Worth Stock Yards 28 October 1898. Six died, ten heifers lost their calves, and the rest of the cattle became stiff and sore. The owner feared that a norther would kill them. All the letters quoted by the Texas Live Stock Journal in the same issue as the Quanah man's account opposed the dipping. ⁷⁸


⁷⁸ "Disastrous Effects of Dipping," Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 14 December 1898, p. 4.
Although the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company gained national attention for its participation in the dipping experiments, business still faced problems. The Chicago and Fort Worth Packing Company operated and did good business only until 1897 when a drought depleted the hog supply. The plant shut down in 1898 and the owners became so discouraged that they turned the entire packing operation and yards back to Simpson and Niles.\footnote{History of livestock industry in Fort Worth, FWSY Co. Coll.}

Competition from the two packing houses and the stockyards in Dallas did not help, either. In an attempt to encourage business, the board approved a motion in March, 1899 to donate four acres of land, for only one dollar compensation, to persons who planned to construct a complete oil mill, providing they would build it within the year.\footnote{Board of Directors meeting, 24 March 1899, Corporate Record, vol. 1, p. 103.}

When the packing plant discontinued operations, the caretaker ran the ice plant only when necessary to maintain low temperature in the storeroom. Supplies arrived daily from Wichita, Kansas. In April, 1899 Simpson and Niles reopened their plant. Niles, one of the major stockholders in the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, organized and operated the Fort Worth Packing and Provision Company after the
stockyards company leased the old plant. Niles had practical business experience and fared reasonably well, continuing operations until 1901.

G. W. Simpson attended the annual conventions of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas every year from the time he created the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in 1893 until the end of the decade and made appeals to Texas cattlemen to support their home market. "Gentlemen, you have a market. You can make it just as big as you want to, and every man that has sold cattle, like Mr. [Samuel Burk] Burnett, will tell you that it is best to sell them as near home as you can." 

---

81 Board of Directors Meeting, 1 July 1899, Corporate Record, vol. 1, p. 125.

82 Wardlaw interview transcript, p. 5. Because L. V. Niles came to Fort Worth from Boston and spent several months out of each year 1899-1901 in Fort Worth, men of the city became better acquainted with him than the other stockholders. Many credit Niles with bringing the plants of Armour and Swift to Fort Worth in 1902. W. L. Pier to Ross Brown, 26 December 1955, W. L. Pier Correspondence, General Correspondence, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Niles, who with his brothers had owned the Boston Packing and Provision Company, was sixty when he came to Fort Worth in 1899 and gave the local businessmen the confidence that Fort Worth could indeed become the packing center of the Southwest. Janie Reid, "Niles City, Texas," Application for Texas Historical Marker, 1980. Copy in possession of Tarrant County Historical Commission.

In November, 1899, a stable and wagon sheds burned at the stockyards, but insurance covered the losses. 84

Although much of what happened to stockyards and packing in Fort Worth depended upon the absentee owners of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company who held their monthly directors meetings, when they could get a quorum, in either Boston or Chicago, city fathers of Fort Worth did not give up either. In March, 1900 these local citizens and businessmen held two conferences with an eastern meat packing expert named Jacob Dold. The Dold interests wanted to build a million dollar packing plant, but wanted Fort Worthians to take $250,000 in stock. One prominent cattleman reportedly offered to take $25,000 if three others would do likewise. The deal fell through, however. 85

By the turn of the century meat packing in Fort Worth had not yet maintained stability, but the relative success of the stockyards, the railroad shipping facilities, and other businesses created at Fort Worth a cattle center of importance, nevertheless. Wealthy cattlemen who owned ranches as far away as one hundred miles to the west made Fort Worth their home and built mansions on Samuels and

84 Board of Directors Meeting, 27 November 1899, Corporate Record, vol. 1, p. 126.

Grand Avenues and elsewhere in the city. In 1900 they hosted the National Live Stock Association which had been created two years earlier, and then numerous cattlemen joined together 24 October 1901 with officials of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company to incorporate the Fort Worth Livestock Exchange with headquarters in the exchange building of the stockyards company. Fort Worth had become a livestock center as early citizens wanted, but until packing plants could be established near the stockyards that would gain the confidence of Texas cattlemen and convince them that a continuing market existed comparable to Chicago and St. Louis, the ambitions of the community leaders would not be completely fulfilled, nor the predominance of Fort Worth realized among the nation's livestock markets. Such success awaited the arrival of two of the Big Four Chicago meat packers early in the twentieth century.

---

CHAPTER III

REORGANIZATION: SWIFT AND ARMOUR ARRIVE

The two original Chicago meat entrepreneurs, Armour and Swift, who decided to expand their operations into Fort Worth, represented the two largest of the nation's Big Four packers. They succeeded where others' early efforts in Fort Worth had failed because: (1) They were large enough to handle the thousands of head that came through the Fort Worth yards; (2) They met their obligations promptly and in cash; (3) They obtained the trade of the other Texas cities; and (4) Obviously, they met the price competition of the Big Four where the previous packing concerns had not.¹

In defending his business against charges of monopoly, J. Ogden Armour, son of Philip Armour who founded the company, explained that before his father and others developed the

¹Rossie Beth Bennett, "History of the Cattle Trade in Fort Worth, Texas" (Masters thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1931), p. 64. The term "Big Four" in the 1880's referred to the four largest meat packing establishments, Armour, Swift, Nelson Morris, and the G. H. Hammond Company. By the turn of the century Hammond had been absorbed by the first three and Michael Cudahy's company had taken its place in the Big Four. Schwarzchild and Sulzberger became big enough to be considered important, so the meat packers became a Big Five early in the twentieth century. However, the Thomas E. Wilson Company became the fifth member of the Big Five, replacing S & S by 1916. When Armour bought Morris in early 1920's, the packers became a Big Four again.
packing business in Chicago, only a local market for beef cattle existed in any part of the country. As invariably happens in our country, when an imperative demand arises for new ways of doing things, somebody steps forward promptly and points out the necessary effective means by which to do them. Armour claimed that the number of beef cattle marketed at the four principal centers increased from 1880 to 1900 by 500 percent.

Armour and Company in 1875 handled no beef or mutton at all, only pork, while Gustavus Swift gained the head start in beef and remained the largest slaughterer in the nineteenth century. Near the close of the 1880's Swift began the practice of building branch plants nearer the source of supply than Chicago. Since beef cattle came principally from the West and Southwest, he reasoned that he could save as much money by slaughtering them near their points of origin as he did when he first dressed beef at Chicago instead of in the East.


\[3\] Ibid., p. 304.  
\[4\] Ibid., p. 321.


\[6\] Ibid., p. 131.
Thus Armour and Swift, and others, gained prominence in the last two decades of the nineteenth century in the slaughterhouse industry in Chicago. Some called them the "overlords of beef" as they bought out the smaller packing concerns to eliminate competition. Critics accused the four principal packers of arriving at a "gentlemen's agreement" which ended all competition among themselves.

The Big Four packers could be unified, have a compact organization, and fix prices among themselves, whereas the producers, cattlemen, and farmers, despite attempts to organize, actually remained disunited and at the mercy of the meat trust. Detractors accused the Big Four of forcing the railroads to pay them a mileage fee of three-fourths a cent per mile for use of their refrigerator cars. If a railroad "seemed tardy in complying with such orders, as in the case of the New York Central, it was punished almost at once" by diverting as many as 150 freight cars per week.

As early as 1886 ranchers began to talk of a packers' monopoly in Chicago that set livestock prices as much as it pleased, mentioning Philip D. Armour specifically in their criticism. Large and small ranchers alike soon endorsed federal supervision of railroad rates, meat packing, and

---

8 Ibid., p. 285
9 Ibid., p. 286.
stockyards. Even in Fort Worth local stockmen accused "combinations at the different livestock markets" of "dictating" to cattlemen what they should receive for cattle. They believed that some cattle raisers had been ruined and driven out of the business. Supply and demand did not appear to regulate prices because the cattle supply declined, but beef prices dropped.

The local livestock journal, supported by cattle interests, upon most occasions sided with the cattlemen, but in 1891 the editor told livestock raisers that men who ship "none but thick fat cattle" do not complain about the Big Four. Only those who shipped scalawags lost out, so they must blame somebody. "Ship none but good fat stock and you will soon be prosperous, and no longer abuse your benefactors and best friends."

Butchers, however, charged the Big Four with illegal combinations to reduce not only the profits of cattle raisers, but also the profits of retail butchers. The


12 "The Big Four," Texas Live Stock Journal, 13 June 1891, p. 3.
butchers believed the motto to be "Keep the price low to producers but high to consumers."\textsuperscript{13}

A public outcry continued long enough that in 1888 the United States Senate appointed a committee headed by Senator George G. Vest of Missouri to investigate the meat packing industry, particularly the four largest dealers, for indications of collusion. When the committee met in Chicago early in its investigation, all the Big Four meat packers and their leading subordinates ignored the subpoenas to testify.\textsuperscript{14} When Philip D. Armour later testified, he blamed the decline in prices on overproduction and overmarketing, as well as numerous other factors including the quarantine which frightened foreign countries into placing embargos on American beef and thus limiting the export trade.\textsuperscript{15}

The Supreme Court in 1898 ruled in favor of the meat packers, but in 1903 the Court sustained an injunction that the Big Five meat packers constituted a monopoly.\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{footnotes}


\item[15] Ibid., p. 414.

\end{footnotes}
Swift, and Morris, in fact, made an attempt at merger which failed because investment bankers refused to grant a loan, seeing signs of financial panic. The packers then incorporated the National Packing Company with some recently purchased interests (Hammond) as a nucleus, to which they transferred the ownership of firms they had bought or contracted to buy in their preparations for merger. For nine years representatives of these companies met regularly as directors of the National Packing Company. Consolidation appeared the pattern then, for United States Steel had just emerged in 1901 as the first billion dollar corporation, so in 1902 when Swift, Armour, and Morris formed the National Packing Company, they believed they could succeed. Public opinion raised a cry, and a court order later dissolved the company.

A muckraking book written in 1905 accused the beef trust of controlling or influencing "one-half the food consumed by the nation." The author blamed the instrument that allowed packers to be so powerful as the railroad rebate, actually called "private car charges." He claimed that the trust

---


18 Swift, Yankee of the Yards, p. 209.

ignored the 1903 court order that enjoined them from acting as a monopoly. He explained that if a producer got a bid so low for their cattle that they could make no profit and so refused to sell and shipped to another market, they received exactly the same bid at the second market as they had at the first, thus collusion. Texas cattleman Christopher C. Slaughter testified before the Vest committee that this exact situation happened to him numerous times.

In the spring of 1901, Simpson and Niles began negotiations with some of these Big Four meat packers, hoping to persuade them to establish a plant in Fort Worth. Armour seemed most interested. Texans soon learned that Swift and Armour wanted to come to Texas, but they expected cities to subsidize construction of the plants just as successful cities had subsidized railroads. By mid-June citizens raised $50,000 for Armour. Cattlemen planned to raise another $50,000 as an inducement to Swift. Armour and Swift requested that the Fort Worth Livestock Commission

---

20 Ibid., p. 58.
21 Ibid., p. 103.
22 Transportation and Sale of Meat Products, pp. 92-93.
Company ship them a load of hogs per day for a certain length of time so they might test Texas hogs.\textsuperscript{25}

J. Ogden Armour testified many years later that his company had agreed to come to Fort Worth first and Swift had been intending to go to Dallas. Armour offered Swift 50 percent of the business if he would come to Fort Worth, for that would save Armour from having to build a plant in Dallas, too.\textsuperscript{26} Some indications are that if Armour built a plant in Fort Worth, Swift "threatened" to build one in Dallas, so Armour agreed to let Swift in at Fort Worth.\textsuperscript{27} Part of the deal was that if Swift got in on the market at Fort Worth, Armour could get a permit in St. Louis where Swift formerly held exclusive right.\textsuperscript{28}

Armour and Swift both seemed anxious to come because one-fifth of all cattle in the United States resided in

\textsuperscript{25}Written transcript of a 1915 interview with Verner S. Wardlaw (1861-1924) about the History of the Packing Plant Industry in Fort Worth. Copy in author's possession, p. 5.


\textsuperscript{28}"History of the Livestock Industry in Fort Worth," W. L. Pier Correspondence, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Records, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.
Texas, New Mexico Territory, and Indian Territory. Because it cost from $3 to $5 to transport a beef steer from the Texas ranges to Chicago, Kansas City, or St. Louis, it would pay packers to relocate near the raw material.  

The Board of Directors of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company met in Chicago 9 August 1901 to approve contracts to offer both Armour and Company and Swift and Company. In the identical contracts the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company agreed to increase its capital stock from one million to two million dollars and to take over the Fort Worth Packing Company and the entire capital stock and other belongings and assets of the Belt Railroad. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company agreed to convey to Swift and to Armour the title to the packing house property and to pay off all its own (the stockyards' company's) debts and liabilities. A new mortgage securing bonds of $1,200,000 payable in fifteen years at 5 percent interest would be established. The stockyards company also agreed to give Armour and Swift separate sites for packing houses free from debt. Both Armour and Swift agreed to subscribe to 6,600 shares of capital stock of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. "In payment therefore and for giving to them $300,000 of the bonds, they would construct a packing house on the site to be conveyed to them by the Stock Yards

29"The Great Packeries and their Benefit to Fort Worth, to Texas and the Southwest," The Bohemian 4(1902):75.
Company." Of the $1,200,000 issue of bonds the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company would have $300,000 to use towards extinguishing its existing bonds and other indebtedness. Armour and Company and Swift and Company each got $300,000 which left $300,000 in the treasury of the reorganized company. 30

When the capital stock of the company was increased, it was to be divided $680,000 to the holders of stock of the original Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, mostly Simpson and Niles, $660,000 to Armour and Company, and $660,000 to Swift. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company would organize a bank and a land or townsite company and any other businesses "as are usual at stockyards" to be owned one-third by present stockholders, one-third by Swift, and one-third by Armour. All proceeds of such businesses would go into the treasury of the stockyards company to pay off bonded indebtedness first. 31

In their visit to Fort Worth in September, 1901, representatives of Armour and Swift encouraged the local committee to get busy in raising the additional $50,000 subscription


31 Ibid., p. 140; also Certificates of Stock 1-250, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Records, Gary Havard Personal Collection, Fort Worth, Texas.
from cattlemen and others. The committee called a meeting of citizens 7 October 1901 in the city hall auditorium when $15,000 remained to be subscribed. That evening they raised $15,778, surpassing the required amount. Committee members sent telegrams to Swift and Armour. The audience cheered, threw hats in the air, waved handkerchiefs, and shook hands as pandemonium reined. The local newspaper the next morning proclaimed to the city of forty thousand inhabitants "Fort Worth started on her road to greatness last night."

Swift and Company, and no doubt Armour, too, sent their lawyers to Fort Worth in October 1901 to examine all sorts of papers, including the deeds of the North Fort Worth Land Company, owned by the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, before finalizing the agreement with them. In one of the final agreements signed in January, 1902, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company promised to give Swift a deed to 21.8 acres if Swift would agree that all livestock slaughtered on the premises "shall pass through the stock yards of said first party and pay the customary yardage and other charges


thereon." In exchange the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company would give 6,600 shares of capital stock to Swift and also 300 bonds of $1,000 each after the packing house was built. The stockyards would not charge Swift any higher yardage charges than they charged anyone else.\textsuperscript{36}

The company made a similar agreement with Armour. L. V. Niles signed the agreement for the Fort Worth Packing and Provision Company 28 January 1902 to sell to Armour and Swift at fair market prices all supplies and equipment on 1 November 1902 when Swift and Armour opened their plants.\textsuperscript{37} When the deal became final, Armour took over the Simpson and Niles plant and operated it until March 1903 when their new plant opened.\textsuperscript{38}

Arrangements like these had become common among packers and stockyards. The stockyards in Oklahoma City made a similar agreement, but with packers Morris and Sulzberger. Morris and Swift signed similar contracts in St. Louis. Swift owned nearly all of the St. Joseph stockyards, however.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36}Copy of a contract between Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and Swift and Company, 25 January 1902, unmarked folder, Havard Coll.

\textsuperscript{37}Copy of an agreement between Fort Worth Packing and Provision Company and Armour and Company and Swift and Company, 28 January 1902, Fort Worth Packing and Provision Co. folder, Havard Coll.

\textsuperscript{38}"History of Livestock industry in Fort Worth," W. L. Pier Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{39}"Why the Packers Own Stockyards," The Cattleman 6(November 1919):21.
By the spring of 1902 J. Ogden Armour became president of the reorganized Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. Edward Swift became vice president, and Greenleif W. Simpson, second vice president. Andrew Nimmo served as secretary-treasurer, and W. O. Johnson, Simpson's lawyer since at least 1893, became assistant secretary. W. B. King became general manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company as of 15 February 1902 at a monthly salary of $375.  

Construction of the two packing plants began 13 March 1902. Officials chose the time of the meeting of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas in Fort Worth for ground-breaking ceremonies. Workers cut down a large tree on the bank of Marine Creek, site of the first stock show, to make room for the packing plants.

An Armour official told the story many years later that in 1902 representatives of Armour and Swift tossed a coin for the choice of locations. Swift won and naturally chose

---


41 Calling them "packing plants" was a misnomer left over from the days when meat was packed and salted down in barrels for shipment. By 1902 refrigeration made "packing" unnecessary, although everyone still used the term.

42 "Big Packeries At Fort Worth," The Texas Stock Journal, 4 March 1902, p. 1.

43 "Fort Worth Packing Industry Celebrates 50 Years of Progress," "Fifty Years of Rodeo in Fort Worth," vol. 3, 1952 Program, p. 34.
the site closest to downtown. This disappointed Armour be-
cause it meant that Armour employees would have to walk
farther from the trolley line, and Armour horses would have
a longer haul from Fort Worth to the plant. Soon the Armour
men got even. When they started to excavate for their plant,
they uncovered a fine gravel pit. Swift had to buy all of
the sand and gravel for their buildings from Armour.44

Workers leveled the old hotel and exchange building to
make room for all the new construction, for Swift alone
planned a floor space of 658,785 square feet, or approxi-
mately 15.5 acres.45 New stock pens for the Fort Worth
Stock Yards Company soon covered a forty-acre tract west of
the packing houses. All eventually would be paved with
brick.46

While work progressed in North Fort Worth, the Fort
Worth Stock Yards Company invited well over one hundred
editors from Texas and Indian Territory (Oklahoma) newspapers
to a banquet and to visit the packeries under construction.
Among several local men making speeches, Marion Sansom

44 "Armour President, Fred W. Specht, Speech for Fort
Worth Audience," Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 17 April 1952,
p. 1.

45 "The Packing Plants," The Texas Stock Journal, 10
June 1902, p. 1.

46 "Big Packeries at Fort Worth," The Texas Stock Journal,
4 March 1902, p. 1. Also Board of Directors Meeting, 12
March 1903, Corporate Record, 1st bound volume, p. 25.
of Alvarado spoke on "The Benefits To Be Derived by Stockmen from the Establishment of Packinghouses and a Stock Market Below the Quarantine Line." The lieutenant governor of Texas, James M. Browning, of Amarillo and a senator also had been invited. A farmer who spoke at the gathering expressed the feeling of many citizens when he said that the packers might belong to the beef trust, "but when they do so much good for others as is being done by these institutions here, there is bound to be some good in them." He suggested that farmers in North Texas diversify their stock raising. The editors ended their day-long tour of the stockyards and packeries with a visit to Texas Brewing Company's plant and free refreshments.48

Directors of the company discussed establishing a newspaper at the yards at their 12 November 1902 board meeting, so either the paper established by the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in 1896 had ceased publication for a time, or the Chicago men lacked knowledge of its existence. By


January 1903 the *Live Stock Reporter* was going strong with a volume seven, however. ⁴⁹ It became a daily.

Contracts called for the packing plants to open 1 November 1902, but building progressed slowly. In January 1903 Armour and Swift wrote a joint letter to Texas stock producers that appeared on the front page of the *Live Stock Reporter*. It promised what they would do: Buy half a million cattle, half a million sheep, and one and one-half million hogs each year and pay the highest market price, saving producers the cost of shrinkage and transportation to send them to northern markets. "If the stockmen will raise and supply the stock, the packing houses will do the rest." ⁵⁰

The packing plants formally opened 4 March 1903 during the annual fat stock show. W. E. Skinner, formerly manager of the Fort Worth yards and in 1903 with the Chicago Union Stock Yards, repeated what he had said before, that the "most actual reality before the farmers of the state was to provide the raw material for the packeries to work upon." ⁵¹ S. S. Conway, superintendent of the Armour plant, felt no doubt about Fort Worth being a second Chicago. "The packing plants


⁵⁰Ibid.

are now in a position to handle all the cattle, hogs, and sheep that can be shipped here,"\textsuperscript{52} he said. The daily runs were not large enough to keep plants running at full force all day.

The Armour plant claimed to be the "best equipped packing plant in the world" and possessed a daily capacity of 1,500 cattle, 3,000 hogs, and 1,500 sheep.\textsuperscript{53} The big packers claimed to be the pioneers in the assembly line technique and even said that Henry Ford, who later got the credit for assembly lines, gained his inspiration from packing house methods. In reality, the packing house was a "dis-assembly" line because the animal carcass kept getting smaller as it traveled through the process.\textsuperscript{54}

When the exchange building opened in April, 1903, it housed stockyards offices and the Stockyards National Bank as well as offices for five railroads and twelve commission companies on the first floor. A dining room on the north ran the width of the building.\textsuperscript{55} A post office and telegraph office also were inside.\textsuperscript{56} So excited were local citizens

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{52}"Opinion of Armour's Superintendent As To Future of Fort Worth," \textit{The Citizen}, 7 March 1903, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{53}"A 1903 Packing House," (North Fort Worth, Texas: Armour and Co., 1903), p. 6. (pamphlet)
\end{flushleft}
about all this growth that rumors even started flying in June, 1903, that Cudahy planned to build a packing plant at Fort Worth, too.\textsuperscript{57}

Armour and Swift began operations on a grand scale, each purchasing daily more than all other buyers combined. In categories like calves, sheep, and hogs, they sometimes constituted the only purchasers.\textsuperscript{58} In fact, in the first ten months of business, the two packers bought 265,279 cattle, 128,934 hogs, and 40,160 sheep, and paid out six million dollars into the local economy for them.\textsuperscript{59}

Quite clearly big business in the form of the meat packing trust had arrived in Fort Worth. The years 1901–1903 represented busy ones and the events at Fort Worth constituted a pattern that existed elsewhere. In 1901 Armour and Company received four thousand shares of the capital stock of the Sioux City Stockyards Company and 12.5 acres of land for locating their plant there. In 1901 Armour received over $300,000 in stock bonuses from the St. Louis stockyards and twenty acres of land for locating a plant there. In 1902 Armour made the deal with Fort Worth. Then in 1903 the St. Louis Stockyards Company paid Armour $388,000 in cash.

\textsuperscript{57}"Is Cudahy Coming?" \textit{The Texas Stock Journal}, 17 June 1903, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{58}\textit{The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 5 April 1904, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{59}"Review of the Live Stock Market for the Year 1903 . . . ." \textit{The Citizen} (Fort Worth), 1 January 1904, p. 1.
and in 1916 Armour received $1,000,000 of which $400,000 was paid in cash and $600,000 in bonus stock from the St. Paul Union Stockyards Company for locating a plant adjacent to those stockyards. Less than 25 percent of the amount of stock represented actual purchases and more than 75 percent represented stock gifts and stock dividends in most instances. 60

Consistent with their pattern of operation in other cities, Armour and Swift soon engaged in a number of businesses in North Fort Worth related to their stockyards and meat packing establishments. Besides each owning one-third of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, the two giant meat packers also jointly owned the Reporter Publishing Company which published the Live Stock Reporter, the Fort Worth Belt Railway Company, the Stockyards National Bank of North Fort Worth, the Fort Worth Cattle Loan Company, and the North Fort Worth Townsite Company. 61

60U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Hearings on A Bill to Amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, S. 2089, 68th Cong., 1st sess., 1924, p. 15. When directors of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company met in Chicago, often they held board meetings the same day for several of the stockyards companies the packers owned. The same secretary served for all and typed up the minutes as a mere formality. The secretary made a revealing slip on 1 May 1903 when he accidently typed the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company minutes under the statement "the meeting of the Board of Directors of the St. Joseph Stock Yards Company was held on . . . ." Board of Directors Meeting, 1 May 1903, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 39.

61Joseph B. Googins, a Swift official, bought 3,375.16 acres from the North Fort Worth Land Company on 1 November
Swift bought a cotton oil mill at Alvarado, a small community south of Fort Worth, for $100,000 cash, and planned to purchase others. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company constructed a sewage plant, costing $70,000 in 1904. It became necessary when farmers living on the Trinity River below Fort Worth sued the stockyards company and the packers for damages because of the waste dumped in the water from the packing plants.

Besides the businesses the packers jointly owned, other associated industries came to the North Side area. Fort Worth intentionally excluded North Fort Worth from the city's boundary to offer a tax advantage. Thus, principally packing and stockyard interests incorporated the city of North Fort Worth in 1902 and chose J. D. Farmer, a commission

1901 with $175,000 "furnished to him in equal parts by J. Ogden Armour and Gustavus F. Swift" and he did not personally use any of his own money. Copy of an agreement between North Fort Worth Land Company vendor and Joseph B. Googins, purchaser, 24 October 1901, North Fort Worth Land Co. folder, Havard Collection; also, copy of a statement by Gustavus F. Swift and J. Ogden Armour 6 June 1902, unmarked folder, Havard Collection; also, O. W. Matthews to A. H. Veeder, 24 November 1903, Belt Railway folder, ibid.; also personal interview with Mrs. Nita McCain, 28 October 1977, Fort Worth, Texas about Reporter Publishing Co. which operated in a two-story building across Exchange Ave. from the Coliseum (after Coliseum was built in 1908).


63 "To Purify the Sewage," The Weekly Citizen, 6 May 1904, p. 2.

man, as the first mayor. The area around the stockyards and packing plants grew from open prairie with scattered houses to a town of five thousand people by April 1904.

Soon after the packers came, Fort Worth became one of the leading grain storage and milling centers of the Southwest. Pharmaceutical firms sprang up to combat livestock diseases. Cattlemen's associations moved their permanent homes to the city. Thus, the city's cattle industry became "the catalytic agent that propelled Fort Worth toward industrial greatness." 

The packing plants of Swift and Armour drew nearly all the cattle of West Texas to Fort Worth for sale. When cattlemen came to town, they brought their wives along to shop, thus the prosperity of Fort Worth magnified.

So important to Fort Worth was the coming of Armour and Swift that even sixty years later the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company thought their own company originated in 1902 when the packers arrived instead of the actual 1893, nine years

---

65 Mack Williams, "State of Mind Now, It Was N. Fort Worth Then," Fort Worth Star Telegram, 12 November 1951 in "N. Fort Worth" file at Fort Worth Public Library. Boundaries of North Fort Worth were Marine Creek on the north, the Trinity River on the south, the Santa Fe tracks on the east, and Grand Ave. on the west.


earlier. Two-color letterhead stationery in 1962 proclaimed their "60 years of leadership, 1902-1962". Of course, in 1902 when Armour and Swift gained two-thirds ownership of the stockyards company through reorganization, that leadership had been assured.

For the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, many good years followed.

---

T. H. Hard to J. A. Lovell, 11 December 1962, Dies Correspondence, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Company advertisements through the years cited the 1902 date as well, particularly in the Cattleman magazine.
CHAPTER IV

PROMISE OF GREATNESS

A streetcar stopped at the corner of Main and Exchange avenues so that a group of men could disembark. Each carried a suitcase and spoke excitedly to his companions as he looked eastward toward the livestock center. These immigrants from Eastern Europe had traveled directly from New York by train to find jobs in the packing plants or stockyards. The scene recurred almost daily after 1905.

The first decade of the twentieth century saw great growth in livestock-related industries in Fort Worth, and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company constituted the hub around which everything else revolved. Even problems of a strike, a flood, federal regulation and litigation, excessive railroad rates, and the state of Texas outlawing the local livestock exchange could not hamper for long the enthusiasm, the business boom, and the increased cattle receipts of the decade. After twenty years of struggle to gain a prosperous stockyards and packery, the only way to go for Fort Worth and livestock, had to be up.

A bustling, vibrant Exchange Avenue with eight to ten saloons, two or three eating houses, a couple of hotels, and two dry goods stores all within two blocks of each other
testified to the increased activity. Horses and wagons clattered over the wooden bridge that spanned Marine Creek just a few hundred yards west of the exchange building. Because at least part of the time commission firms gave free meal tickets to all ranchers and herdsmen coming into the stockyards with stock, the dining room in the exchange building stayed busy.  

When newcomers to the stockyards area turned east from Main Street onto Exchange Avenue, they only traveled a block before encountering wooden horse and mule barns on the south side of the street and the two-story exchange building on the north side of the street. Architects designed the exchange building after the "Alamo Mission" style of Spanish architecture which seemed popular near the turn of the century. A roof of deep red Spanish tile sat atop the beige stucco building. Two white marble staircases in the inner gallery led to a common landing on the second floor. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company spent $125,000 for the building.  

North and east of the exchange building stretched the newly-constructed brick-floored pens with a capacity of 24,500 animals. Railroad tracks separated the pens from the

---


huge plants of Armour and Swift located just east of the railroad. A large "Armour and Company" sign that covered the west wall of the long row of refrigerator buildings of the Armour plant stretched four hundred feet long and eighty feet high was said to be the largest sign in the entire state.\(^3\) Before the decade ended more office space was needed in the exchange building, so the stockyards company constructed additional offices out of the dining hall that had formerly occupied the entire north part of the lower floor of the building. Ten commission companies quickly snatched them up.\(^4\)

The value of the Fort Worth Stock Yards and packing property interests in 1904 reached 2.5 million dollars: North Fort Worth Townsite Company, $282,090; Stock Yards Company, $273,996; Belt Railway, $75,100; old packing plant, $50,000; Armour and Company, $734,412; and, Swift and Company, $734,412.\(^5\) Values rapidly increased. The stockyards company spent large sums for advertising during these early


\(^5\)Fort Worth Record and Register, 21 December 1904 as cited in Research Data Fort Worth and Tarrant County, Texas Federal Writers' Project, vol. 40, pp. 15604-05. Hereafter cited as Research Data.
years—over $4,590 in 1903 and $7,281 in 1904. This constituted their third largest expense and nearly as great as office salaries.  

Before noting the specific problems of personnel, government regulation, and construction during the years that remained in the first decade of the twentieth century after Armour and Swift came, it might be well to notice chronologically up to 1910 the positive growth in market receipts and the aspirations Fort Worth officials held for their market. Although problems and disappointments arose during the decade, these never loomed severe enough to dampen the optimism and enthusiasm for the great new market and its promise for the future, as livestock interests planned for their city to become one of the major marketing centers of the United States. 

Within a year after Armour and Swift opened their doors twelve commission companies operated on the yards, and their numbers increased steadily. Northern livestock newspapers, however, remained slow to recognize the potential of the growing new market at Fort Worth. The local paper complained that the northern interests ignored Fort Worth by citing as the six leading markets Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, St. Joseph, and Sioux City, even though in 1904

---

\(^6\) Annual Reports, 1903, 1904. Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. The stockyards subsidized the market newspaper to the extent of over $3,000 per year in 1903 and 1904. Ibid.
Fort Worth showed greater total receipts than either St. Joseph or Sioux City. Fort Worth actually ranked fifth in the nation that year. By 1904 J. Ogden Armour even predicted that Fort Worth might someday surpass Chicago and become number one. In his 1906 book, Armour commented favorably on the growth of Fort Worth: "Last year, with other markets holding their own, the Fort Worth market showed a larger increase in the actual number of cattle handled than any other market in the country. Its percentage of increase in cattle receipts was more than three times that of any other market." It even increased its hog receipts from 1904 to 1906 by 60 percent. In 1906 the calf market at Fort Worth ranked second only to Chicago. That same

7 "One of the Big Markets," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 6 February 1905, p. 1. The United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Marketing Service cites specific figures for each of the stockyards of the nation beginning in 1917 but no earlier.

8 Actually, Armour was trying to run the Chicago stockyards out of business. The big packers did not own the Chicago stockyards; the Vanderbilts did. The packers thus built their own large, new and well-equipped stockyards and packing plants in the Southwest and West. If the Vanderbilts refused to sell the Chicago yards, Armour and the other packers planned to divert trade. The packers did not own the Kansas City yards either. Charles Edward Russell, The Greatest Trust in the World (New York: The Ridgway-Thayer Co., 1905), pp. 222-23.


10 Ibid.

year Texas devoted 120 million acres to stock farming and had eight million range cattle, making it the first cattle state in America. No wonder J. Ogden Armour believed Fort Worth could become number one!

Because of increased receipts and hopeful prospects that they would continue, both Swift and Armour added canning factories to their Fort Worth plants in the spring of 1906. The canneries brought two obvious benefits: since canners represented the cheaper quality of cows, low cost meat could be provided for the poor. Also, another market for Texas cattle opened up, for the local packeries would buy the cheaper grades, and producers would not have to ship them farther north as they had been doing.

The panic of 1907 affected business and industry nationwide, especially the cattle receipts at the larger terminal markets. Despite that, the Fort Worth market reached a million cattle that year, counting calves as cattle. The Live Stock Reporter bragged that it took Fort Worth less than five years to reach the million mark. Chicago took


eleven years, St. Louis, twenty-eight; Kansas City, seventeen; and Omaha, seventeen. Of course, the reporter for the paper chose to date the beginning of the Fort Worth market as 1902 when the packers came and forgot all those years of struggle to get a stockyards going. In fact, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company obtained its charter in 1893, something local people kept forgetting. General Manager King expressed his gratification at the excellent 1907 showing in cattle receipts, but he said he would feel a good deal better if he had a million hogs to "jubilate over."

While directors of the stockyards company voted to enlarge their pens to a capacity of eighteen thousand cattle and fourteen thousand hogs and sheep in 1908, the packers enlarged their plants that year as well after only five years of operation because of the growth of the trade. They added beef coolers, an oleo plant, fertilizer plants, and calf and sheep coolers. Swift even enlarged the hog killing floors and pork and curing cellars. The enlargements had the effect of practically doubling their capacity.

Again in 1908 Fort Worth became the only large market in the nation to make a considerable gain in receipts of

15 "Past the Million Mark," Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, 20 December 1907, p. 4.
16 Ibid.
cattle. All others lost heavily except St. Louis which remained constant. Although a growth in hog receipts continued, the stockyards needed more hogs to meet the market demand.\textsuperscript{18}

Stockyards officials in Fort Worth undoubtedly aspired that theirs become the number one market in the United States. In May, 1908 when they realized that for the previous four months they had topped St. Louis in cattle sales, the market newspaper gloated: "We passed St. Joseph last year. We will pass St. Louis this year. Now we are after Omaha..." Then they cited figures showing that the gap in difference between Fort Worth and Omaha was narrowing. "We are going to pass Omaha next year. This will leave Chicago and Kansas City ahead of us. And then we are going after Kansas City."\textsuperscript{19}

By January 1910, Fort Worth equalled St. Louis in receipts of cattle and calves and tallied receipts behind only Chicago and Kansas City! The previous year Fort Worth again had been the only market in the nation showing a gain in every class of stock--cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, horses, and mules.\textsuperscript{20}

By March 1910, five packers besides Armour and Swift maintained buyers on the Fort Worth market. These included

\textsuperscript{18} "Fort Worth's Cattle Trade, 1908," \textit{The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 1 January 1909, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{19} "St. Louis in the Rear," \textit{The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 2 May 1908, p. 1.

Morris, Cudahy, Schwarzchild and Sulzberger, Independent Packing Company, and Dold Packing Company. The market newspaper chided them, "Why not come here and do your slaughtering, gentlemen?"21

As a result of all the increased livestock receipts, packing activity, and additional jobs in North Fort Worth, the population of that area and of the city of Fort Worth increased tremendously. In the decade between 1900 and 1910, Fort Worth increased its population 173 percent, from 26,688 in 1900 to 73,312 in 1910.22 Quite obviously, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and its related enterprises including the adjacent packing houses stimulated this remarkable growth. Cowtown had established itself as a market to watch in the future.

The tremendous progress of the decade did not come without numerous problems. The packing plants and the Fort Worth Stock Yards remained so closely intertwined that anything which affected one inevitably affected the other. The butchers' strike during the summer of 1904 serves to illustrate. Packinghouse workers nationwide had been attempting to make the Amalgamated Butchers Union a viable force under the


The presidency of Michael Donnelly since before the turn of the century. Locally, the butchers had just organized 6 June 1904, when six days later Donnelly ordered a general strike. Other employees of the packing plants and stockyards did not strike, but they could not work with butchers out. The commission men sent letters to their regular shippers telling them to hold their stock until further notice. The dispute at Chicago erupted over a wage scale and a desire that packers hire only union workers. The packers would not agree, especially concerning the union shop. Soon the local plants began hiring other butchers, and Fort Worth production continued more steadily than at any other of the packing centers. No violence occurred at Fort Worth, but some did at Chicago, St. Louis, and St. Paul. Rumors had circulated that other packing plant workers would go out and that even railroad workers would cooperate by refusing to haul cars containing packinghouse products, but this action did not happen.

Local citizens opposed the activity of the strikers and some suggested an ordinance against crowds gathering and loitering as the strikers had been doing, but no ordinance

---


was passed.\textsuperscript{26} When the strike finally ended 10 October 1904, the big packers won. Of 700 to 800 men who went out on strike, only about 250 remained employed in Fort Worth; the rest found work elsewhere.\textsuperscript{27} The nationwide strike cost packers eight million dollars and the strikers about five million in wages. A local striker complained, "There were too many scabs in Texas, and the people had not been sufficiently educated on the principles of the union."\textsuperscript{28} The few other unions in the city contributed to a fund to help strikers, and the farmers' union provided vegetables.\textsuperscript{29} No nationwide threat of a meat shortage materialized as the strikers had hoped, because the packers could operate somewhat, and the independent packers increased production.\textsuperscript{30} The packers broke the power of the union, and it went underground for years, nationally.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{26} "Strike Is Over Here," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 28 July 1904, p. 1. Although the newspaper reported a new city ordinance to that effect, an examination of the city council minutes of both the cities of Fort Worth and North Fort Worth reveals no such ordinance.

\textsuperscript{27} "Effects of the Strike," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 10 September 1904, p. 1.


\textsuperscript{29} Gauthier, "Organized Labor," p. 18764.


\textsuperscript{31} Lewis Corey, Meat and Man: A Study of Monopoly, Unionism, and Food Policy (New York: The Viking Press, 1950), p. 64.
Another labor problem occurred during the bustling decade of growth at the Fort Worth market center, involving the hundreds of immigrants from central and eastern Europe who came to the area to work in the packing plants. A citizen's committee met with packing officials in December 1907 to tell them that they represented the feelings of citizens expressed at a mass meeting that they did not like "Bohunks" being hired while "white" residents of North Fort Worth and Fort Worth remained unemployed. Packers replied that they hired the foreign workers when labor was scarce. They also could not afford to discriminate against foreigners because of the export trade. The packers, however, promised to give work to those who were suffering at the first opportunity and would "cooperate" with the citizens. At the time of the problem 160 of these immigrants worked at Swift and 40 at Armour. A Swift official, Joe Googins, explained that he employed the workers only to do the jobs the "whites" would not do. Others disagreed with him and said that the local citizens had held every job there and would hold any job to feed their wives and children. Cargill of Armour said that he hired the foreigners because in the fall much of Armour's Negro labor left the plant to go to the cotton fields to

32 Most of the foreign workers were Bohemians, Polish, Serbs, or Czechoslovakians, but local citizens made no distinction, calling all of them "Bohunks" even in the newspaper accounts. Local citizens were referred to as "white" by contrast.
work. Workers would stand at the gate and the foreman would go and get the ones needed that day. Often the foreigners rushed up and got ahead of a "timid white laborer," he said.33

Citizens also complained of the unsanitary conditions under which the foreigners lived and insisted it represented a danger to all of North Fort Worth. The city health officer reported that they lived twenty in a room, all dipping stale bread into the same pot of soup. A representative of the Farmers' Union of Texas told the citizens at the mass meeting that his group had passed resolutions that they would not support institutions that employed labor that would live under such conditions as the "Bohunks" were living. He said his group represented every city and county in the state.34

The local stock journal indicated that after the mass meeting, the packers turned many more foreigners away from their gates and did not employ them. In addition, teenage boys, or some of the rowdier element among the local population, attacked the foreigners' quarters and upon at least three occasions broke windows. The immigrants became frightened and most left town. Many of them had come to Fort Worth originally because of encouragement by immigration

34Ibid.
and employment agents who got a large percentage of their wages for getting jobs for these foreigners at packing plants. 35

Not only were labor relations a problem, federal regulation of the meat packing industry, including the stockyards and the railroads that carried their products, remained a continual threat since the days of the Vest Committee of 1888. That resulted in part in the Sherman Anti-Trust Act and attempts at regulation of railroad rates. The Federal Meat Inspection Act directly regulated meat packers in 1906. Regulation of stockyards would come a decade and one-half later.

Early efforts at federal controls on the industry concerned tick-infested cattle which remained a problem after the turn of the century. Conservative estimates in the early 1900's placed the losses directly and indirectly of tick fever at $40 million annually. 36 The Fort Worth Stock Yards built a new fifty-five foot long dipping vat in April, 1904. The part deep enough to submerge the cattle stretched twenty-five feet long and five feet four inches deep. So that a cow could not turn around, the vat measured eighteen inches

---

35 "Packers Put on More Men No Bohunks in North Fort Worth," The Texas Stockman-Journal, 29 January 1908, p. 3.

wide at the bottom and three feet wide at the top. The brick vat held one thousand gallons of oil and had a reserve supply tank alongside holding seven thousand gallons. Attendants drove the cattle in, then the animals would slide to the deep part over their heads. Since they could not turn around, they kept going to the steps to climb out. A dripping pen followed. The vat, completed by mid-May, 1904, had the capacity of one thousand cattle a day.  

After a large crowd assembled 18 May 1904 to witness the opening of the new dipping vat, stockyards ads proclaimed, "The government dipping station located at the Fort Worth Stock Yards is in operation, and cattle feeders can now ship from below the line to northern pastures at any season of the year at a nominal cost by dipping at Ft. Worth, under the government officers' supervision." The ads continued for many weeks and proclaimed in bold headlines "Dip! Dip! Dip! Texas Fever Overcome!" In October 1904, a German doctor and member of the official meat inspection department of


40 "Dip! Dip! Dip!" Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement, The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 8 December 1904, p. 3.
Germany came to Fort Worth and inspected the stockyards and packing plants. He said that he had been told that the dipping vats were the first of their kind in the world, and he came to America especially to see them. He seemed properly impressed.

Renewed efforts by the federal government to eradicate the tick problem began in earnest in July, 1906, with the Inspection Division of the Bureau of Animal Industry in charge. They divided the infested territory into five districts and made the first federal appropriation of $82,500. One-fourth of the total area under quarantine in the United States was located in Texas. Obviously, then, the majority of the cattle at the Fort Worth Stock Yards consisted of ticky cattle in the early days, so the pens for the quarantined cattle represented the largest.

A solid board fence separated the tick-infested cattle from the smaller section where the clean pens stood. Other attempts at federal regulation besides tick eradication included six anti-trust suits filed against Swift, Armour, Cudahy, Morris, and a number of their associates in the years from 1902 to 1910. The Court dismissed most cases or acquitted the defendants. In one of these cases in 1905 the government charged a number of meat packers with a conspiracy to fix livestock prices in the stockyards. The sales had occurred in local stockyards while the animals were "at rest," but the Court refused to consider local transactions as distinctive from the general flow of interstate commerce. The Court distinguished sales from production, but the distinction was vague. In U.S. v. E. C. Knight Co. (1895), the Court said that production had only an incidental effect on commerce and so could not be regulated by the federal government. The Knight doctrine was not overthrown until the 1930's. Proposed anti-trust legislation, the Hepburn Act, failed in 1908, but a groundwork had been laid for the

45 Taped Conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Tom Saunders, Jr. and Ted Gouldy, 24 June 1971, in possession of Ted Gouldy, Fort Worth, Tape 1.

46 Corey, Meat and Man, p. 52.

Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act, both of which would come later.\textsuperscript{48}

Most discussions during the decade that opposed the packers surfaced at cattlemen’s meetings in Colorado, South Dakota, and other places far from Texas. Local producers seemed too happy about their good market at Fort Worth to be in the forefront of any complaints against the Big Five. Managers of the Armour and Swift plants in Fort Worth naturally denied that any filthy conditions existed such as Upton Sinclair charged in his muckraking novel, \textit{The Jungle}, about Chicago packing plants. A reporter from the local \textit{Southwestern Farmer and Breeder} toured the Fort Worth plants and was told to let the manager know about anything unclean.\textsuperscript{49} In fact, Fort Worth citizens seemed outspoken in their expressions of sympathy for the packers. Several leading citizens even sent a telegram to J. Ogden Armour in which they said they represented "the prevailing sentiment." They believed the "persecution" was "conducted more for political purposes than for a sincere desire to improve . . .


\textsuperscript{49}"Fort Worth Packing Houses Use Utmost Care," \textit{Southwestern Farmer and Breeder}, 15 June 1906, p. 1.
Winfield Scott, a local cattleman, believed that the packing houses had done more than any other enterprise "towards developing the country."\(^5^0\)

A few Texans disagreed, however. A. B. Robertson, in a speech to the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas, complained that in the big markets one buyer frequently got precedence one day to stock up and the following day another big packer obtained the same opportunity "in order that there be no competition."\(^5^2\) As would be expected, the *Live Stock Reporter*, owned by the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, defended the packers, calling the attacks against them "untruthful and vicious" and warned that such attacks would "hurt the cattle trade."\(^5^3\)

As a means of working together to combat the bad publicity, mostly small packers formed the Association of American Meat Packers at a meeting at the Grand Pacific Hotel in Chicago on 1 October 1906. The small meat packers reasoned that what affected the big packers hurt the little ones.

---

\(^{50}\) "Confidence in Mr. Armour," *The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter*, 29 November 1911, p. 1.


more. One man from Morris appeared to be the only one of the Big Five even represented. Organizers certainly invited the big packers to join the organization and they eventually did.\textsuperscript{54}

While meat packers organized, cattle producers attempted a stronger alignment as well. On 30 January 1906 the American Stock Growers Association and the National Live Stock Association merged to become the American National Cattlemen's Association, as a power to unite them against the packing and railroad trusts and to help them influence national politics.\textsuperscript{55} Also, cattlemen from mostly Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Colorado organized the Cooperative Livestock Commission Company in 1906 to try to avoid the excessive rates charged by regular commission companies at livestock exchanges. The commission company did well at first, but producers later boycotted it when they felt intimidated by the exchanges. It went out of business in 1909. The cooperative won a lower court suit in Missouri, but the Missouri Supreme Court overturned the decision and said the defendants had not engaged in a conspiracy to put the cooperative out of business. The cooperative failed partly because "Wyoming sheepmen, Texas cattle raisers, and Iowa cattle


and hog farmers were not sufficiently aware of their common interests to stand together." 56

While federal regulation of stockyards and meat packing always represented a threat, even the state of Texas did not consistently befriend the local industry either. A bill before the Texas legislature in 1907 proposed to reduce charges for yardage and feed at stockyards in the state. Naturally, the Fort Worth Stock Yards fought it. The company asked legislators to visit the yards to examine the costs of operation. 57 A subcommittee of the House Committee on State Affairs visited the yards on 16 February 1907. While the company extended to them every courtesy, they could not show the legislators the financial records, for the secretary-treasurer was out of town. The committee admitted that they opposed any state legislation that would cripple the industry, but because charges indeed seemed unreasonable they all favored federal regulation so that the large shippers out of Texas would be under the same restrictions. Since out of state packers controlled the local stockyards, only federal legislation would help, the committee believed. The majority report of the subcommittee thus made no recommendations for


legislation, but a minority report submitted by one legislator called the stockyards charges "exorbitant" and suggested state restrictions.\(^{58}\) Armour and Swift were considering spending $175,000 for a coliseum at the stockyards for the annual stock show, but they delayed construction for several months until they saw what the state legislature intended to do.\(^{59}\)

Two years later yardage fees at the local stockyards still brought complaints from cattlemen. As of 1 January 1909, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company reduced yardage fees by one-third because a committee from the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas visited company officials and threatened to place the matter before the next legislature if the company made no changes.\(^{60}\)

Investigation and threatened legislation may have been all that resulted concerning yardage fees at the stockyards, but the legislature took a different attitude entirely about the livestock exchange itself. While the Kansas Supreme Court deliberated on a case in which they later held that the


Kansas City Livestock Exchange constituted a trust, the Texas attorney general decided to investigate the Fort Worth Live Stock Exchange. Judge Jewell P. Lightfoot, an assistant in the office of the Texas attorney general, made a secret visit to Fort Worth during the first week of March, 1906 to investigate the conduct of business at the local livestock exchange. People did not find out about his visit until after he was back in Austin. The state attorney general then filed suits against the exchange, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Armour, Swift, commission companies, and some cattlemen to forfeit the right to do business in Texas and to invoke penalties aggregating $17 million. In brief the charges alleged,

You have been and are committing acts that enable you to fix the price of cattle and hogs and also to fix the price of slaughtered or cured meats. The effect of that policy is to depress the price of the live stock the people want to sell, and raise the price of the meat you sell to the people. That is harmful to legitimate industry; is unjust and unfair in principle and is contrary to law and sound public policy. You must stop it.

Even the Stockman-Journal, a newspaper supported not by the packers or stockyards, but by cattle interests, lamented that it "would be a real misfortune to have the packeries at


Fort Worth closed" and asserted that "They can obey the law and make money" because small packing houses in Waco, Dallas, and other places were doing so.\(^{64}\)

Members of the exchange, which included the stockyards, commission companies, order buyers, and many Texas cattlemen, protested that the suits against them were political in motivation and that every fact in the possession of the attorney general had been recently threshed over by the Tarrant County grand jury, which "found nothing in the premises that would warrant an indictment."\(^{65}\) Of course, the writer did not mention that the local grand jury probably would not want to destroy the industry that was making Fort Worth wealthy!

Naturally, the *Live Stock Reporter*, owned by the packers and stockyards, defended the industry. The editor reported that commission men regarded it "laughable" that anyone would think they would work out a deal to set prices because their interests were opposed to that of the packers. Packers bought livestock at the market, while commission men worked as agents for sellers.\(^{66}\) Fort Worth business interests even started a fund to help the packers defray the costs and

\(^{64}\) Ibid.


penalties in the case in order to show the packers their appreciation for what they had done for the city.\textsuperscript{67} Suspense in the case ended by October 1907 when the attorney general agreed to drop the suit against the exchange if the members would pay $17,500 and costs. In addition, the state terminated the Live Stock Exchange charter, which had been issued 24 October 1901, and ordered the exchange to do no further business in the state. Actually, the exchange had been out of business since April, 1906 when litigation began.\textsuperscript{68} All defendants, which amounted to a "who's who" of Texas cattle-men, as well as the stockyards and packers, were enjoined from making contracts or agreements to regulate charges.\textsuperscript{69}

Construction and expansion at the yards continued despite legal setbacks. In late November 1905, the board of directors authorized the construction of covered pens

\textsuperscript{67}"Sympathy for Packers," \textit{Southwestern Farmer and Breeder}, 11 May 1906, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{68}"Trust Suit is Settled," \textit{Southwestern Farmer and Breeder}, 11 October 1907, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{69}Copy of a judgment included in a letter from William Hunter McLean to Tom B. Saunders, Jr., 7 February 1974, in Tom B. Saunders, Jr. Collection, TCU. Thirteen livestock exchanges remained in the nation after the Fort Worth one was outlawed. "National Exchange Meeting," \textit{The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 17 July 1907, p. 1. A Kansas Supreme Court decision later ruled that the Kansas Live Stock Exchange was not a trust, leaving Fort Worth as the only large market in the country that was "not allowed to have an exchange for the better regulation of business among its members." "Not Considered A Trust," ibid., 9 January 1911, p. 1.
costing between $4,000 and $5,000 uniform with the existing hog pens and connecting with them. As early as January, 1906, the board considered a suggestion by General Manager King to build a pavillion or auditorium at the stockyards for use of the stock show. If outside subscriptions by Fort Worth citizens toward the building reached $20,000 or $30,000, King wanted to know if the company would agree to furnish the balance and construct the building. The board preferred to await the results from the experiment of using the new hog pens for the fat stock show.

The directors authorized the officers to dig a new artesian well to a lower strata than the existing wells, at a cost of about $5,000. At the same meeting they also decided to purchase a suitable tent for the cattle show to be held at the stockyards in March 1907 and to guarantee the premium list to an amount not to exceed $7,500. The arrangement was that advance sales of tickets for the show, gate receipts, and income from all other sources would be applied to provide a sufficient premium, and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company would be liable only for the deficit, if any.

---

70 Board of Directors Meeting, 15 November 1905, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 161.

71 Board of Directors Meeting, 25 January 1906, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 181.

72 Board of Directors Meeting, 25 October 1906, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol.,
The directors continued to discuss the construction of a coliseum or pavilion in the fall of 1906. They learned that local citizens had pledged $42,000 toward the project. Directors were willing to set an architect to work. At the same meeting they also decided that as soon as practicable the horse business should be controlled by the stockyards company and that no more leases to outside companies should be made as had been done previously.73

At the January, 1907 directors meeting, Edward Swift complained that insufficient switching facilities existed at the stockyards. The board voted to continue negotiations for the control or acquisition of the stockyards located on property of the Texas and Pacific Railroad and the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad in Fort Worth, the Hodge Yards.74

Officials also agreed to expand the stockyards facilities. General Manager King indicated that commission men and others needed more office space which would cost $21,000. The directors approved the addition and granted permission

p. 187. After the show the following March a directors meeting revealed that receipts for the show were $10,136.85 and disbursements $13,500.00, so the deficit the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company paid was only $3,363.15. Corporate Record, 28 March 1907, p. 219. Indian Chief Quanah Parker and two wives visited Fort Worth during the cattlemen's convention and fat stock show in March 1907. "Quanah Parker, Great Chief of the Comanches," The Fort Worth Record, 17 March 1907, p. 1.

73 Corporate Record, 14 November 1906, p. 195.

74 Corporate Record, 16 January 1907, p. 209.
to build a three hundred-ton hay barn and granary. \(^{75}\) While King always maintained final control over any expansion project, Kennerly Robey, the chief engineer and architect of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, directly supervised the coliseum construction and other additions. At a cornerstone ceremony on 3 October 1907, officials placed some papers relating to the occasion in a box under it. Plans called for the coliseum to be the "largest, most elegant and perfectly appointed live stock exhibition building in the South, and one without superior in the United States." \(^{76}\) Judge Sam Cowan, a representative of the Cattle Raisers Association, spoke at the ceremony and emphasized the four prime factors that made a good livestock market:

1. the buyer who gives at least as advantageous \([a]\) price as can be otherwise or elsewhere secured,

2. the ability of the seller to reach that market at least as cheaply and advantageously as other markets with his products,

3. the ability of the packing houses to prepare the products for sale in as good condition as at other markets,

4. the ability to reach the markets of the world as cheaply and conveniently as competitors. \(^{77}\)

\(^{75}\) Corporate Record, 28 March 1907 and 20 June 1907, pp. 219, 227.

\(^{76}\) "New Home of Texas Feeders and Breeders," Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, 4 October 1907, p. 1.

\(^{77}\) Ibid.
Judge Cowan indicated that all four factors existed at Fort Worth except that for out of state shippers the railroad should give better rates.  

By October, 1907, $37,000 of an eventual $50,000 subscription promised by the local citizens actually had been raised. Some of the prime movers in the local effort were officials of the local fat stock show: S. Burk Burnett, president; T. T. D. Andrews, manager and secretary; Marion Sansom, vice president; and C. C. French, publicity agent for the stockyards, assistant secretary. Burk Burnett helped raise the money by sending out a letter to the cattlemen of Texas.

Part of the agreement between the Fort Worth Stock Yards and the show consisted of a promise that local show officials would hold at least one show each year for the coming ten years if the stockyards company would erect the building for the purpose. The show officials promised to deposit $50,000 as a guaranty with the stockyards company that they would hold the show. The $50,000 would stay in escrow. If the show continued for ten successful years, the money would go

---

78 Ibid.


back to the cattlemen; if not, the stockyards company would get it as part compensation for the expense of constructing the building.\(^{81}\) Stockholder L. V. Niles objected to the $130,000 cost of the coliseum and to the liberal terms to the National Feeders and Breeders.\(^{82}\)

By 1908 several changes had occurred in the stock show since the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company began it in 1896. The name had changed three of its ultimate four times from the Texas Fat Stock Show to the Fort Worth Fat Stock Show and in 1906 to the National Feeders and Breeders Show. Officials added a horse show and poultry show in 1906. With poultry added, they felt the title "fat stock show" misleading.

C. C. French, public relations agent for the stockyards, explained that a resolution to have a poultry show in connection with the fat stock show was voted down for three years in a row. He quoted Frank Hovencamp, a veteran Texas cattleman, for the reason why: "We don't want six bit

---

\(^{81}\) The agreement was presented and put into the record at the meeting. Board of Directors Meeting, 17 December 1907, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 239; also B. B. Paddock, ed., Fort Worth and the Texas Northwest (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1922), p. 664; also "Fat Stock Building," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 31 July 1906, p. 1.

\(^{82}\) Board of Directors Meeting, 17 December 1907, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 239. Actual cost turned out to be $155,305.33, although newspapers called it a $175,000 building before it was built. J. W. Dies to F. F. Murray 4 June 1936, J. W. Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.; also "Fat Stock Building," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 31 July 1906, p. 1.
roosters crowing in the early morning and waking up $1,000 bulls."  

An innovation occurred when the new coliseum opened. On 14 March 1908 the first cutting horse contest ever held under electric lights under a roof took place. Unbelievably, following the 1908 show, S. Burk Burnett, Marion Sansom, and Fort Worth Stock Yards Company manager W. B. King were named as a committee to go to Chicago to meet with Armour and Swift and let them know that the show was too big for the new coliseum and more room was needed.

The company prospered despite a nationwide business panic. By 1908 the directors authorized dividends of $1.25 per share to be paid in May and August and planned regular quarterly dividends of the same amount per share in February, May, and August, and November each year until further notice.  

---


84 Tom B. Saunders, "How the Word Rodeo Originated As Applied to Western Events," The Quarter Horse Journal 20(June 1968):30. The first cutting horse contest ever was in Haskell, Texas at the Texas Cowboy Reunion (now held in Stamford) on 29 July 1898.


86 Board of Directors Meeting, 14 January 1908, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 251.
shares, earned over $30,000 from the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company in one year alone.

General Manager King submitted plans for covered sheds or pens with a capacity of seven hundred cattle, amounting to $23,000 to $25,000, and plans for open pens with a capacity of thirty-two railroad cars of livestock to be erected at a cost of approximately $5,000. The pens would be used for housing show cattle during the fat stock show and for other purposes at other times. King also submitted drawings for the extension of pens in the quarantine division which he estimated would cost between $6,000 or $7,000 and which would increase the capacity of the yards about fifty cars. Directors, especially Niles and Simpson, talked of cheaper ways to build the pens. They suggested that an effort should be made to get the local people to help build the pens for the fat stock show, so they appointed a committee to investigate. 87

The board also decided in 1908 to hire two men to educate the farmers in Texas to try to increase the output of hogs in the state, an important decision indeed. 88 The chance for more hogs for the local market increased that year.

87 Board of Directors Meeting, 11 August 1908, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 255. When finally completed, the pens cost $10,000 rather than the $23,000 estimated. Ibid., 12 January 1909, p. 272.

88 Board of Directors Meeting, 11 August 1908, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 257.
when railroads crossing Oklahoma lowered the tariff from seven cents to two cents on the hundred on hogs shipped from Oklahoma points to the Fort Worth market. Commission men became excited because the lower rate obviously would mean more business. 89

One of the setbacks of the year 1908 included a flood on 17-18 April in the low area between the Trinity River and Marine Creek which cut off street car communication between Fort Worth and North Fort Worth. The Fort Worth and Denver City Railroad put on a special train service to carry the workers to the stockyards area. Oldtimers remembered a similar flood in July 1889. 90 People did not have to wait another nineteen years, however, for on the night of 23 May 1908 flood waters again ravaged North Fort Worth, covering the lawn in front of the exchange building and the floor of the new coliseum. Water flooded the Live Stock Reporter building to a height of three feet as well as the Simmons-Team Mule Company, both of which stood on the south side of Exchange Avenue across from the coliseum and exchange building. Both packing houses, on higher ground to the east, escaped damage, but the area to the west of the stockyards did not fare as well. Marion Samson lost all but two hundred

89 "Lower Rates to This City on Hogs," The Texas Stockman-Journal, 19 August 1908, p. 12.

of twenty-five hundred sheep in his pasture. Waters swept away the bridge on Exchange Avenue, but the stockyards company soon constructed a foot bridge.  

Despite such problems, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company managed to make a profit of $194,698.64 for the year 1908 and authorized that quarterly dividends be raised to $1.50 per share for the coming year. In March, 1909 the directors increased the capital stock of the company from $2 million to $2.5 million dollars. They also authorized General Manager King to construct a concrete bridge over Marine Creek at a cost of not over $8,000. In November directors learned that the bridge would cost $16,000 and approved that sum as well as authorizing the construction of a brick building on the north side of the bridge at a cost of $34,000 and a brick building on the south side for $25,000. They also decided to colonize and incorporate a village comprising the stockyards and packing houses, and authorized $25,000 to $35,000 to construct rentable houses. The directors further gave the general manager authority to

92 Board of Directors Meeting, 12 January 1909, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., pp. 269, 273.
93 Annual Stockholders Meeting, 15 March 1909, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 287.
94 Board of Directors Meeting, 24 March 1909, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 293.
spend $16,000 to build more cattle pens in the southern division of the stockyards.95 By the end of 1909, the assets and liabilities of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company balanced at over $4 million and profits reached $247,583.13.96

Almost from the time that Armour and Swift opened their doors, rumors flew in the city of Fort Worth that other packers would construct plants at the stockyards, too, such as Nelson Morris or the Schwarzchild and Sulzberger Company,97 but real efforts to obtain another packer came toward the end of the decade. Even as early as 1904, however, a speaker at a tick dipping ceremony predicted that instead of supporting two great packers, Fort Worth would soon boast three or four or even a half dozen.98 City leaders of Fort Worth remained always ready to encourage them to come. When local citizens heard a rumor that Nelson Morris might open a packing plant in Oklahoma City, B. B. Paddock met with Morris's lawyers and offered a bonus to locate at Fort Worth instead of the Oklahoma site, for that would draw off some...
of Fort Worth's business. Morris's lawyers informed Paddock that the packer was not expanding to either location at present.\(^99\)

Cattlemen and local businessmen created a committee in 1907, however, to raise a bonus to get another packer.\(^100\) Their hopes soared in 1908 that Schwarzchild and Sulzberger or even Jacob Dold and Company might come. The newspaperman who printed the hopes for another packer admitted that Fort Worth would have grown faster if the market received more hogs. Cattle interests would benefit too, he admitted, if Texas got more hogs, because more packers would come. A packing house cannot run on beef alone, the writer reminded the readers of his stock journal.

... where the hogs are not there will be no packing houses. Let this fact once seep into the heads of those who look with contempt on the humble porker and we may get a real hog revival, for which the press of Texas has so long been preaching ... .

And after that the packing houses will come, and with them more competition in the beef trade.\(^101\)

Fort Worth businessmen made the offer in November 1908 of a bonus of $100,000 to the first packer who would build, equip, and operate a plant like the existing two. In just


\(^100\)"Plan Bonus For Packing House," The Texas Stockman-Journal, 13 March 1907, p. 15.

a few hours on 6 November they subscribed $51,000. A committee composed of Winfield Scott, S. Burk Burnett, George T. Reynolds, Marion Sansom, and W. T. Waggoner planned to go to Chicago and call on the packers and present their proposition. The men felt certain that at least one packer would come. 102 Citizens raised the remainder of the $100,000 bonus, but officials still held it as of 5 June 1909, for no packer had accepted their offer. Rumors continued that Schwarzchild and Sulzberger would build a plant in Texas and one in Oklahoma. 103 When two members of the Cudahy Packing Company came to Fort Worth 7 July 1909 to look over the area with the possibility of putting a plant in Fort Worth, they asked about the supply of cattle and hogs. 104 Citizens felt so certain that one or more new packing plants would be built in the city in 1909 that they stated the information in a souvenir program published that year relating facts about Fort Worth. 105 In 1910 some citizens even attempted to


105 Official Souvenir Programme, Thirty-third Annual Convention, Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas, Fort Worth, Texas, March 1909.
acquire an interest in the stockyards and present that holding as an inducement for the establishment of a new packing house.  

While many cities might claim that the two Big Five packers already in Fort Worth, Armour and Swift, exerted influence to keep others away, the overriding factor seemed to be the absence of a sufficient number of hogs to induce a third major packer to come. Even the Armour and Swift plants never operated to capacity in hogs. C. C. French, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company promotional agent, told of a conversation with packer Nelson Morris in Chicago when French urged Morris to build a packing plant in Fort Worth. Morris asked, "How soon will you have hogs enough?"  

The supply of hogs in Texas became the one major factor on which the continued growth of the Fort Worth market depended. Whether the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company became number one and surpassed Chicago quite possibly depended on Texas hog production rather than that of cattle. This vital issue will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

---


CHAPTER V

HOGS! HOGS! HOGS!

Ante-bellum cotton farmers and plantation owners migrated due westward from the Southern states into East Texas bringing their agricultural habits with them; cotton provided the one money crop. Other foodstuffs and animals raised--including hogs--only supplemented the family food supply. Sons and grandsons followed their ancestors' habits even into the twentieth century. Few considered raising hogs as a money crop because until Swift and Armour opened at Fort Worth in 1903, no reliable market existed. West Texas and the Panhandle area of the state developed as cattle ranches, often with midwesterners and even British and Scottish syndicates as owners. These West Texas cattlemen resisted hog production as a business enterprise even more strenuously than the farmers of East Texas. Both groups failed to realize that the availability of hogs at the Fort Worth market represented the one most vital issue to its growth and progress during its first half century of existence.

Had a sufficient supply of hogs materialized in Fort Worth to attract two or three other big packers, quite possibly the local market would have surpassed Kansas City and Chicago and led the nation as local citizens, packer
J. Ogden Armour, and other officials desired. The tremendous efforts of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company to increase their hog receipts, especially in the second decade of the twentieth century, constitutes an exciting story. Company officials reached for the sky in their plans and ambitions, and accomplished much success because of their publicity efforts, but they never quite attained number one. Hogs, not cattle, explain the reason why.

Actually, prior to 1875 Chicago packers such as Armour and Swift had been primarily pork packers. Texas cattle arriving after the long drive changed the aspect of meat packing, but the consuming public still ate a larger diet of pork than of beef.

A farmer from Bowie, Texas wrote a letter in February, 1890 to the editor of a local stock journal promising that if Fort Worth would build a packing house, the farmers would start raising more hogs. At present, he explained, no incentive existed to raise any hogs except for family consumption.1

As previously noted, leading citizens of Fort Worth helped build small packing houses in Fort Worth in the 1890's, and Simpson and Niles organized the Fort Worth Stock

1"Hogs and Packing House," Fort Worth Daily Gazette, 12 February 1890, p. 3.
Yards Company. In practically every issue of the local stock journal in 1899 a stockyards advertisement begged for more hogs. Then about a month after the major packers, Armour and Swift, opened their plants in 1903, an editorial in the *Live Stock Reporter* compared hog prices with Kansas City and St. Louis to reveal that Fort Worth offered a few cents higher. The editor again urged farmers to ship to Fort Worth.  

After two of the Big Five meat packers constructed large modern packing plants in Fort Worth and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company began its expansion, packers, stockyards officials, and local citizens expected the local market to go all the way. G. W. Simpson of the stockyards stated in a letter to the local livestock newspaper that by July, 1903 Fort Worth already ranked as the sixth largest cattle market in the country and handled more cattle in its first year than did Chicago, Kansas City, or Omaha. He believed Fort Worth would eventually lead them all "if the people will raise hogs to the extent of their ability."  

Another local stock journal described the swine industry of Texas as "in its infancy," but believed it "capable of

---


remarkable development" owing to the opening of the new
Texas market. From the beginning, however, packers never
obtained enough hogs to make up a complete shipping order
from local supplies. From the outset they told Texas
farmers: "Texas cannot raise more hogs than the Fort Worth
market will care for." They assured them that if they did,
other packers would come in who could.  

Livestock writers even tried to convince cattlemen to
raise hogs as well as beeves in order to increase cattle
prices. The market continually paid lower prices than the
producers desired for their cattle because packers got all
they could use. Because packers never got all the hogs they
needed, they urged producers to raise more hogs so as to get
other packing plants built. Then demand for cattle would
increase as well. Observant market analysts—but not
enough producers—noted that hogs represented the key to
growth.

Even the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas realized
that the growth of the market depended on more hogs and
launched a campaign to help. H. E. Finney, general manager
of the local Armour plant, endorsed the plan and indicated

4 "Big Packeries At Fort Worth," The Texas Stock Journal,
4 March 1902, p. 1.

5 "Hog Supply in Texas," The Texas Stockman-Journal, 12
October 1904, p. 11.

6 "More Hogs Needed to Help Cattle Business," The Texas
that the quickest way to get another packing plant in Fort Worth would be to ship three or four hogs to the market for every head of cattle. Swift officials agreed, for in 1907 Louis P. Swift predicted that if the people of Texas would raise ten times as many hogs as presently, the local market "would buy every one of them."

While packers and others might have expected that West Texas cattlemen would be difficult to convince, they at least should have reasonably been able to expect that East Texas farmers could be persuaded to raise more pork instead of cotton once an excellent market existed. Fort Worth stood practically on the borderline between East and West, with the Cross Timbers of the East Texas farming district located on one side and the plains of the West stretching into cattle country on the other.

No one should fault the officials of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company for not trying to obtain more hogs at their market, for they used every promotional device known to advertisers in those early days of the twentieth century and even developed a few new ones. Even before Armour and Swift came, a Fort Worth Stock Yards Company advertisement


in March, 1900 proclaimed: "We Must Have More Hogs, Hogs, Hogs." After the turn of the century, the Daily Live Stock Reporter ran articles as lead stories in boldface type urging farmers to raise more hogs. An almost daily newspaper campaign lasted through 1915 when the Reporter started encouraging sheep production as well.

One may realize the various promotional techniques the company used during the first two decades of the twentieth century to encourage hog production by sampling articles from the newspaper barrage that appeared in both the Reporter and the Stockman-Journal during these years. As early as January, 1904, Charles French, the publicity agent for the stockyards, told Texas farmers that 75 percent of the money paid for hogs at Fort Worth went to swine breeders in Oklahoma and Indian territories, rather than Texas farmers who should have been getting the money. In 1906, under a headline of "Now Will You Raise Hogs?" the stockyards launched a plan in which the company would give monthly prizes of five registered boars, four of them to shippers of the four best carloads of hogs and one for the best

---

9Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement, Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 14 March 1900, p. 11.


wagonload of hogs. The producer had to own the hogs and feed them for at least two months prior to sale. The stockyards received seventy-five thousand hogs a month and officials wanted at least twice that many.

In 1909 at the State Fair of Texas in Dallas, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company offered a $25 premium for the grand champion boar and a $25 premium for the grand champion sow to help encourage the hog breeders of the Southwest. The company also cooperated with other organizations and stock journals in addition to their own in its hog campaign. The Cattle Raisers' Association of Texas continually told farmers in the Stockman-Journal in the first decade of the twentieth century how profitable hog raising could be. They even ran a special issue on hog raising in February 1909. The Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, also published locally, made a practice of printing names of specific ranchers or farmers who shipped to Fort Worth, the prices they received, and how they compared, favorably of course, to Kansas City and Chicago. The publication followed this practice with both cattle and hogs.

13 Ibid.
The stockyards company fitted up a Cotton Belt Railroad car on 21 July 1910 to demonstrate different breeds of hogs and to "preach the gospel" of raising fine hogs. The Missouri, Kansas and Texas and the Fort Worth and Denver City railway companies expected to do the same kind of educational campaign for farmers on their lines. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company also decided to bring in a number of extremely high-grade gilts from Illinois and Missouri and sell them at actual cost to stock farmers. They planned to keep up the practice as long as a demand existed, which they believed "probably will be for a good while."  

On of the numerous advertisements used by the company to urge hog raising asked the "Eternal Question."

With the Farmer--How to get the farm paid for, the children educated, the new house built, and some money in the bank?

With the Landowner--How to get the tenants to make the farm more productive?

With the Packer--How to get more hogs to meet the increased demand for pork products?

With the Stockyards--How to satisfy the packers' constantly increasing demand for more hogs?

With the Stockman--How to get another packing plant in Fort Worth?


The Answer is: Raise Hogs!
Raise More Hogs!!
And THEN SOME.\textsuperscript{18}

This advertisement appeared many times in the local market newspaper during the first decade of the twentieth century.

Newspaper articles, premiums at state fairs, and rail-road cars of purebred pigs represented the variety of tactics the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company utilized. However, the largest and most successful hog promotion effort of the company involved the fulltime activities of agent Charles C. French.\textsuperscript{19} In fact, his efforts through Texas and the South

\textsuperscript{18}Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement, Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 1 January 1909, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{19}Charles C. French became so important to promotional efforts for the stockyards for four decades (1896-1936) that a background description of him seems relevant. As early as 1856 he traveled through Texas by stage. Then he trailed herds northward for a while as a cowboy. By 1888 he traveled in Texas buying cattle for such commission companies as McIlhany, James H. Campbell, and Evans-Snider-Buel. By 1896 he had become the agent of the Fort Worth Stock Yards company, but he apparently quit near the turn of the century when business slowed and worked again for Evans-Snider-Buel. He returned to the Fort Worth Stock Yards by the time the packers came and stayed with them until the mid-1930's except for about five years with the extension service of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. In fact, he was being "carried gratuitously" on the payroll at $162 per month in July 1936. Rossie Beth Bennett, "History of the Cattle Trade in Fort Worth, Texas" (Masters thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1931), p. 4; "General Range & Stock Notes," Texas Live Stock Journal, 14 September 1889, p. 10; Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 31 July 1896, p. 4; Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 31 October 1898, p. 8; W. C. Walker to L. V. Niles, 18 May 1921, L. V. Niles to W. C. Walker, 10 May 1921, and A. G. Donovan to W. K. Wright, 11 July 1936, Dies correspondence, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.
constituted a major aspect of a campaign for which Armour, Swift and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company jointly appropriated $100,000. They wanted to triple the hog supply in Texas within five years. At first they held off to see what the state legislature would do in its investigation of the market in 1907, but when it decided not to tax, they continued their plans.20

As promotional agent, French's job consisted mainly of increasing hog receipts at the Fort Worth market. Oklahoma had been a good source from the beginning, but when two packers constructed plants at Oklahoma City, French realized he had to obtain a new source of supply. Convincing cotton farmers to change to hogs for their money crop constituted "almost a hopeless case," he believed, especially after a man reached age fifty.21 French therefore decided to start with the children. He convinced A. W. Matthews, secretary-treasurer of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, who gave his consent and cooperated on the project which French called a "herculean task." Because county agents were agronomists, they did not take kindly to the idea: some even fought it.


French studied the corn club idea that began spreading among young people in rural areas about 1908 and became convinced that a pig club idea would work too. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company assisted with funds up to $7,500 each year.

Whether a youngster came from a wealthy family or not, French encouraged him to borrow the money at a local bank equal to the purchase price of a bred sow. After the first litter arrived, the youngster would feed the piglets and sell them when they matured—at the Fort Worth market, naturally. Then the young pig farmer would pay off his loan at the bank. The situation made a businessman out of the youngster, a new customer for the small town bank, and more hogs for the Fort Worth market.22

From 1908 to 1910, boys corn clubs, which French later expanded as pig clubs, increased in rural communities to help youngsters gain agricultural skills. The clubs eventually formed a nucleus for the 4-H Club movement that emerged from the Smith-Lever Act in 1914. Franklin M. Reck, historian of the 4-H movement, affirmed that the 4-H story represented too great a movement to be credited to any one man, even though many communities claimed to have originated the corn club idea.23 Shortly after 1900 the climate created by the

22 Ibid., pp. 24682-91.
colleges, farmers' institutes, school teachers, and educational philosophers made certain that a youth phase of an extension program would emerge. In this climate, public-spirited people in many places began home project programs for rural youth. Thus, many communities even today believe they are the authentic birthplace of the 4-H clubs because as they worked out their ideas independently, they remained unaware that their program was being "simultaneously" discovered elsewhere.  

Apparently the first pig club originated in Oktibbeha County, Mississippi when the county superintendent of schools started it in the fall of 1909 and planned to judge the pigs the following fall. By 1910 French also discussed a pig club idea with E. W. Jones, superintendent of schools in the rural parish of Caddo, Louisiana. The two clubs most likely

---

24 Franklin M. Reck, *The 4-H Story: A History of 4-H Club Work* (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State College Press, 1951), p. ix. One of the local communities that claims to have originated the first farm boys' club in the world was Jack County, Texas. Thomas Merriwether Marks, editor of the Jacksboro News, thought of the idea in 1907 to get the farmers to plant better seed and grow better crops. He tried to stage a corn show with the adult farmers of Jack County participating. The show failed, and Marks decided it was useless to work with older farmers who were set in their ways. Therefore, in 1908 Marks tried his plan with the farm boys of the county, organizing the Jack County Corn Club. Marks succeeded so well with boys' clubs, that he quit the newspaper business and became a county agent of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College Extension Service and served as their agent in Jack County for ten years. "Jack County Is Proud of Boys' Farm Club," *Weekly Live Stock Reporter*, 8 March 1945, p. 1.
represented the first and second pig clubs. French worked actively from that time on until 1914, establishing pig clubs all over Texas. In fact, in 1911 he worked towns along the line of the Fort Worth and Denver City Railway giving lectures to adults and establishing clubs for the youngsters. People called him a "pork evangelist."  

In 1914, when the Smith-Lever Act created the United States Extension Service, cooperative extension work included the creation of pig, beef, corn and other clubs, soon called 4-H. By March, 1915 clubs existed in Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Oklahoma, the Carolinas, and the Dakotas. French continually explained that "The object of these clubs is to educate boys and girls correctly along livestock production lines." Quickly the USDA extended the clubs to thirteen states, and the Live Stock Reporter even claimed that the idea had spread to foreign countries. Naturally, the newspaper credited French and 

---


the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company with the idea which in
actuality spread simultaneously in many of the rural areas
of the South and mid-West.

French believed so strongly in the club idea that as
of 1 October 1915 he quit the Fort Worth Stock Yards
Company and took a job as Superintendent of Livestock
Development in Texas with the United States Department of
Agriculture in its extension service at the Agricultural
and Mechanical College of Texas. He told friends that he
would be just as close to livestock growth, if not closer,
than before. In his new job he assisted the eighty-five
government farm demonstrators in various sections of Texas
in the organization and upbuilding of different kinds of
livestock clubs. French issued a statement from his new
position that "More Farmers raised hogs in Texas this year
than ever before" and expressed the belief that "a still
greater number will raise hogs next year." He added that
of the 525,000 farmers in Texas, 125,000 of them did not
raise even one pig.

In 1917, as a favor to the Fort Worth Stock Yards
Company, Floyd Sherwood, local hog buyer for Armour, selected

hogs to deliver to bankers in rural Texas towns who then turned them over to youngsters at cost, taking their notes for a year. From his new government job French still urged the program. He reminded producers that it helped older established farmers to decide to raise hogs, because they saw the success the boys achieved. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company bred the sows to purebred boars before turning them over to the young men.\textsuperscript{32} French announced that Texas boys clubs reached an enrollment of 28,388 participants as of 3 June 1918 composed of corn, cotton, peanut, sorghum, potato, baby beef, sheep, dairy, poultry, and other special clubs, in addition to pig clubs which enrolled 9,241 members.\textsuperscript{33}

French resumed his job as promotional agent for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company by about 1920. In a single month in 1923, he conducted fifty farmers' meetings in ten West Texas counties in conjunction with the West Texas Chamber of Commerce for a "poultry-dairy-livestock campaign." He showed moving pictures and slides to seven thousand people.\textsuperscript{34}


\textsuperscript{34}"Rural Campaigning in Western Texas," \textit{Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 4 January 1923, p. 1. The Future Farmers of Texas, an organization of vocational agricultural students in Texas high schools, quite possibly grew out of
As late as 1933 the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company still presented bred gilts weighing from 200 to 225 pounds to several 4-H Club boys. The boys signed agreements by which they would return to the company from the first litter of pigs one gilt of the same weight as the one they first received. The boys also agreed to plant enough corn or grain to fatten two litters of pigs and to sell both litters on the Fort Worth Stock Yards through any commission company. The company still worked with the 4-H in 1940. During that year they took 4-H and Future Farmers of America boys on tours of the stockyards and packing plants, showing and explaining the entire process so they could possibly see the carcasses of their own cattle, hogs, or lambs hanging on the hooks soon after selling them, not that

the pig and beef clubs and the 4-H movement. The Secretary of State granted the charter and the movement began at a statewide meeting in the summer of 1928. It soon affiliated with the national organization. "Farmers-To-Be Given Charter," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 21 March 1929, p. 1.

35 "Agreement for Swine 4-H Club Boys," 4 February 1933, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll. When the 4-H movement celebrated twenty-five years of existence in 1939, it possessed more members than at any previous time in its history. In Texas its membership list totaled 67,028, of whom 32,696 were boys and 34,332 were girls. Nationally, 1,255,000 members were enrolled. Boys owned more than 280,000 head of livestock and produced $250,000,000 worth of cattle and crops during one year. Girls canned as many as 8,200,000 jars of food. "Enrollment 4-H Clubs at Highest Peak in History," Weekly Life Stock Reporter, 28 December 1939, p. 1.
they would be able to identify! Actually, cooperation with the youth clubs remained active throughout the 1950's.

While C. C. French and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company cannot take credit for originating the corn club or possibly even the pig club idea, nor for the official creation of the 4-H Clubs or FFA, nevertheless, the full-time efforts of French as agent of the stockyards contributed so much to the spread of these organizations in Texas and the South that the effects are incalculable. What influence he and the stockyards may have exerted out of state is impossible to measure, but within Texas certainly the movement would not have succeeded so well without their efforts. Although the motives of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and the packers to attract more hogs for their market may have been purely selfish and financial in nature, they nevertheless worked to the advantage of the youngsters. Many young men became at least partially hog farmers, and thus production of swine in the state increased considerably. In addition, the youngsters gained some business experience. The promotional efforts of the stockyards company in creating the clubs and increasing hog production undoubtedly succeeded, although not to the actual numbers in increased production that the stockyards officials had hoped.

36 "Preparing the Stockmen of Tomorrow" (Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement) The Cattleman 26 (May 1940): inside front cover.
Efforts to get Texas farmers to raise more hogs multiplied production considerably, but packers' needs continued to be so tremendous that farm hog production never quite reached desired levels. Over the long term, one could admit that farmers failed to raise enough hogs to keep the two existing packing plants operating to capacity, therefore no other large packers moved to Fort Worth. As a result, the Fort Worth market never achieved its potential or its dream of being number one in the nation. In fact, the son of L. V. Niles wrote in 1926: "In spite of the best efforts of Mr. French and everybody in general, it appears to be most difficult for the farmers of Texas to raise any considerable number of hogs."  

An examination of the pleas for hog production and the actual receipts as reported in the market newspaper from the time the big packers came in 1903 to 1925 and beyond proves Niles's point. In 1903, Texas produced nearly one-third of the American cotton crop, nearly one-sixth of the total cattle of the country, but only one-twentieth of the hogs. That same year 150,527 hogs reached the Fort Worth market; in 1904, the number increased to 280,840, but the packers needed 1,500,000 in 1905. Most of the hogs sold

37 Harold L. Niles to W. C. Walker, 29 November 1926, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.
on the Fort Worth market at that time came from Indian Territory. The writer chided Texas farmers strongly, and told them that the packers were paying money to Oklahoma and Indian Territory farmers that should go to Texans. In 1904, the total amount was $2,651,000 of which $2,386,000 went out of state. He told Texas farmers they had "a screw loose somewhere" because this money could go to Texas.  

In 1905 the Fort Worth packing plants wanted five thousand to ten thousand hogs a day but only received one thousand to three thousand.  

In 1907, Armour and Swift operated at half their capacity in hogs much of the time. Someone estimated in 1909 that Texans paid out $15 million dollars annually for pork and pork products from other states. If this went to Texas stock raisers instead, "the effect on the state's prosperity would be marked. . . There would be less talk about the price of cotton." Ironically, pricewise, Fort Worth became the highest hog market in the nation and


41"Why We Need Hogs," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 13 June 1907, p. 1.
remained so for several years. In 1912, the Reporter editor fussed at Texas farmers that "it finally happened." Armour bought ten railroad cars of hogs from St. Joseph, Missouri to slaughter in its local plant because not enough were available at Fort Worth "To the shame of the hog raisers of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana and Arkansas. . ." 43

In 1913, the Armour hog buyer told the local newspaper that the packers could kill twelve thousand to fifteen thousand hogs per day, but receipts ran about eight thousand per week. 44 And in 1914 a big Fort Worth Stock Yards Company advertisement proclaimed: "Texas loses $52,000,000 annually by sending that sum out of the State for pork and pork products, and yet Texas is the greatest possible hog producing State in the Union." 45 In 1914, the local market received 111,000 more hogs than the previous year, but the demand called for 150,000 more. Local people still wanted the market to be number one, but as agricultural writer T. O. Walker proclaimed, "The future greatness of the

44 "Fort Worth Plants Equipped to Kill 15,000 Hogs Each Day; Receipts Average Around 8,000 Per Week," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 7 October 1913, p. 1.
Fort Worth livestock market depends upon the farmers of Texas.\textsuperscript{46}

In 1921, the \textit{Reporter} still announced: "Texas Consumes More Pork Than State Produces" and urged farmers to reverse the situation.\textsuperscript{47} A 1922 headline said, "Texas Farmers Do Not Raise Enough Hogs for Market."\textsuperscript{48} A Fort Worth Stock Yards Company advertisement in 1924 told farmers under the heading "Something to Think About" that the stockyards needed ten thousand hogs each day to supply the territory of which Fort Worth was the distributing center. When that demand was met, packers could then use double the amount of cattle they presently required which ultimately would make cattlemen more prosperous.\textsuperscript{49} In 1925 the market newspaper still begged, "More Hogs Are Needed To Fill Local Demands."\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Annual Report for 1913 and 1914, FWSY Co., Coll. Also T. O. Walker, "Fort Worth's Livestock Industry," \textit{Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter}, 1 January 1915, p. 6.}


\textsuperscript{50} "More Hogs Are Needed To Fill Local Demands," \textit{Weekly Live Stock Reporter}, 19 November 1925, p. 1. For actual figures of annual hog receipts at the Fort Worth market 1902 to present see Appendix B.
When the market clearly existed that would buy all the hogs Texas farmers could produce any day of the week and would pay a higher price than any other market in the country, why then did Texas farmers not raise more hogs? Movie actor Gary Cooper may have answered the question in an educational film he narrated in 1961 called the "Real West." He said that a Westerner did not want to do anything he could not do "from the hurricane deck of a Spanish pony." In other words, Texans were cow men, not hog men. Texas represented the West, and in the West one raised cattle. No doubt this is one explanation. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company probably would have been happy enough to let West Texas do as she pleased if just East Texas farmers had raised hogs, but they felt southern enough in their heritage that cotton remained king. Farmers had planted cotton as their money crop for generations and saw no reason to change, despite the massive efforts of the Fort Worth market to induce them to do so.

Historian Samuel Lee Evans, who made a study of Texas farm production prior to 1930, agreed. He indicated that Texas never became a major hog raising state for several reasons, one of which was the poor quality of Texas swine. Other factors he considered included: 2) the steady rise in

---

the urban population of the state from 17.1 percent in 1900 to 24.1 percent in 1910, 32.4 percent in 1920, and 41.0 percent in 1930, 3) the increase in the price of cotton by the turn of the century after twenty years of decline, causing the Texas farmer to favor cotton production over hogs, 4) the increase of tenancy in which landlords most likely pressed their tenants to raise the proven money crop, cotton, 5) the "impelling force" of custom and tradition, "King Cotton," and 6) a vast existing complex dedicated to the raising, ginning, marketing, and shipping of cotton, a complex that had been built up over generations. 52

A factor not mentioned by Evans seemed to be the belief among many producers that since Texas was not a corn state it could not be a hog state either, for one needed corn to feed swine. Many farmers insisted that the Texas climate remained too dry to be a corn producing state. Humid weather in August and September seemed a necessity for a good crop. Texas generally experienced such conditions only two years out of five. 53 Stockyard and packing officials kept trying to offset the belief in the necessity

---


for corn. H. G. Kalhorn, hog buyer for Armour at the Fort Worth market, said that Texas could produce hogs more economically than in the so-called corn belt because those states had such long winters and no grazing. State agriculture agents at the experiment station proved that peanuts or cowpeas provided as good a feed for hogs as corn. Texas may not have had the soil or climate for corn, but it did for peanuts. Armour officials suggested kafir corn, milo maize, or Armour's 60 percent meat meal.

Fluctuating prices for hogs may have scared off some farmers. Other oldtimers have explained that Texans remained too independent to be tied down to hog raising, agreeing again with Gary Cooper. A farmer must take care of his hogs every day, but not his cattle; one can let them graze much of the time. Even with cotton, after planting his crop, the farmer enjoyed some days when he did not have to do any work.

54 "Fort Worth Plants Equipped to Kill 15,000 Hogs Each Day; Receipts Average Around 8,000 Per Week," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 7 October 1913, p. 1.


57 Interview with Ted Gouldy.
Because Texas farmers, for these numerous reasons, failed to raise enough hogs, the Fort Worth market achieved only limited success. Yet it constituted a successful hog market. Probably because of insufficient numbers, the price paid for hogs remained consistently higher than the other large markets for years. Receipts did gradually climb causing the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company to keep expanding its hog pens. Hog receipts finally reached a million in 1917 for the first time.

The depression years of the 1930's marked a turning point in hog promotion efforts, for the Live Stock Reporter stopped urging people to raise hogs. The pages never again reflected the same campaign, even though some of the 4-H pig work continued. The combined spring and fall pig crop


60 "Concrete Hog Sheds," Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, 2 February 1912, p. 10, also the board in 1917 authorized $50,000 to be spent to extend the hog yards. Board of Directors Meeting, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 9 January 1917, Corporate Record, Fort Worth, Vol. 3, p. 108.

in Texas for 1934 decreased 34 percent from 1933 and 44 percent below 1932. Scarce feed supplies and the unfavorable hog-corn price ratio constituted part of the problem. Mainly, however, the federal government's New Deal hog reduction program attempted to raise prices by creating scarcity.  

|62|

Sadly, the Annual Report of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company to stockholders in 1934 commented: "We discontinued our efforts to increase the production of hogs in this state, which were inconsistent with the Government's program."  

|63|

On that note, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company concluded a campaign that began as far back as the nineteenth century and with its demise abandoned their chances to rank consistently any higher than third or fourth in the nation among the terminal markets. The company would settle for being the largest market south of Kansas City and the largest market in the Southwest during the peak years of its existence.

---


CHAPTER VI

RECORD BREAKING YEARS

Board members of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company had reason to rub their hands together in unabashed glee—or at least to congratulate themselves on their business acumen—at their monthly directors' meetings in Chicago during the second decade of the twentieth century. Receipts of animals in all categories continued to grow, and promotional agent Charles C. French's efforts to increase hog production seemed to be working. Not until the 1920's and 1930's, as pointed out in the previous chapter, did directors begin to realize that swine production would not reach the company's expectations. Meanwhile, from 1910 to 1920 optimism remained high. Each year's figures surpassed those of the previous one until 1917 when receipts reached a million animals in both cattle and swine categories. Problems during the decade such as two fires and a flood hampered progress slightly, but increased demands brought on by World War I, the strength of the big business connections of the stockyards ownership, and the well-organized promotional activities of the company combined to make the decade a memorable and profitable one. In fact, when Edward Swift visited Fort Worth in February 1911 he willingly shared the largess with others. He contributed
$5,000 to a committee raising funds for the site for a Methodist university. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and Armour and Company contributed equal amounts.¹

Two fires swept through the stockyards during 1911. The first fire, early on the morning of 14 March 1911, destroyed the horse and mule barns during the Feeders and Breeders Show on the very day that ex-President Theodore Roosevelt visited. Between five and six hundred horses died in the blaze, one hundred hogs, and an unknown number of sheep. All of the buildings on the south side of Exchange Avenue from Marine Creek to the swine sheds, including half of the sheds, burned to the ground, the flames fed by large stacks of hay in the barns. The stock show continued despite the disaster.² W. B. King, manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, announced that the company would rebuild with concrete and steel fireproof buildings. On behalf of the company he also offered to pay for all hogs and sheep lost in the fire, even though lawyers indicated no legal obligation.³


A second fire erupted at the yards on Sunday afternoon 25 June 1911, presumably started by a spark from a locomotive. Although a brick fire wall kept this second conflagration from spreading to the sheep pens, and possibly even the exchange building, the hog sheds and the greater part of the cattle pens burned. Only seventy-five to eighty head of cattle and fifty hogs perished in the blaze in which a thirty miles per hour wind fanned the flames for a $175,000 to $200,000 loss. The company began rebuilding immediately, and new hog sheds costing $60,000 soon replaced the old ones. The stockyards interests planned new brick horse and mule barns to make everything south of Exchange Avenue fireproof except for a small section of sheep sheds. The company also constructed fire walls in various divisions with steel, concrete, and brick used in place of timber.

The new horse and mule barns, completed in March, 1912, stretched 540 feet by 350 feet and held a capacity of three thousand animals. Manager King had visited all leading markets for ideas to make them not only fireproof, but the most modern, sanitary, and well ventilated public stables.

---

available. Costs reached $300,000. Feed storage houses, constructed like vaults, possessed automatic closing doors so sensitive that even the heat of a lighted match would activate them. The only lumber in the entire building consisted of gates, floors, and office fixtures. Local citizens began calling the new horse and mule barns "among the finest stables in the world." In addition to replacement costs, the board of directors authorized an additional $30,000 to $40,000 to be spent to construct depressed runways and to reinforce concrete roofs over the hog division. The company authorized new dipping vats, as well as the new covered pens, chutes, and docks, to be constructed at the north end of the southern cattle yards to replace those destroyed by the fires. The new vats became the best facilities in the country upon completion. A movie company took pictures of the first cattle to go through the new dipping facilities and planned to show the pictures at theaters throughout the

---

7 B. B. Paddock, ed., Fort Worth and the Texas Northwest, II (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Co., 1922), p. 663. These brick horse and mule barns still exist and form the nucleus of plans for a "Mule Alley" shopping mall.
8 Board of Directors Meeting, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 17 July 1911, Corporate Record, Fort Worth, 1st bound vol., p. 343.
nation to illustrate government inspection of cattle to prevent animal diseases. In addition to fires, a flood also plagued the stockyards area when the Trinity River overflowed its banks late on 9 June 1915 and isolated North Fort Worth from the rest of the city except for train service. Although the stockyards escaped actual flooding, the area remained cut off from the city. Hundreds of men walked across the train trestle to get to work in the packing plants and yards.

Despite these problems livestock receipts in all classifications climbed during this second decade of the twentieth century as previously set records began to tumble. At the beginning of the decade, nearly fifty buyers competed daily on the Fort Worth cattle market. The local market newspaper also published a Mexican edition once a week to attract cattle raisers south of the border who looked to Fort Worth as their nearest market.

---

9"New Dipping Vats Open," Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, 11 August 1911, p. 5.


11Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 26 August 1911, Part 2, pp. 2-3. Some of these buyers were from larger packing concerns in the North such as Dold, Cudahy, and Morris. "Morris in the Buying," Southwestern Farmer and Breeder, 8 March 1912, p. 4.

livestock analysts already compared Fort Worth favorably with Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City—often ranked as the top three markets.\textsuperscript{13}

The Brand Book of the Cattle Raisers Association used at the stockyards during these years, as agents examined brands for stolen animals, indicated that cattle came from Oklahoma, New Mexico, and even from as far away as California and Kansas.\textsuperscript{14} Big runs of cattle arrived by rail with as many as eighty cars in the yards at one time.\textsuperscript{15} Not all cattle came by rail, however, for until the 1930's some nearby cattlemen still trailed their herds to Fort Worth to save money. The company offered the services of drovers to these customers.\textsuperscript{16} In addition, motor trucks began to arrive with livestock.

As late as 1913 local citizens still "confidently expected" one and possibly two additional packing companies to locate in the city.\textsuperscript{17} Several small independent packers

\textsuperscript{13}The Book of Fort Worth (Fort Worth: Fort Worth Record, 1913), p. 23.


\textsuperscript{15}Tape of conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Ted Gouldy and Bob Bramlett, Fort Worth, Texas, 24 June 1971. Tape in possession of Ted Gouldy.


\textsuperscript{17}The Book of Fort Worth, p. 23.
operated, but not others of the Big Five as citizens hoped. Even so, the market claimed to be second in size in the United States.\textsuperscript{18} That year the company spent $45,000 to grade, pave, and construct pens, $15,000 for a new office wing, and $8,000 for a roof over the pens in the dip division.\textsuperscript{19}

By January 1914, approximately one hundred regular buyers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and horses worked on the Fort Worth market, fifty of these for cattle.\textsuperscript{20} Later that year as market analysts looked back over 1914, they saw that Fort Worth had completed its best year yet. It remained the only large market that increased in receipts over the previous year, despite adverse conditions such as foot-and-mouth disease in the north and east and a tight money situation all over the country with its resulting industrial stagnation.\textsuperscript{21} Heavy receipts of Mexican cattle assisted

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 24. A booming cattle industry created side effects for the local economy. In 1913 the grain business in Fort Worth was the largest southwest of Kansas City with eighteen grain elevators and several large flour mills located in the city. Ibid., p. 14.

\textsuperscript{19} Board of Directors Meeting, FWSY Co. 16 May 1913, Corporate Record, p. 369.

\textsuperscript{20} "Fort Worth As A Livestock Market--Its Stockyards, Packeries, and Coliseum," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 1 January 1914, Sect. 3, p. 1

\textsuperscript{21} "Livestock Trade Experiences Best Year in History," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 1 January 1915, Sect. 1, p. 1.
in this success. Toward the close of 1914, an Armour official announced in a speech that Fort Worth was "rapidly getting to be the greatest live stock center in the United States." He cited as major markets Fort Worth, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Chicago.

Also in 1914 General Manager W. B. King resigned. He had served in that capacity since 1902 when the new yards were constructed, having been a civil engineer and railroad builder before becoming manager of the stockyards. When he died nearly a year later on 11 October 1915, practically the entire stockyards attended his funeral. J. A. Stafford, assistant general manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and manager of the National Feeders and Breeders Show, succeeded King on 1 February 1915. Stafford was a native Texan who after ten years railroad experience became traffic manager for Armour and Company at Kansas City and later at Fort Worth.

Mule sales on the yards soon became an attention-getting event. Mule buyers would drive up and down

---

22 "Fort Worth Market Shows Gain Over Previous Years," The Cattleman 1(January 1915):15.


Exchange Avenue carrying bull whips, and practically playing a tune with them as they drove the animals down the street. 25 When World War I erupted in Europe, the mule sales picked up considerably as representatives of European governments traveled to the yards to purchase animals for use of their armies. One of the reporters of the North Fort Worth News, whose offices stood just west of the coliseum on Exchange Avenue, often looked out the window and counted as many as fifteen uniforms from as many nations buying mules. Frequently, when drovers herded the mules down to auction, bypassers often waited a quarter of an hour for them all to clear the street. 26

Within about an eight-month period from 14 November 1914 to 29 July 1915, warring nations of Europe spent more than $5 million in Fort Worth for horses and mules. 27 The British and French governments also purchased cavalry animals at Kansas City, Oklahoma City, and Wichita, 28 and


26 Interview with Mrs. Nita McCain, co-owner of North Fort Worth News, Fort Worth, Texas, 28 October 1977.


by June, 1915 had bought an estimated 200,000 horses in all markets since the war erupted. 29 A year later in June 1916, local sources estimated that the total number of mounts shipped to Europe from Fort Worth reached 100,000 for which local dealers had received $11 million. 30 Fort Worth proclaimed itself the largest horse and mule market in the world during this period, and receipts and sales justified the claim.

By October 1915, Fort Worth declared itself to be both the largest stocker and feeder market and the largest speculator market in the world. 31 By 1916 the market could boast that more than a billion dollars had been paid for livestock at the Fort Worth market since 1903. Packing and allied industries distributed $3 million in wages annually and employed forty-seven hundred people. 32 The activities of the year broke records all down the line both in receipts and prices prevailing during the year. 33

29 "Horse and Mule Notes," The Cattleman 1 (June 1915): 37.
Even the United States government at Washington recognized the importance of the Fort Worth market during these years, for the local office of the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, located in the livestock exchange building, became a distribution point for black-leg vaccine in 1916. Before this date the Department of Agriculture supplied the vaccine only from Washington. The following year in June the department opened a branch of the Bureau of Markets at Fort Worth in the exchange building. Office reports then could be published five days each week, giving complete information about fresh meat trade in the East, the demand, market conditions, and other information. The department issued other reports from New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, and Portland.

The year 1917 became the peak record setter, chalking up marks that would stand for nearly thirty years. Increased production because of World War I pushed stockyards receipts to totals not surpassed until war conditions in the 1940's boosted livestock tallies even higher. Almost $250,000,000 changed hands at the Fort Worth Stock Yards

34 "Government Vaccine May Be Secured From Fort Worth," The Cattleman 3 (August 1916): 43-44.

during 1917, breaking previous records. Daily receipts often surpassed 350 railroad cars. For the first time, cattle, exclusive of calves, reached and exceeded the million mark. Hog recruitment efforts also paid off, for swine receipts tallied a million in 1917 as well.

By mid-1918 the war peak had passed and receipts of all species of livestock except horses and mules dropped from the same period a year earlier. However, Armour and Swift planned a combined expansion program of $800,000 with Armour spending $500,000 for a five-story building, and Swift adding to facilities to increase its daily slaughter capacity from fifteen hundred to two thousand cattle.

---

36 Miles, "Fort Worth and World War I," p. 64.


38 Annual Report for 1917, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas. Actual figures for 1917 were 1,646,110 cattle, 313,427 calves, 1,062,021 hogs, 405,810 sheep, and 115,233 horses and mules—a total of over three million animals.

39 "Live Stock Receipts at Fort Worth Decrease," The Cattleman 5 (August 1918):19; also Annual Report for 1918, FWSY Co. Coll., T. B. Saunders II claims to have invented a new way to move cattle during 1918 when he used flatbed trucks to transport his cattle from grazing pastures on the West side of Fort Worth to the yards. He simply put a "fence" around the sides of the truckbed. The new method caught on. Taylor, Money on the Hoof—Sometimes, pp. 77-78.

40 "Million Dollars Worth of Building Begun in Fort Worth Since Armistice Signed," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 15 December 1918, p. 9.
One must not forget that a major factor contributing to the success of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company during these boom years was their connection with Armour and Swift, two of the nation's Big Five meat packers, each a one-third owner of the stockyards. The two meat packers also held controlling interests in the Stockyards National Bank, the Fort Worth Cattle Loan Company, North Fort Worth Townsite Company, the Daily Live Stock Reporter, the Fort Worth Belt Railway Company, and other interests. So interconnected were many of these companies that a man could be traffic manager of the stockyards company and of the belt railway at the same time and also serve as assistant secretary of the National Feeders and Breeders Show. The company, however, "always denied connections between interests," as one official admitted to another in a telegram.

The cattle industry represented the largest industry in Fort Worth, and city leaders determined to maintain that supremacy. One way to do so involved a plan to organize the

---

41 "Vance Now Heads Stockyards Bank," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 30 November 1921, p. 1. Also W. C. Walker to L. V. Niles, 13 September 1921, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll. The Cattle Loan Company was organized in 1914.


43 Telegram from O. W. Matthews to G. B. Robbins, 12 July 1913, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.
counties in West Texas that shipped livestock to Fort Worth into "one big family." The Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce on which stockyards officials always served, led in this effort by joining with the cities of Brownwood, Wichita Falls, and Ranger to issue a joint call on 17 December 1918 to formulate plans to organize. Representatives of thirty-seven counties met in Fort Worth on 21 December. Dr. C. C. Gumm, manager of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, made a motion to organize a West Texas Chamber of Commerce. Visiting community representatives reacted enthusiastically to his suggestion and adopted it unanimously. The Fort Worth Chamber paid $6,000 cost for the preliminary meeting. Marion Sansom, Fort Worth cattleman, served on a committee to raise a permanent fund. Once organized, the first task of the new chamber in 1919 became the study of possible solutions to agricultural and livestock problems.

By creating a West Texas Chamber of Commerce, the Fort Worth businessmen also ultimately encouraged more participation from West Texas counties in the annual fat stock show. In a decade of broken livestock records and firsts, the show, originated by the stockyards' and cattle interests in 1896,

44 Carl A. Blasig, Building Texas (Brownsville: Springman-King Co., 1963), p. 152.
began to set a few records as well. The show, subsidized by the stockyards company, had not always made expenses. In fact, in 1911 the board of directors of the company vowed to advance the show no more money after 1 September of that year. One problem surfaced during the stock show when someone scheduled riding and roping contests in an old ball park on the Texas and Pacific Railroad reservation. These amateur attractions always drew good crowds, while the stock show on the stockyards grounds failed to entice sufficient gate receipts to pay expenses.

Wild West exhibitions remained in their heyday nationwide around 1915-1916 and generally drew big audiences wherever scheduled. Therefore, stock show officials, who had been operating at a deficit, decided to stage a Wild West attraction in 1916 in connection with the livestock exhibition. They invited Joe Miller of the 101 Ranch in Oklahoma to bring his Wild West show to the coliseum.

---

46 Board of Directors Meeting, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 17 July 1911, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 343.

47 Fog Horn Clancy, "How It All Started," 1946 Rodeo Souvenir Annual, p. 89.


The show that year "excelled all previous shows and for the first time in many years came through without losing money."  

The Chamber of Commerce discussed plans at a citizens' meeting in the Fall of 1916 to change the name of the show to Southwestern Exposition rather than National Feeders and Breeders. Following the show in March, 1917, according to the terms of a contract made with the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company ten years earlier, the company would return stock subscriptions totaling $50,000 made by citizens of Fort Worth and prominent cattlemen of Texas. These had been made in 1907 to persuade the company to build the coliseum for the show. The citizens wanted to make plans for the future of the show once the company no longer guaranteed to absorb any deficit. Marion Sansom became chairman of a committee to plan the next exposition. The citizens proposed to create an exposition company and so appointed a committee of fifty-five prominent persons to solicit stock subscriptions and work out details.


52 "Southwestern Exposition for Fort Worth," The Cattleman 3 (December 1916): 5, also "Fort Worth Show Re-organized Extensive Improvements Planned," The Cattleman 3 (May 1917): 8.
Colonel Zack Mulhall and his daughter Lucille brought a Wild West show to the coliseum in 1917. They put on a performance with bronc riding, steer riding, and bulldogging, but paid all cowboys the same fee regardless of their efforts. Thus, it was not truly a competitive show.

Either by the 1917 show or shortly thereafter, officials changed the name to Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, its present name. Cattlemen met in April 1917 to plan a new organization, since the contract with the stockyards company had expired. The show would have to pay to the company an annual rental of $3,500 for the use of the coliseum and show grounds. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, however, agreed to spend $40,000 for additional accommodations to display sale bulls and for sheep and swine divisions inside the main show grounds. These animals had been scattered all over the stockyards in previous years.

Late in 1917, Ray McKinley, editor and publisher of the Daily Live Stock Reporter and Sunday North Fort Worth


55 "Fort Worth Show Reorganized," p. 8.
News, lunched one day with Marion Sansom, stock show president, and A. B. Case, manager of Armour and Company in Fort Worth. McKinley saw the need for monetary incentive or competition to bring out the best in the Wild West show performers and suggested a competitive Wild West contest for the 1918 show. A committee later met to work out details and to find some way to distinguish the Fort Worth show from Cheyenne's "Frontier Days" and Pendleton's "Roundup." Claude Hamilton, a member of the committee, mentioned a Spanish word meaning "to encompass or encircle," frequently used by cowboys to mean a roundup, cow work, or horse breaking, pronouncing it "Ro-Day-O." A member of the committee asked how it was spelled. Hamilton went to the blackboard and printed "RODEO." Buck Sansom, son of Marion, spoke up and said, "That spells "Ro'-Dee-O!" The men like the name and called their show "The Rodeo of the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show." The show

---


57 Ibid., p. 33. Saunders claims that Fort Worth used the word "rodeo" first, that it caught on quickly to describe bronc riding, steer wrestling, and similar events, and by the 1920's had become part of every American's vocabulary. Similar events had been held for a number of years, but they were called Stampedes, Frontier Days, Roundups, Wild West Shows, and Cowboy Reunions. Handwritten notes, Tom B. Saunders, Jr. Collection, Texas Christian University Special Collections. Probably there is no way to establish without question that Fort Worth used the word "rodeo" for the first time in connection with these competitive events in 1918, but Saunders' claim seems as
11-16 March 1918, with its "rodeo," became the largest cattle show ever held southwest of Kansas City. Seven barns housed the show cattle and officials increased pen yardage to take in all the pens of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company south of the coliseum and east to the livestock exchange building. An estimated twenty-three thousand persons witnessed the rodeo which made history as the first indoor rodeo. The fledgling show which the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company nurtured for twenty-one years gave great promise of making it on its own.

Stockyards officials could look back on the decade that began in 1910 with pride. A promotional campaign for hogs finally brought in a million swine in 1917, the same

---


year that cattle receipts also reached the million mark. World War I demands made Fort Worth the largest horse and mule market in the world, and the stockyards company completed its contract with the stock show and saw it reorganized and rejuvenated by competitive contests called a "rodeo."

Financially, company officials no doubt were even happier as they reviewed the booming decade. Assets totaled nearly 4.5 million dollars in January 1912 and profits reached $151,534.48. The company paid quarterly dividends of $1 per share in 1912 and profits soared to $197,804.20 as of January 1913. Profits climbed to $269,810.52 a year later. In 1914, quarterly dividends rose to $1.50 per share, and profits at the end of the year increased again to $308,556.57. Profits for 1915 dropped to $295,385.86, but set a new record in 1916 at $359,087.23.

The company continued to pay quarterly dividends of $1.50 per share during these years, but on 1 February 1917 and

---

60 Annual Stockholders Meeting, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 9 January 1912, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 354.
61 Ibid., p. 361, and Ibid., 14 January 1913, p. 365.
62 Ibid., 13 January 1914, p. 374.
63 Ibid., p. 382, and Ibid., 12 January 1914, p. 388.
64 Ibid., 11 January 1916, p. 400.
4 December 1917 authorized extra dividends of $5 per share. When officials tabulated profits for the record breaking year of 1917 they soared to $503,046,24. Quarterly dividends of $2 per share began in July 1917. Assets of the company by that time reached nearly $5 million.

The promises and prospects of Fort Worth as a successful livestock market center located within the heart of cattle country brought both pride and profit to the many persons responsible for its existence.

---

66 Board of Directors Meeting, 1 February 1917, Vol. 3, p. 107, also 4 December 1917, p. 112.


69 Annual Stockholders Meeting, 18 June 1918, Vol. 3, p. 121.
CHAPTER VII

MUNICIPAL MANEUVERINGS

Every morning at 5:30 a.m. a Swift employee activated a whistle to notify Swift workers and everyone else in the North Side area with a shrill and demanding blast that a new work day had dawned. No working family within miles of the stockyards district needed to set alarm clocks, so loud and dependable became the morning call from the Swift's whistle. All who awoke to its sound each day knew that for better or for worse, they were stockyards' people. The five blocks of Exchange Avenue consisting of hotels, saloons, the coliseum, the exchange building, the stockyards, and the packing houses formed the heart of a company town during the days of the city of North Fort Worth and later of Niles City.

In addition, local Fort Worth residents and businessmen enjoyed continuous daily benefits because of the lively market center in their midst. Consequently, the relationship between the stockyards district and the city of Fort Worth leaned more toward cooperation than conflict during their many years of dealing with one another. Even the happiest of associations, however, cannot completely avoid occasional problems. The greatest of these came in the early 1920's when the city of Fort Worth decided not to deny itself the
potential tax revenues of the separate stockyards district any longer. The background of this struggle that ultimately saw both cities clash in a hard fought court contest dates back at least a decade and must be recounted briefly before the reasons for the litigation may be understood.

Other problems that plagued the stockyards area as the second decade of the twentieth century ended and the 1920's began involved strikes and floods. A 1921 strike created so explosive a situation, including a lynching, that the failure of the local police to maintain order provided additional arguments for the city of Fort Worth to use to fight for annexation of the district to place it under the larger city's police jurisdiction.

The area encompassing the stockyards had been known as Marine, because of Marine Creek running through it, as early as 1890 when city leaders constructed the earliest packing plants and the Union Stock Yards. A brief land boom occurred and a few houses appeared, but when the packing company failed some houses became deserted. Only about five hundred people lived in the community when Armour and Swift began work in March, 1902. When a vote came in November, 1902 to incorporate a large area north of the Trinity River as North Fort Worth, the action absorbed the old town of Marine.¹

¹"North Fort Worth," The Weekly Citizen, 26 August 1904, p. 2; also "Stockyards Area Restoration" (Fort Worth: Fort Worth City Council, n.d.), p. 79. Boundaries of North Fort
As could be expected, most candidates for city council of the new community owned commission firms or held other stockyards interests. The local newspaper, the *Daily Live Stock Reporter*, owned by the stockyards, reflected these interests when it criticized the city health officer of North Fort Worth, Dr. Charles Galloway, for his complaints that the packers dumped refuse near the business district. Dr. Galloway informed a convention of health officers in Austin that he could not enforce sanitary regulations against the packing houses and stockyards because the board of aldermen would not back him up. Out of town visitors to the area, there to sell livestock, did report an "awful smell."

The state legislature wrote all city charters at this time and could merge incorporated cities whenever it chose to do so. Fort Worth Mayor W. D. Harris and the city commissioners urged State Representative Louis J. Wortham of Fort Worth included Marine Creek on the north, the Trinity River on the south, the Santa Fe tracks on the east, and Grand Avenue on the West. "In Old Fort Worth: The Story of the Two Fort Worths," *The News-Tribune In Old Fort Worth Bicentennial Memory Book* (Fort Worth: News-Tribune, 1976), p. 13.

2 First mayor of North Fort Worth was James D. Farmer, a partner in a commission firm. *North Fort Worth, City Council Minutes, vol. 1*, 9 December 1902, p. 1; also, *The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter*, 5 April 1904, p. 1.


Worth to push for annexation of North Fort Worth. Since the smaller city did not have a state legislator living in its midst, the bill annexing it to Fort Worth came as a complete surprise. Although city officials resisted, they lost, and the annexation occurred on 11 March 1909. Mayor John F. Grant of North Fort Worth became a "special" member of the Fort Worth city commission.\(^5\) W. D. Davis, who previously had served as mayor of North Fort Worth, later ran for mayor of Fort Worth and eventually served four terms, thus indicating the influence of the livestock business on the larger city.

An area immediately adjacent to and including the stockyards and packing plants did not fall under Fort Worth jurisdiction in 1909 when North Fort Worth succumbed. A Fort Worth committee on city boundaries, consisting of B. B. Paddock, Clarence Owsley, and F. M. Rogers, pursued an idea to leave a sizeable area of trackage property outside the city limits to induce factories to locate close to downtown and yet be exempt from city taxes. The Chamber of Commerce advertised in many trade journals over the United States, offering factory sites free of city taxes to manufacturing firms. Actually too few factories came to the area to compensate for the loss of tax revenues, so in 1911 the

\(^5\)The last city council meeting of North Fort Worth gave no indication that they were about to be incorporated into Fort Worth. Minutes, vol. 1, 9 March 1909, p. 369; also "In Old Fort Worth: The Story of the Two Fort Worths," p. 13.
city planned to annex it as well. The stockyards' interests, however, created their own city to forestall annexation. As early as 23 November 1909 the directors of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company discussed incorporating a "village comprising the stockyards and packing houses" and even authorized $25,000 to $30,000 to construct rentable houses.

Consequently, thirty-three men met in T. E. "Dad" Carson's grocery store, 126 Decatur Avenue, on 21 February 1911 and voted 33-0 to incorporate a new city. Some suggested "Carson City," but Carson insisted that they name the new community for the man most responsible for bringing Armour and Swift to Fort Worth—Louville V. Niles. Four

6 "The Real Story of Niles City: Editor Started It As Tax Shelter," in Mack Williams, In Old Fort Worth (Fort Worth: News-Tribune, 1977), p. 67; also Interview with Janie Reid, historian of Niles City, Fort Worth, Texas, 12 August 1980.

7 Board of Directors Meeting, 23 November 1909, Corporate Record, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Fort Worth, 1st bound vol., p. 294.

8 Niles City, City Council, Minutes, vol. 1, Judge's Order Copied in Minute Book, 25 February 1911, p. 2. Also Raymond Teague, "Niles City A Present from the Past," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 2 August 1980, sec. e, p. 1; also "The Town of Niles," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 22 February 1911, p. 1. Niles came to Fort Worth in 1893 at the request of G. W. Simpson who had bought the Fort Worth Packing Company and had incorporated the Fort Worth Stock Yards. Niles invested as well, but the packing house failed. In 1899 Niles returned to Fort Worth, reopened the packing plant, and made it show some profit. Niles has been given the major credit for inducing the two packers Armour and Swift into locating their plants in Fort Worth. Janie Reid, "Niles City, Texas," 1980 Program for the Texas Cowboy Classic Windy Ryon Memorial Arena, Saginaw, Texas, 30 May-1 June 1980, p. 36.
days later they incorporated the city under state law as a village or town of five hundred inhabitants or more but less than one thousand. 9 Actually, the community of Niles City claimed slightly over five hundred residents. 10

The one-half mile square area which housed the packing plants and stockyards also included a police and fire department, artesian wells for water, electric lights, telephone and gas service, five school buildings (four white, one black), two grain elevators, a pottery works, a round house for the railroad, three grocery stores, and one drug store. 11

Forty-three voters in the first election held on 4 April 1911 in the new little community chose Carson as mayor and picked five aldermen. 12 The aldermen decided in their June

---


10 Janie Reid, "Niles City, Texas," History essay accompanying Historical Marker Application for Texas Historical Marker, 1980. Copy in possession of Duane Gage, Tarrant County Historical Commission chairman.

11 Reid, "Niles City, Texas." Also "Niles City was wealthy town," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 6 August 1978, "Niles City" File, Star-Telegram Reference Library; also Raymond Teague, "Niles City A Present from the Past," p. 2. It was bounded by Marine Creek on the west, Twenty-ninth Street on the north, Harding Street on the east in a straight line south to the Chicago and Rock Island Railroad to the Trinity River on the south.

12 "Town Election Tomorrow," The Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 3 April 1911, p. 1; also "Government
meeting that the advalorum tax rate for Niles City would be .25 of 1 percent of the value of all real and personal property as of 1 January 1911. They estimated property values at between twenty-five and thirty million dollars and would claim to be the "richest little city per capita in the United States" because of its size in proportion to population. Roy Vance, an officer of the Stockyards National Bank, served as treasurer. The aldermen eventually purchased a lot and by March 1912 built a brick and stucco city hall at a cost of $4,511.

The little city a few years later even boasted a woman mayor, Mrs. E. P. Croarkin, whom the aldermen appointed late in 1920 after her husband, the mayor, had died. She maintained her home, cared for two small children, operated the post office and drug store, and performed her duties as


15Law firm Cantey, Hanger & McMahon to C. J. Faulkner, 17 April 1930, p. 4 of enclosed report, FWSY Co. Coll. Vance served as cashier, then president of the Stockyards National Bank during his tenure as treasurer for Niles City.

16Minutes, vol. 1, 16 December 1911, p. 18; also "Site is Purchased for Niles City Hall," North Fort Worth Sunday News, 26 November 1911, p. 1.
mayor. All this, and she claimed not to believe in woman suffrage. When interviewed by a Fort Worth newspaper reporter, she said, "I believe that women are as capable as men in any position for which they fit themselves, but I do not believe that they should be continually trying to remind the world of this fact." Apparently she knew how to be a diplomat, too.

One of the rare strikes at the stockyards itself occurred beginning at noon 12 June 1918 when 130 Fort Worth Stock Yards Company employees walked out. Union officials called the strike from Chicago demanding an eight-hour day, time and one-half for overtime, double time for Sundays and holidays, and a flat increase of $1 per day in salaries. The participants in the strike included dockmen, weighmasters, and cattle drovers. Butchers at the packing plants agreed not to kill livestock driven by non-union men. Stockyards officials, however, assured the press that the strike was not affecting the market and business would continue as usual. Commission men helped the stockyards company clear up the livestock receipts. Employees of the company

17 "New Woman Mayor of Niles City, Runs Home, City Affairs and Drugstore: 'Not Too Busy,'" Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 31 October 1920 in "Niles City" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library. See also Minutes, vol. 1, 25 October 1920, p. 206.

returned to work 17 June 1918 after a government mediator arrived and held several conferences with both stockyards and union officials.¹⁹

When switchmen on the Cotton Belt Railroad went on strike 9 April 1920, they left cattle stranded and affected every railroad that operated through Fort Worth. The Santa Fe sent cattle on to Oklahoma that originally had been meant for Fort Worth. The livestock market at the stockyards reached a standstill for two or three days.²⁰ An officer of the Belt Railway Company operated one engine, and at least twenty-one cars of livestock had arrived at the yards by 12 April. Swift still killed a few cattle, but Armour had shut down.²¹ Everyone went back to work by 15 April.²²


²⁰"Only Live Stock To Reach Yards Saturday Comes Via Auto Truck," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 10 April 1920, p. 1.


Labor relations in the packing industry, which owned most of the stockyards of the nation, continually worsened as the year 1921 progressed. Low prices forced packers to reduce wages. Only by mediation of the Secretary of Labor was a strike averted 23 March 1921. The Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, chartered by the American Federation of Labor, had been attempting to gain recognition for their union since 1897. A major strike had not plagued the industry since 1904, however.

To try to avert future problems, Louis F. Swift announced on 23 May 1921 a plan whereby employees could elect representatives to an assembly where employees and appointed management personnel could sit down and discuss problems. Decision of the group would be binding. Armour and Company adopted the plan as well. Local workers later claimed that the governing council idea did not work because the employee representatives failed to include enough members from the foreign-born workers such as the Polish, Bohemians, Lithuanians, and Mexicans.

---


24 Lewis Corey, Meat and Man, p. 34.


Local Armour employees accepted wage cuts of from three to seven and one-half cents an hour in November 1921, but in December the union voted to call a nationwide strike because of more proposed wage cuts and to gain official recognition of their union. The strike involved forty-five thousand workers in fifteen states. Armour and Swift in Fort Worth kept operating as usual because they filled the places of the striking workers "from a long waiting list."

Rioting occurred, however, on 6 December 1921 between packinghouse workers who continued to report and the strikers. A large crowd of strikers accosted Fred Rouse, a black worker, who then pulled a .32 caliber pistol and fired into the group twice. He hit two brothers, Tracey and Tom Maclin, the former in the leg and the latter in the chest. Niles City police arrested Rouse, but a mob of several hundred took him away and beat the black man into unconsciousness. Officials placed Rouse in the City-County Hospital in Fort Worth where he was listed in critical condition. They planned to charge him with murder should

tom maclin die.  

five days later, as rouse began to recover, a large group of young men wearing handkerchief masks entered the hospital late at night and took rouse from the nurse who was guarding him. they carried him to a well-known hanging tree on samuels avenue near the stockyards area, and left his bullet-riddled body dangling. the two maclin brothers recovered, but the twenty-five to thirty young men involved in the lynching never were identified or brought to justice.

as difficulties continued, both armour and swift filed injunctions in district court to have certain of the strikers cited for contempt of court, claiming that they were interfering with persons who had refused to strike. the strikers apparently had been stopping street cars on which employees of the packing plants were riding, entering them, and threatening the men with bodily harm if they continued on to work. w. c. summers, the armour manager, claimed that "hundreds" were turned back and kept from their jobs on 13 december 1921. the next day fort worth and niles city

31 "strikers obey court unionists cease picketing pending appeal decision," fort worth star-telegram, 7 december 1921, eve., pp. 1, 4.
32 "weapon may prove owner took part in rouse lynching," fort worth star-telegram, 12 december 1921, eve., p. 1.
33 ibid., p. 2.
34 "23 strikers accused, armour moves in halting of cars," fort worth star-telegram, 13 december 1921, p. 1.
35 fort worth star-telegram, 13 december 1921, p. 4; also "master is sitting in swift plea on strike," ibid., 15 december 1921, eve., p. 1.
police officers each patrolled their respective boundaries with extra attention to prevent a reoccurrence of the previous day's incident.³⁶

The judge ruled that the one hundred or more strikers carrying pickets who had been accosting workers each day must be reduced to a pair of pickets at each approach to the packing houses. Squads of men who had been visiting the homes of strikebreakers must cease the practice. Both sides agreed to the injunction.³⁷ The judge also held in abeyance contempt charges against twenty-three specific striking employees to see how the agreement between strikers and packers worked out. Picketing soon became a silent procedure in contrast to the noisy activities of the previous days.³⁸

Arthur Meeker, vice president of Armour and Company in Chicago, refused to negotiate with the union, claiming that the packers had agreed with their employees over wages through the employee representative plan. They claimed that they were in agreement with the majority of their employees and that only a few workers had walked out.³⁹


The nationwide strike finally ended 1 February 1922. The local strike and its violence called attention to the inability of the nine-man Niles City police force to handle the explosive situation. Fort Worth intensified its plans to annex Niles City and its lucrative livestock industries as soon as possible.

In fact, Fort Worth officials already had taken steps to annex Niles City and several other suburbs, for in 1919 the local representative to the state legislature, Wallace Malone of Fort Worth, introduced a bill which would permit a city of from 100,000 to 150,000 population to annex any neighboring city with less than 2,000 population. The bill failed because of opposition from the Board of Trustees of the Diamond Hill Independent School District, but the Thirty-seventh Legislature passed a similar bill, H.B. 126, which became law without the governor's signature 15 November 1921.

Because Niles City possessed only about seven hundred inhabitants, the local aldermen in 1921 extended the city

---

40 Hendricks, "The History of Cattle and Oil in Tarrant County," p. 23. National membership in the Amalgamated Union had fluctuated from seventy-five thousand in 1904 to seventy-five hundred in 1916 and up to one hundred thousand or more in 1919. After the 1921 strike, membership dropped to five thousand. Corey, Meat and Man, p. 289.

limits to include Washington Heights, North Fostepco Heights, and Diamond Hill, thereby increasing their population to twenty-six hundred and their size to 1.5 square miles. Fort Worth ignored this action and allowed city residents to vote in July 1922 to annex Niles City and several other suburbs without the Niles City residents even getting a chance to express their wishes.\textsuperscript{42}

On 22 July 1922, the city of Fort Worth officially annexed Niles City with its property evaluation of from twenty-five to thirty million dollars.\textsuperscript{43} Niles City officials had argued that it would receive no benefits from uniting with Fort Worth, for it already had its own water plant, sewage system, and school facilities. They called the annexation unconstitutional and invalid. The Malone Bill was proclaimed to be a general law, but was in fact local, and

\textsuperscript{42}Minutes, vol. 1, 25 April 1921, pp. 212-13. Teague, "Niles City A Present From the Past," p. 2. Malone, interviewed in 1962 said of the bill, "I introduced it because I thought it was about time those two packing houses that ran Niles City started paying the city of Fort Worth and the school system some money in taxes." Teague, "Niles City A Present From the Past," p. 2. See also Reid, "Niles City, Texas," Essay Accompanying Historical Marker Application, pp. 7-9.

Niles City had not even been given thirty days notice before its passage, the smaller community contended. 44

Mayor W. S. Gallaway of Niles City declared in November 1922 that the city would carry its fight to the United States Supreme Court if necessary. The district court had upheld the right of a larger city (Fort Worth) to annex adjacent territory and had ruled that Niles City's hurried expansion of her own boundaries to increase its population to twenty-six hundred had been an intentional move to attempt to circumvent the law. 45 The appeals case between Fort Worth and Niles City opened 22 February 1923 before the Court of Civil Appeals at Texarkana. 46 This suit was still pending

44 Niles City v. City of Fort Worth, No. 63225 Dist. Ct. of Tarrant County, 17th Judicial Dist. of Texas, 8 October 1923. Also "New Suit Against City is Filed," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 29 March 1923 in "Niles City" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

45 Minutes, vol. 1, 3 November 1922, p. 237. See also "Niles City Will Carry Annexation Fight to U.S. Supreme Court," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 12 November 1922. A problem occurred in the November elections because Fort Worth operated under the assumption that Niles City had become a part of Fort Worth. Apparently primary elections for city elections in Fort Worth were being held in conjunction with general elections. Democrats opened a voting box in Niles City. Niles City officials attempted to prevent voting because they still maintained that Niles City was not in Fort Worth. The Democrats called the chief of police who talked the Niles officials into not closing the polls by force. Ibid. See also Washington Heights Independent School District et. al. v. City of Fort Worth 251 S.W. 341 (1923).

46 "Niles City to Know Its Fate Within a Week," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 17 February 1923, p. 1. See Niles City v. City of Fort Worth.
in July 1923 when the two communities reached a compromise.\textsuperscript{47} Niles City agreed to drop all annexation suits and become a part of Fort Worth if the latter city would assume the debts of the smaller city, which were estimated by some to be between $300,000 and $400,000, but appeared to be nearer $65,000.\textsuperscript{48} Nearly $10,000 of the debt included salaries to employees not paid when Niles City funds became short because big taxpayers withheld tax money pending the settlement of the annexation contest.\textsuperscript{49} Niles City attorney, S. F. Houtchens, claimed that the huge debt consisted of bank warrants which resulted because "Niles made no effort to live within its income."\textsuperscript{50}

The city of Fort Worth did not seem to worry too much about the amount of the bank warrants, but gloated that an

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{47}"Niles Adds 30 Million To City's Assets," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 11 August 1923, "Niles City" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

\textsuperscript{48}"Suburb To Come in City Aug. 1," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 24 July 1923 in "Niles City" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library. City council minutes show that the overdraft from 1919 to December 1922 at the Stockyards National Bank was $63,553.72. Minutes, vol. 1, 15 February 1923, p. 242. In the Annual Report of the Stock Yards Company for 1923 the amount of the Niles City warrants was cited as $65,450.99. Annual Report for 1923, 5 January 1924, FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{49}"Niles Adds 30 Million To City's Assets;" also " Richest Little City in World Becomes A Part of Fort Worth," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 24 July 1923, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{50}By February 1923 Niles City was paying some bills but saving others "for when the litigation between Niles City and Fort Worth is settled." Minutes, vol. 1, 3 February 1923, p. 242. See also Raymond Teague, "Niles City A Present from the Past," p. 2.
additional $30 million in property values would be added to its tax rolls. Niles City had valued the property at only $8 million and had taxed accordingly.

When these warrants continued to be ignored, the Stockyards National Bank, which held them, sued the City of Fort Worth for the money they claimed Niles City owed them. Some of the warrants issued by Niles City and paid by the Stockyards National Bank seemed to have been Christmas presents to various persons and bonuses to the officers and employees of Niles City. In some instances they were for flowers, funeral wreaths, and donations. On the other hand, some were for paving streets, sewage disposal, and similar items. Apparently, Niles City taxes remained so low that the city could not pay all its obligations, so the packers and stockyards interests (who also owned the bank) had simply arranged for the bank to pay them.51 While monthly expenses generally did exceed income, the costs in reality, even with the Christmas bonuses, seldom seemed excessive.

The industrial interests that owned from 75 to 96 percent of the taxable property in Niles City consisted of Armour and Company, Swift and Company, the Fort Worth Stock

51 Bonuses to city employees at Christmastime sometimes represented 10 percent of their salary for six months. Minutes, vol. 1, 20 December 1917, p. 142. Funeral expenses sometimes were paid for former city officials such as $50. Minutes, vol. 1, 29 September 1919, p. 180. Cantey, Hanger and McMahon to C. J. Faulkner, 17 April 1930 and enclosed report, pp. 4-6.
Yards Company, Libby, McNeill and Libby Foods, and the Fort Worth Belt Railway Company, all representing the same ownership, the two packers.\textsuperscript{52}

The Stockyards National Bank filed its suit against the City of Fort Worth 21 July 1924, but when the Court finally reached a conclusion in 1930, it discarded some of the older claims because of the statute of limitations. The Court also disallowed any items authorized to be paid by the Niles City aldermen after 11 July 1922, considering these acts illegal since Niles City was already a part of Fort Worth.\textsuperscript{53} Of approximately $400,000 the Stockyards National Bank had been trying to collect, the Court allowed only $70,685.20 plus interest at 6 percent.\textsuperscript{54} The interest amounted to $32,000. The stockyards company wrote off as a loss that portion of the $400,000 which they claimed was owed them but which they did not collect\textsuperscript{55} and kept trying to get the city of Fort Worth to pay a larger share of the warrants.\textsuperscript{56} The city of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52}Cantey, Hanger and McMahon to C. J. Faulkner, 17 April 1930 and enclosed report, p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{53}Cantey, Hanger and McMahon to C. J. Faulkner, 17 April 1930 and enclosed report, p. 14. See also Stockyards National Bank v. City of Fort Worth, No. 67594 (Dist. Ct. of Tarrant County, 48th Judicial Dist. of Texas, 16 June 1930.)
\item \textsuperscript{54}Stockyards National Bank v. City of Fort Worth; also letter from Cantey, Hanger and McMahon, p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{55}A. G. Donovan to F. W. Ellis, 18 April 1930, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.
\item \textsuperscript{56}Cantey, Hanger and McMahon to C. J. Faulkner, 5 May 1930, FWSY Co. Coll.
\end{itemize}
Fort Worth eventually paid a total of only $59,952.42 in warrants and interest with Armour receiving 39.52 percent or $23,693.20; Swift, 39.71 percent or $23,807.11; the Fort Worth Stock Yards 18.14 percent or $10,875.37; and Libby, McNeill and Libby 2.63 percent or $1,576.74.\(^\text{57}^\)

Disposition of the stucco building which had served as "the richest little city's" town hall rested with the larger city. The building served as a residence for several years; then after being vacant for a time became a syrup factory, then a Works Progress Administration canning plant during the 1930's.\(^\text{58}^\) Owners rented it out as a duplex to war workers in 1943. After letting it stand vacant a number of years, the current owners demolished the building in 1975 to make room for a parking lot.\(^\text{59}^\)

---

\(^\text{57}\) Albert H. and Henry Veeder to A. G. Donovan, 26 May 1931, Dies Corr. FWSY Co. Coll.; also "'Red' Seen for City Finances," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 1 January 1931, "Niles City" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library. Libby, McNeill and Libby was a subsidiary of Swift. Also see Stockyards National Bank v. City of Fort Worth.

\(^\text{58}\) "Ye Town Hall of Niles May Become a 'War Duplex,'" Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 3 December 1942, "Niles City" File Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library; also "A Southern Acady--the Park City of the Southwest," "North Fort Worth" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

\(^\text{59}\) Janie Reid, "Niles City, Texas," p. 36. Louville V. Niles, after whom Niles City was named, made annual trips to Fort Worth to the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show as late as the early 1920's. He remained a major stockholder in the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and wrote lengthy letters about its operations. He died in July 1928 at the age of 89. Letter from L. V. Niles to W. C. Walker, 18 April 1921, Niles Folder, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll. Also Reid, "Niles City, Texas."
All dealings between the packing and stockyards interests and the city of Fort Worth during the 1920's did not disintegrate into court battles. Cooperative effort did in fact take place, especially concerning water and flood control. Because floods of the Trinity River generally affected the stockyards district, officials from the area became as interested in flood control for the city of Fort Worth as anyone else. Immediately following a disastrous flood of 24-27 April 1922, a citizen's committee met at the city hall of Fort Worth to take steps to restore confidence and provide adequate relief. No sooner had they put plans underway than a second flood came 8-11 May 1922. Kennerly Robey, chief engineer for the Fort Worth Stock Yards, became chairman of a group of citizens who petitioned and eventually created the Tarrant County Water Control District No. 1, the first of its kind in the state. Robey later served as consulting engineer for the district. By a four-to-one vote, citizens approved the District on 7 October 1924. Supporters hailed the plan as the first combination flood control and water supply plan in America, as the engineers announced intentions to construct two lakes on the West fork of the Trinity, Lake Bridgeport located approximately fifty

---

60"Final Report of Board of Engineers of Tarrant County on Flood Control and Water Conservation for Tarrant Co. Texas," 1925, FWSY Co. Coll. See also Tarrant County Water Improvement District Miscellaneous Material, ibid., Item 2, p. 1.
miles upriver, and Eagle Mountain Lake, closer to Lake Worth which had been built in 1912. In an election on 7 October 1927 voters approved $6,500,000 in bonds for the projects.\(^{61}\)

Lending their chief engineer to direct the plans for the water control district did not constitute the only bit of cooperation between the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and the city of Fort Worth. The company donated $1,800 in 1925 to the Community Chest, predecessor of United Way, which probably represented their usual annual contribution.\(^{62}\) Much earlier, the company had approved an investment of $4,250 in an inter-urban railway to be built from Fort Worth to Mineral Wells.\(^{63}\)

Reluctantly then, during the early years of the 1920's the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and the packing plants came under the taxing jurisdiction of the city of Fort Worth. Twenty years earlier the city had made numerous concessions to persuade the packers to relocate in their area and to build up their terminal market, but later felt that the time for such generosity to the wealthy meat packers had expired.

---

\(^{61}\) Edmunds Travis, "Fort Worth's Big Water Plan," Bunkers Magazine 2 (July-December 1928):49.

\(^{62}\) Telegram from A. G. Donovan to F. W. Ellis, 30 October 1925, Dies Corr. FWSY Co. Coll. The telegram asked permission to donate the money. An undated reply gave the permission.

\(^{63}\) Board of Directors Meeting, 13 January 1914, Corporate Record, 1st bound vol., p. 384.
The state of Texas had ended any "coddling" of the livestock industry in 1907 when its courts outlawed the Fort Worth Live Stock Exchange. The city and the federal government both chose the early 1920's to make their restrictive moves. How much a national mood antagonistic to the meat trust influenced the attitude of city leaders probably cannot be determined. While federal regulation of the meat packers and stockyards had been a subject under consideration since the 1880's, the movement did not reach fruition for those seeking such restrictions until the early 1920's. That story must next be told.
CHAPTER VIII

GOVERNMENT REGULATION

The years many have deemed the "Roaring Twenties" brought a loud outcry in the cattle industry that reached all the way to the nation's capitol, affecting all major terminal markets including Fort Worth. In fact, the 1920's became a turning point for Fort Worth's leading industry in a number of ways, but none more influential than the federal regulation that became law soon after the decade began. Throughout the nation new trends began to emerge, affecting agriculture both economically and politically.¹ Many still considered the raising of livestock the predominant industry of Texas in the 1920's² as Texas produced 11 percent of the cattle of the entire country (nearly as many as any other two states combined),³ but toward the close of the decade some cited cotton as the more prominent agricultural industry, pushing livestock to second place.⁴

Farmers and other livestock producers all over the nation began experiencing problems as the decade began. Livestock prices remained low for producers, although a postwar inflation caused prices to soar for consumers. Other problems included: low beef consumption because of wartime conservation, rising beef production surpassing population increases, a two or three year drouth in the South, increasing meat imports but decreasing exports, rising labor costs, and tax hikes. In addition, higher freight rates came at the exact time when declining product prices made shipment impossible.  

Fort Worth in the 1920's still considered itself predominantly a cattle town and bragged that more than two million head of livestock arrived at the Fort Worth Stock Yards annually, making the local market the greatest in the Southwest and livestock the largest industry in town. The stockyards area employed more than five thousand workers and turned out products valued at $120 million each year. The population of 1920 represented a quadrupling during the two decades since the arrival of Big Five meat packers Armour and Swift in 1902.  


Among the factors that began to alter this dominance one must include the discovery of oil west and northwest of the city in 1919. Fort Worth soon became the promotional and developmental headquarters for the oil industry in that section of the state.  

By 1924 nine refineries produced petroleum products valued at $52 million annually, making Fort Worth the "oil capital of North Texas," possibly seeing themselves on the way to being a great metropolitan center, citizens approved the council-manager form of government in 1925.

The stockyards area, however, became more directly concerned over its connection with the meat packing trust and the federal regulation of that industry that began in 1921. Both producers of livestock and consumers often believed themselves to be at the mercy of the Big Five whom they claimed set prices and acted in collusion with one another to limit competition. The official publication of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas charged that in 1916 the Big Five control of interstate slaughter at the twelve largest packing centers had been 94.4 percent of cattle, 89.1 percent

---


10 Ibid.
of calves, 94.3 percent of sheep and lambs, and 81 percent of all swine brought to these markets. The cattle raisers published net earnings for Swift and Company after paying a dividend each year of $5,250,000 as a surplus of $3 million in 1912; $4 million surplus in 1913, $4,200,000 in 1914, and $8,650,000 in 1915. Armour reported net earnings of $7,599,907 in 1914 and $11 million in 1915. The public became incensed at these figures, especially when they learned that the packers owned the stockyards where most livestock had to be sold as well as the railroad cars by which much of the nation's processed meat and even perishable fruits and vegetables were distributed. Many persons feared that the meat trust could control the food supply of the nation. Some even called for the "meat monopoly" to be operated as a public utility, allowing only small independent companies to continue as free enterprise.

In defending himself of these charges of monopoly, J. Ogden Armour wrote, "Unfortunately a good many people will

---

11 "Facts About the 'Big Five' Packers," The Cattleman 6 (July 1919):11, 49. The twelve markets were Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, New York City, St. Joseph, Fort Worth, St. Paul, Sioux City, Oklahoma City, Denver, and Wichita.


always believe anything that is persistently told them, particularly if it be about a corporation." He claimed that no monopoly existed and that the five largest packers handled less than 50 percent of the beef and packing industry of the entire country.

He said that packers built and operated their own refrigerated railroad cars so that they would be available when needed, for the railroads could not be depended upon to supply them. Once they had the cars, the packers found it more profitable to ship fruits and vegetables on them at least a part of the time rather than move empty cars. They bought and operated stockyards for basically the same reason, he said, to see that a market existed to provide sufficient animals for their packing plants to operate efficiently.

Armour and Swift remained among the top five industries of all categories in the United States as the 1920's began. Swift even admitted later that his company did business second only in volume to United States Steel.

15 Ibid., p. 153.
16 Ibid., pp. 28-29, 298-99.
Unquestionably, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company existed as an integral part of this meat packing trust since Armour and Swift each owned one-third of the shares of the company.\(^1\) In testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee on 25 January 1919, J. Ogden Armour explained that he induced Swift to build at Fort Worth and promised him half of the business to keep him from building across the river at Dallas.\(^1\) Published accounts of livestock purchases of the two packers at the Fort Worth Stock Yards indicate that buyers for the two packers contracted for almost identical amounts, particularly of cattle, each day over the years although Armour denied any agreement between the two packers for each to purchase half the livestock.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Typed list of stockholders of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 1 April 1923, Gary Havard Collection, Fort Worth, Texas.

\(^2\) U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Hearings on Government Control of Meat Packing Industry on S.5305, 65th Cong., 3rd sess., 1919, p. 664. Armour contended that the arrival of the packers at a location MADE the markets, for until their plants were constructed to purchase livestock very little market existed. He contended that total receipts increased at Fort Worth by 1600 percent within sixteen years after the opening of the packing plants from 227,000 head to 3,540,000. Ibid., p. 537.

The two packers also proposed buying out the Hodge Stockyards at Fort Worth, an important feeding-in-transit facility nearer the downtown railroads, in order to eliminate them as competition. Their attorneys advised them, however, that such a purchase might be construed as a violation of the anti-trust law. The packers later accomplished the closing of the Hodge yards by making an agreement with the Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railway not to ship their cattle from Hodge by promising them preferred shipments from the Fort Worth Stock Yards two days a week. 21 "I feel quite sure you will be pleased to know that this competition is going to be discontinued," A. R. Fay of the Fort Worth Stock Yards wrote Louis F. Swift on 29 June 1917. 22

For years the Fort Worth Stock Yards conducted operations like the big business that it obviously represented. Swift bought shares of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock in the name of directors of the company, but on the death of that director the stock went to his successor. In transferring stock, officials changed the name on the certificate, but notified the secretary that "This transfer involves no change of ownership whatever." 23

---


22 Ibid., 50-51.

23 W. W. Sherman, assistant treasurer, to Henry Veeder, 5 February 1923, attached to Stock Certificate No. 52, Havard Collection.
In 1920 the stockyards company owned some seventy rent houses for employees.\textsuperscript{24} The company owned twenty blocks of land from Twenty-third to Twenty-eighth Streets on the west side of Main Street, plus twelve blocks between Twentieth and Twenty-third on the east side of Main. They also held an additional three or four blocks north of Twenty-eighth Street.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed, O. W. Matthews, secretary-treasurer of the company, wrote that they had been selling real estate for fourteen years "and we always remit this money direct to the New York Trust Company for credit to our Contingent Account, from which we redeem Bonds at the end of each year."\textsuperscript{26} Then on 20 August 1926, the North Fort Worth Townsite Company sold out to the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company for $1.\textsuperscript{27} The company continued to sell land, and by 1930 only owned two blocks between Clinton and Ellis and Twenty-seventh and Twenty-eighth of about forty-six lots and a few lots in the east section of North Fort Worth near Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{25}Surveyor's Map of Stockyards Area. Havard Coll.

\textsuperscript{26}O. W. Matthews to Henry Veeder, 24 March 1915, St. Louis and SW Railroad Folder, Havard Coll.

\textsuperscript{27}Copy of an agreement to sell North Fort Worth Townsite Company to Fort Worth Stock Yards Company for $1. Unmarked folder, Havard Coll.

\textsuperscript{28}Map of Property of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Showing Land Now Under Mortgage and All Transfers to July
The company created an Agricultural Livestock Finance Corporation late in 1921 with John Sparks, president of the Stockyards National Bank, as president. The new finance corporation, capitalized at one million dollars, began soliciting applications and subscription blanks to members of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.29 One agricultural expert explained that the meat packers encouraged and assisted in the incorporation of cattle loan associations in stock raising centers to help finance the industry better because the meat packers needed to maintain a steady production of cattle on the ranges or the fattening of beef by feed yard operators. He added, however, that a danger existed when the meat packers advanced loans too liberally to boost business, and then when the market became unstable, they called in their loans, letting the producer suffer.30 In addition to real estate and cattle loan corporations, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, as mentioned in Chapter 3, owned major control of the Stockyards National

1922. Altered to December 1930. K. Robey, Engineering Department, City of Fort Worth. Havard Coll.

29 Charter No. 37096, Agricultural Livestock Finance Corporation, filed 7 November 1921, Office of Secretary of State, Austin, Texas. Also "Empire Builder," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 15 October 1921 and 9 November 1921 as cited in Research Data, vol. 36, p. 14314. In March 1921 the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas merged with the Panhandle and Southwestern Stockraisers Association to become the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, its present name. Headquarters remain in Fort Worth.

Bank, the Belt Railroad Company, the Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter (which would become a weekly in the 1920's), and a utility company.

In attempting to curb such big business activities nationwide, reformers urged federal regulation of the meat packing trust. In arguing for such legislation in 1921, Senator George Norris of Nebraska expressed what many consumers and producers in Fort Worth and around the nation felt when he contrasted the sixty cents his wife had recently paid for bacon with the ten to twelve cents per pound farmers obtained.31

Agitation against the meat packing industry began long before Senator Norris's cry in 1921. In fact, a Senate investigation of the dressed beef industry in 1888, the Vest Committee, provided a major thrust toward the passage of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act two years later.32 A test case in 1898 ruled in favor of the industry when the Court held that the activities of commission men did not constitute inter-state commerce.33 But in 1903 the United States filed a


bill in equity to enjoin further conduct of an illegal con-
spiracy of the Big Five packers as a meat monopoly, and
issued an injunction which the courts later sustained.\(^3^4\)

Because of large profits by the meat industry during
World War I, renewed cries came for reform, even though the
government regulated the packers under the wartime Lever Act.
High prices and excessive published profits generated com-
plaints from those less fortunate and drew accusations of
unfair competition. Several things encouraged these demands
for reform. The American Federation of Labor became irate
at the Big Five's resistance to collective bargaining and
decided to challenge. Progressives encouraged by Senator
Robert M. LaFollette and President Woodrow Wilson called for
stricter anti-trust legislation. In addition, the packers' expansion into nearly every food line, including a fresh
fruit trade on their refrigerator cars, made consumers fear
that a food monopoly might gain complete control of the
nation.\(^3^5\)

Probably the most effective call for reform came from
farmers and ranchers in the Western states, concerned over
the low and fluctuating price of meat animals.\(^3^6\) Producers


\(^3^5\)Lewis Corey, Meat and Man, p. 74.

\(^3^6\)Theodore Saloutos and John D. Hicks, Agricultural
Discontent in the Middle West 1900-1939 (Madison: University
of Wisconsin Press, 1951), p. 325; also G. O. Virtue, "The
Meat Packing Investigation," Quarterly Journal of Economics
34(August 1920):626.
also complained that because commission men were tenants of livestock exchange buildings owned by packers that they would tend to favor packers in their business to keep on good terms with their landlords.37

Even as early as 1914 the American National Cattlemen's Association formed a committee to investigate the growth and control of the large packers.38 A committee reported in July 1915 at a special Denver conference that the belief persisted that in the marketing of livestock, supply and demand "has ceased to have very much to do with the matter of price making."39 A. E. DeRicqles, chairman of the committee, reviewed the gradual acquisition by the packing interests of stockyard companies, exchange buildings, daily market papers, tanneries, belt railways, and loan companies, which seemed the pattern throughout the industry.40 T. W. Tomlinson, secretary of the Association, told members of a second conference in 1915, this one held under the auspices of the United States Department of Agriculture on livestock


40Ibid., p. 6.
marketing, that it was not in the best interest of the livestock industry "for the large packers to own and control important stockyards, exchange buildings and other facilities" for it "tends to a complete control over our industry." 41

Early in January 1916 the American National Cattlemen's Association held its annual meeting in El Paso and created another committee to study marketing conditions. 42 Not all livestock producers favored the investigation. A pro-packer and an anti-packer faction existed within the American National as well as several of the other livestock organizations. 43 But at the El Paso meeting, the majority passed a resolution to ask Congress to enact legislation to correct the abuses of the packers. 44 In March of that year Congressman William P. Borland of Missouri introduced a resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate any violations of the anti-trust laws by the big packers. Borland said, "Indications are . . . that the Standard Oil Company in its palmiest days never had as complete a system


of controlling the supply and price of a great necessity of life as has now been developed by the packers' trust."45

Packers tried to forestall such investigations by meeting with livestock associations, for officials of four of the Big Five came to Fort Worth in May 1916 to meet with a committee of members of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas. Their efforts failed, for the committee still recommended that the American National Cattlemen's Association continue its investigation.46

As a result of these calls for an investigation, on 7 February 1917 President Woodrow Wilson requested the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the packing industry to determine if agreements in restraint of trade and other monopolistic practices existed. After several months of hearings, investigations, and five volumes of collected material, the Commission concluded:

It appears that five great packing concerns of the country—Swift, Armour, Morris, Cudahy, and Wilson—have attained such a dominant position that they control at will the market in which they sell their products, and hold the fortunes of the competitors in their hands.47

45 "To Investigate Packers," The Cattleman 2(March 1916): 111.


Some estimates ran as high as five hundred subsidiary companies in which they held joint stock, agreements, communities of interest, or family relationships.\textsuperscript{48} In one chart, the Federal Trade Commission report listed thirty-one major stockyards, showing percentages of ownership by the Big Five. They controlled over 50 percent of all but two of the yards cited and the percentage of ownership usually ranged in the eighties or nineties.\textsuperscript{49} The FTC also charged the Big Five with making agreements to buy cattle in specified percentages.\textsuperscript{50} The investigation also revealed the big packers engaged in extensive foreign meat export activity.\textsuperscript{51} The FTC recommended that the federal government acquire the railroads used to ship cattle, the stockyards, and the cold storage plants owned by the Big Five and operate them as a government monopoly.

The FTC report cited the Fort Worth and Denver stockyards specifically as markets where only two of the Big Five packers operated and claimed they divided everything

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., pp. 4-5, 10.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., p. 16. They owned 66 2/3 percent of the Fort Worth Stock Yards.


fifty-fifty only allowing independent packers, local butchers, and speculators to purchase not over 5 percent of the livestock, which constituted too small a percentage to influence the market strongly "much less fix the price." The FTC report asserted that at Fort Worth the two packers who owned the stockyards "have refused, contrary to the wishes of the citizens of Fort Worth to allow other packers to come in on the ground that there is not enough stock in that market to support another plant.53

Almost as an immediate result of the FTC report, President Wilson, under authority of a food control act passed in August 1917, issued a proclamation in June 1918 that as of 25 July 1918 all commercial stockyards must have a federal license as well as all commission merchants and livestock dealers. Regulatory power would be in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, but he delegated his power to the Bureau of Markets.54 As could be expected, the local Livestock Reporter began defending the packers, blaming the high cost of living on the system of credit and the retail dealers.


53Virtue, "The Meat Packing Investigation," 646-47. As discussed in Chapter 5, not enough hogs existed to support the two packers already in Fort Worth, and other packers refused to build plants because of this shortage.

The editor also charged the consumers who wanted the best cuts of meat with causing the higher prices. Packers only made a profit of two cents on each dollar, the editor explained.55

Roy C. Vance, cashier of the Stockyards National Bank in Niles City, blamed the "caprice of politicians" for attacking a business simply because it had been successful and had attained tremendous growth because of "economy and good business methods."56 Packers took the risks in establishing the banks, stockyards, and packing plants when the public did not want to invest; then when they became successful, they brought down the wrath of Congress, the Attorney General, and others, Vance charged.57

A bill actually was introduced in the House of Representatives in November 1918 authorizing government ownership of stockyards, exchange buildings, terminal railroads, rendering plants, market newspapers, and other market facilities, but some critics labeled the action as part of the war psychology. Once the war ended, the defeat of the bill became certain.58

55 "Some Plain Facts Regarding the Packers and the Part They are Alleged to Play in the 'H.C.L.' (High Cost of Living)," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 6 August 1919, p. 1.


57 Ibid.

As suggested earlier, a division existed in the livestock industry concerning the guilt of the packers and the need for strict regulation. One writer blamed the furor and calls for legislation on wholesale grocers publicizing the FTC report, although the "findings were never substantiated or made to form the basis of a real court action."\(^{59}\) Robert Justus Kleberg, owner of the huge King Ranch in south Texas, opposed government regulation of packers, claiming that such regulation would be ruinous to packers, meat producers, and consumers.\(^{60}\)

Marion Sansom, a Fort Worth cattleman, also spoke out. He favored the minority report of the Forty-fourth Annual Convention of the Cattle Raisers Association of Texas which opposed the requested regulations. He told the convention that he regretted that some had accused those who favored the minority report of being "bought" by the packers. He said that retailers caused the high beef prices to consumers, not necessarily packers, although he claimed he was not defending packers. Sansom reminded his fellow producers that one cannot get a larger market for beef by breaking the packers up, for they represented the only ones large enough


to expand on a world market. A fellow Texas rancher, George Hendricks of San Angelo, asked Sansom in the meeting how "in the name of common sense" the proposed legislation would put the packers out of business. The majority report favoring the packer regulation passed 299 to 127.  

The meat industry formed the Institute of American Meat Packers, composed of at least two hundred small packers as well as the Big Five, to combat the anti-packer publicity and the proposed confiscatory legislation.  

Also to forestall any drastic regulation that might entail government ownership, the packers requested a meeting with Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer in which they proposed to clean up the industry from within.  

They signed a Packers' Consent Decree in 1920 in which they voluntarily agreed to dispose of their interests in public stockyards, stockyard terminals and railroads, market newspapers, cold storage warehouses, and to relinquish the business in unrelated lines and the use of the distribution system for other than meat products. Thus threatened with anti-trust action or confiscatory legislation, the Chicago giants signed this Decree by which they agreed to end certain objectionable practices and thus avoid

---


62 Fowler, Men, Meat and Miracles, p. 139.

63 Saloutos and Hicks, Agricultural Discontent, p. 326.
prosecution. Many cattlemen became indignant at the deal which they claimed had been made between the packers and the Attorney General.\textsuperscript{64}

Beginning with the outset of the controversy, Armour and Swift began running full page ads in \textit{The Cattleman}, the monthly magazine of the Cattle Raisers Association, to try to explain their position and to gain good will. They protested that they were being misunderstood, that they helped the farmer on the world market.\textsuperscript{65} In fact, these full page packer advertisements continued throughout the entire decade of the 1920's.

Litigation began over the Decree almost immediately and continued for a decade during which time the packers did not comply with all its provisions. Not only did the Big Five packers challenge, a California Cooperative Canners' Association took their side and argued that the order forbidding the cooperative to use the refrigerator cars belonging to the packers, had, in a few months, ruined their fruit industry. Eventually the California Canners and the Big Five lost, and in 1930, the Court ruled that the packers had to dispose of


\textsuperscript{65}Swift and Armour Advertisements, \textit{The Cattleman} 6(December 1919):28, 30.
their stockyards and other interests before 31 December 1931.  

Neither the Sixty-fifth or the Sixty-sixth congresses succeeded in passing legislation to regulate the packing industry, although congressmen listened to arguments on both sides during months of committee hearings. As the Sixty-seventh Congress met in the spring of 1921, feelings remained strong among many that the legislation could be passed, while the meat packing industry opposed it as vigorously as ever. Representatives of various large organizations appeared before the House committee, chaired by Iowa Congressman Gilbert Haugen, to show their support for legislation to regulate the meat packers.

Support for packer regulation came from a new organization created in 1919, the American Farm Bureau Federation. This federation emerged from local farm bureaus that originally underwrote the expenses of agricultural technicians from land grant colleges who educated farmers in better farming practices. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 authorized resident county agents to be financed by federal, state, and local governments.

---


local, and even private funds. Local and state farm bureaus allied with the land-grant colleges helped provide this aid, often on a membership-subscription basis. Each partner ultimately benefitted greatly from the alliance. These state organizations combined in 1919 to form the American Farm Bureau Federation.  

In May 1921 a group of twenty to twenty-five Senators from agricultural states began meeting with the Washington agent of the American Farm Bureau Federation in his office and formed what became a farm bloc. Western farm bloc congressmen refused to adjourn until Congress passed agricultural legislation. The American Farm Bureau Federation and its Washington director, Gray Silver, exerted much influence, and telegrams against adjournment poured in from farm areas. They agreed to a bargain to permit adjournment only after some farm bills were passed—a farm loan act, a grain futures act, and the Packers and Stockyards Act.  

The final law represented a compromise House bill giving regulation to the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the

---


69 Shideler, Farm Crisis 1919-1923, p. 155.

70 Ibid., pp. 158-59.
Senate's bill with Federal Trade Commission control.\textsuperscript{71} Congress titled Public Law 51, effective 15 August 1921, as "An Act To regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock, live-stock \textsuperscript{sic} products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes."\textsuperscript{72} It became unlawful to engage in unfair deceptive practices, to give undue preferences to persons or localities, to apportion a supply among packers in restraint of commerce, to trade in articles to manipulate prices, create a monopoly, or to conspire to aid in unlawful acts. Under the law, packers would be served with complaints of suspected violations and hearings would be held. Stockyards had to file rates with the Secretary of Agriculture and could not make changes without ten days notice. Hearings had to be held on new rates, and the Secretary could suspend a rate schedule. In addition, packers, stockyards owners, and market agencies had to keep accounts and disclose them to the Secretary.\textsuperscript{75} The Packers and Stockyards Administration, created by the Act, also printed pamphlets and brochures to help livestock producers

\textsuperscript{71}Washington Post, 18 June 1921, p. 1; also "House Packer Bill Passed by Senate, New York Times, 18 June 1921, sec. 1, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{72}Packers and Stockyards Act, Statutes at Large, vol. 42, chap. 64, pp. 159-169 (1921).

\textsuperscript{73}Ibid., pp. 161, 164, 168.
and livestock dealers to let them know what the law meant to them.\textsuperscript{74}

A court case immediately tested the constitutionality of the Packers and Stockyards Act. The court ruled that Congress had power to regulate business done in the stockyards and the Secretary of Agriculture had power to insist on an open schedule of charges by commission men.\textsuperscript{75} Later government officials charged that lawyers for the Big Five helped write the final bill so that it would not regulate too strictly.\textsuperscript{76}

\textsuperscript{74}The Packers and Stockyards Act As It Applies To Livestock Dealers, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Washington, D.C. PA-808; also Questions and Answers on the Packers and Stockyards Act for Livestock Producers, U.S.D.A., Packers and Stockyards Administration, Washington, D.C. PA-810; and Livestock Payment Guidelines For Producers, U.S.D.A. Packers and Stockyards Administration, Washington D.C. PA-923. In 1982 there were thirteen offices of the Packers and Stockyards Administration throughout the country, established at the larger terminal markets when the administration was created. One of these is located in Fort Worth. Because of the fluctuations in livestock marketings and the time involved in securing approval of applications for increased rates and charges, the rate of return realized oftentimes does not measure up to the rate permitted. Annual Report, United Stockyards Corporation, Year ended 31 October 1948, Dies Correspondence, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.

\textsuperscript{75}Stafford v. Wallace, 258 U.S. 495 (1922).

\textsuperscript{76}Interview with Mike Pacatte, Auditor, Packers and Stockyards Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth, Texas, 27 July 1977.
In challenging the Act, the companies argued that the sale of livestock in stockyards did not constitute an integral part of interstate commerce. Their brief maintained that the stockyards only indirectly affected interstate commerce and therefore were not a matter of national concern. Chief Justice William Howard Taft in his opinion explained that the Act was a permissible regulation of a business affected by a public interest as the Court had ruled in Munn v. Illinois (1877). The stockyards, he said, were "great national public utilities" which served to promote interstate commerce in livestock and their public nature and national character combined to subject them to national regulation. He also maintained that the stockyards played a vital and direct part in interstate commerce.77 Thus the Court affirmed the Packers and Stockyards Act as constitutional.

Nothing terribly drastic in the way of change happened to the stockyards of the nation, including the Fort Worth Stock Yards, immediately after the implementation of the law because of the delaying litigation. The packers made no immediate moves to divest themselves of their stockyards. In fact, Henry Veeder, assistant secretary of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, wrote a Packers and Stockyards official

in 1925 that the minute books of the Fort Worth Stock Yards were at his office in Chicago and the official could see them there. Veeder at that time served as vice president of Swift and Company.  

A special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, H. J. Galloway of Washington D.C., visited Fort Worth 19 February 1923 to inspect the yards and hear complaints. The Department of Agriculture did order the Fort Worth Stock Yards to establish a new shipping division into which might be gathered all cattle in the native yards destined for interstate shipment. The company had been trying to do this anyway.  

A disagreement between the American National Cattlemen's Association and the old line commission firms on the Fort Worth market over commission

78 Henry Veeder to John T. Caine, III, Chief Packers and Stockyards Administration, 24 October 1925, Dies Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.


80 "New Division Established in Stock Yards," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 25 April 1923, p. 1. The Crisp Bill was passed 28 June 1926 which provided that on and after 1 May 1928 only tick free cattle would be permitted in interstate commerce for any purpose. Of Texas' 254 counties, 111 had been released from federal quarantine since 1906, but the area yet under quarantine in Texas stretched 83,118 square miles. H. L. Darby, "Texas and Tick Eradication," The Cattleman 13(March 1937):73.
rates was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture Henry C. Wallace for arbitration early in 1924.  

One immediate result of the Packers and Stockyards Act became the packer-instituted practice of buying livestock directly from producers in the country, rather than waiting until they arrived at the public terminal markets. Packers claimed that they could not get all the supplies they needed on the public markets. Producers charged that the packers bought directly in order to pay lower prices and also to avoid the federal regulations at the larger stockyards. With less competition for the cattle on the terminal markets where legitimate values should be determined, farmers feared that the prices there would plummet and saw these fears realized.

Many mid-western farm groups agitated in the mid-1920's for amendments to the Packers and Stockyards Act to include provisions against direct marketing. Others urged that jurisdiction of the Packers and Stockyards Administration be placed in the hands of the Federal Trade Commission rather than the Secretary of Agriculture whom many believed acted too leniently. The editor of the Farmer-Labor Advocate of St. Paul, Minnesota appeared before the Senate Agriculture

81 "Commission Rate Hearing in Fort Worth May Have To Be Resumed Before Dagger," Fort Worth Daily Livestock Reporter, 1 April 1924, p. 1

and Forestry Committee in 1925 in favor of FTC jurisdiction over the packers and stockyards. He said that the people he knew believed the law had failed, "so far as bringing to the farmers the relief which they hoped to get out of that sort of legislation." A lawyer representing the Kansas City Livestock Exchange, the Farmers' Union Associates, and the Missouri Livestock Producers Association argued that packers' direct purchases from a small unregulated yard exceeded those at the public market in Kansas City by 80 percent.

Some farmers, however, liked the direct marketing system because they did not have to pay yardage or commission fees as they would at the public yards and so saved $25 to $30 on each animal. They, along with the packers, opposed the amendment against direct marketing. Members of the Congressional committee argued along with the farmers' organizations favoring the amendment that the big packers manipulated prices because the more stock they bought directly in their private yards, the lower the price would be on the public yards. Some claimed that they purposely decreased

---

83 U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Amendment to Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921. Hearings Before Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on S. 3841, 68th Cong., 2d sess., 1925, p. 10.

84 U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Hearings on A Bill to Amend the Packers and Stockyards Act S. 2089, 68th Cong., 1st sess., 1924, p. 7.
competition and manipulated prices through direct buying at their private yards. 85

An interesting thing happened to the five-man Federal Trade Commission during the 1920's after receiving new appointees from the Harding and Coolidge administrations. Created in 1914 to investigate business practices, the Commission by 1925 reflected business interests and did less investigating. Under Woodrow Wilson progressives had defended the FTC and businessmen had opposed it, but in

85 U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Agriculture, Hearings Before the Committee on Agriculture, A Bill to Amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 H.R. 11384, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926, p. 63. Also U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on S. 3676 and S. 4387, 69th Cong., 1st sess., 1926, p. 1. The FTC never took jurisdiction away from the Secretary of Agriculture, as many wanted, but in 1958 somewhat joint jurisdiction became possible, and the FTC could investigate if the Agriculture Department failed to do so. Thomas N. Schroth, ed., Congress and the Nation, 3 vols., (Washington: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), vol. 1, 1945-1964, pp. 456-58. In 1958 Congress also amended the law to include all the country stockyards. Prior to that a stockyards had to be larger than twenty thousand square feet to be under federal jurisdiction. Interview with F. J. Novacek, Supervising Auditor, Packers and Stockyards Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth, Texas, 27 July 1977. The Packers and Stockyards Administration today audits records, tests scales at markets, makes sure packers and commission firms are bonded, and mainly operates as a complaint agency for individuals who desire redress against a packer, dealer, or a stockyards. A violation of the law results first in a cease and desist order. If the party violates the order by another infraction, the P & S Administration can take the case to a civil court. If a packer or other dealer commits an illegal act for a third time, the administration can take the case to a criminal court. "But the Justice Department thinks of it as a white collar crime and does nothing. Few ever go to jail," an administration official complained. Interview with Mike Pacatte.
Coolidge's day these two groups had reversed themselves. Businessmen praised the FTC because it did their bidding, and progressives thus criticized it.  

What happened in Washington concerning federal regulation of packers and stockyards affected the Fort Worth market eventually, but during the 1920's persons connected closely with the local market seemed to believe that the good days would go on for a while yet. The yards continued to break monthly and weekly records in July 1919. During the first half of that year, Fort Worth had ranked sixth in sheep, sixth in cattle, fourth in calves, and eighth in hogs among the leading terminal markets. For the twelve months ending December 1920 in the ten leading markets Fort Worth ranked sixth in cattle, fifth in calves, ninth in hogs, and tenth in sheep. Only three years later, however, a former trail driver and Texas commission agent reported that the cattle business was down and he expected a slow comeback.

---


87 "Cattle Receipts at Fort Worth Reach New High Record," The Cattleman 6(August 1919):44.


89 George W. Saunders to T. B. Saunders Jr., 31 July 1923, Tom B. Saunders Jr. Collection, Box 1, Texas Christian University Special Collections, Fort Worth, Texas.
An optimism for the future continued to exist at the Fort Worth Stock Yards, however, and a lack of new ideas never seemed to be a problem. In the fall of 1923, the company and commission firms set aside Tuesday and Friday of each week as "Stocker Days" and advertised this fact to shippers and buyers. They believed that within a radius of a few hundred miles of Fort Worth more stocker cattle existed than in any similar section in the entire United States.

"Fort Worth is as much a stocker market as a packer market, but these possibilities have not been developed," one official stated. The market newspaper advertised the stocker feeder idea with a box story on page one every day during September, 1923. Then Tom Wallace, head sheep buyer in Fort Worth for Armour and Company, suggested to C. C. French that feeder lambs be concentrated in Fort Worth each season for sale to northern buyers. Wallace proposed to build up a market at Fort Worth rather than allow buyers from the north to go to ranges in West Texas personally. Wallace believed that Texas constituted the greatest mohair and sheep growing section in the country and that Fort Worth could develop into one of the largest feeder lamb markets in the United States.  


Auction buyers came from many states to the Fort Worth Stock Yards' first annual stocker-feeder sale 18-19 October 1923. A year later market agencies planned for the second annual sale confident that the coming auction would outstrip the last and that "Fort Worth is destined to be the great stocker and feeder market of the world." They became overly optimistic as usual, but Fort Worth did remain the largest market in the Southwest during these years.

Terminal markets experienced larger cattle receipts in 1924 and 1925 because of a depression in the cattle trade following World War I. Producers had been accustomed to high prices during the war, but when they were not forthcoming, they kept their cattle from market for two or three years. When high prices failed to materialize, they had to sell their stock and could not afford to hold it any longer. Cattlemen held some animals back from market so long they were only good as canners. An agent of the United States Bureau of Animal Husbandry, Sterling Emens, said he never before saw as many aged steers on any market as he saw in Fort Worth during 1924 and 1925.


Producers may have been hurting, but the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company succeeded admirably. Whereas the business paid an 8 percent return usually, in 1925 the profits soared to 16 percent. The company paid $2 quarterly dividends most of the time throughout the decade. The boom year of 1925 brought periodic extra dividends, however. Stockholders meetings, always held in Chicago, became mere formalities in the 1920's with no one present but the secretary and president who held all the proxy shares of the absent owners and elected directors and voted dividends. That usually represented the only business conducted, and board meetings by the 1920's were held only once or twice a year.

The Fort Worth market faced a specific problem that hurt its receipts in mid-decade—unfavorable railroad rates. Livestock shippers, commission men, and others formed a Live Stock Traffic Association of Fort Worth in 1923 to protest these rates that drove cattle away from Fort Worth to other markets. The Association filed an application in 1925 to


95 Annual Stockholders Meeting, 23 January 1923, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Corporate Record, unnumbered vol. 1917-1934, p. 76. Also ibid., 16 January 1924, p. 84; 28 January 1925, p. 92; 11 January 1927, p. 113; 10 January 1928, p. 126; and 15 January 1929, p. 149.

96 Board of Directors Meeting, 23 December 1925, Corporate Record, p. 95.
the Texas Railroad Commission and finally got a favorable decision in April 1927. The court ordered freight rates reduced by 15 percent starting 1 June 1927. The traffic association had argued that lower rates on long hauls even by a few cents could determine which plant would do slaughtering from certain sections. Just the freight rate could close one market in favor of another and thereby destroy the inherent right of the shipper to select the nearest market where, under normal conditions, livestock could be disposed of to the best advantage.

Because of freight rates, often the packers found it more profitable to slaughter the great bulk of Texas livestock on the Missouri River and to the East rather than at Fort Worth. One of the packer representatives testified before the rate hearings that the northern plants operated near capacity, while the Fort Worth plants ran about 50 percent. Producers testified that the more favorable adjustment in the longer haul rates resulted in forcing heavier receipts into northern markets, followed by immediate decline in prices, which in turn depressed prices at the intermediate markets.97 These transportation charges quite often determined the outlets for Texas cattle, giving other

producing sections, with more favorable tariffs, a competitive advantage over Texas producers. 98

Labor problems apparently remained light during the 1920's decade except for the 1921 strike discussed in Chapter 7. The stockyards company provided a group insurance for its employees as of 4 September 1926. 99 General Manager A. G. Donovan contributed $250 in the name of the company to the Open Shop Association of Fort Worth. In thanking him for his contribution, the secretary of the association gave his agency credit for "the peaceful labor conditions which have existed here during the past several years." 100

98 L. V. Niles complained of this fact as early as 18 October 1921. L. V. Niles to W. C. Walker, 18 October 1921, Niles Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. See also Lewis, A Market Analysis of the Cattle Industry of Texas, p. 170.

99 A. G. Donovan to F. W. Ellis, 12 December 1925, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.; also A. G. Donovan to several employees, 4 September 1926, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

100 C. O. Vinnadge to A. G. Donovan, 16 May 1927, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. From 1916 to 1931 Al Donovan served as general manager. He came to Fort Worth in 1902 as manager of the Southwestern Mechanical Company, a company that repaired the rolling stock of the packers, built steel and oil tanks, and manufactured packing boxes. In 1916 he resigned to become manager of the stockyards. Before his Southwestern Mechanical position he served as manager of Armour Car Lines in Kansas City after starting with Armour and Company as a messenger. Prospectus, United Stockyards Corporation, 1 October 1936, Gary Havard Collection, p. 5. Also "Al G. Donovan Dies At Home," Clipping in W. L. Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
In the mid-1920's the Fort Worth market also believed itself fortunate in gaining radio coverage for its market reports. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics provided a livestock market news service which Fort Worth market analysts bragged represented one of the most complete news services in the country. Service began 1 October 1925 in cooperation with WBAP radio with market reports twice a day at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. The company provided a padded, well-equipped booth on the second floor of the livestock exchange building for the broadcasts.101

The decade of the 1920's ended before the actual implementation of the Packers and Stockyards Act, or before the binding provisions of the Packers' Consent Decree changed much in Fort Worth, mainly because the latter agreement remained tied up in court appeals during that time. Armour and Swift each retained one-third interest in the stockyards company as late as 1 May 1928, although Armour had shifted his stock by that date to a new company created for the purpose, General Stockyards.102 Swift still owned one-third of the local sewage disposal plant in 1929.103


102 A five-page list of stockholders as of 1 May 1928 in front of Stock Certificate Book 1 to 250, Havard Coll.

In 1931 when Armour and Company sought to sell its stockyards holdings in accordance with the Packers' Consent Decree, it by then owned 59 percent of the stock of the Jersey City Stockyards and 30 percent of General Stockyards Corporation which held stock in seven different stockyards (including Fort Worth.) Armour and Company sold to Stanmore Corporation, owned by Philip Armour, to Armforth Corporation owned by Lester Armour, and Valmay Corporation, owned by Mrs. May L. Valentine, mother of Philip and Lester. Justice Jennings Bailey of the District of Columbia Supreme Court on 15 July 1931 signed a court order that allowed the sale, claiming that "None of these parties hold any substantial voting interest in the Armour packing business." 104

A final ruling on the Packers' Consent Decree came in 1932. For twelve years, since 1920, the Decree had the effect of law, yet the Justice Department had not enforced its provisions. By 1932 the Packers contended that conditions had changed considerably since the signing of the Decree and that restrictions imposed had become inequitable. The government contended that no court of equity had the power to modify a consent decree over the objections of one of the parties to the Decree. 105 However, on 5 January 1931


the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia modified the Decree to let packers use their distributive machinery for handling foods in addition to meats, but did not relent on the issue of packers owning stockyards. The Court ordered them to divest themselves of their stockyards interests. A court order dated 16 June 1932 modified the Packers' Consent Decree and directed Swift and Armour to transfer their shares to a trustee with power and duty to dispose of their financial interests in stockyards. Legal delays forstalled Swift's compliance with the order at least regarding the Fort Worth Stock Yards for an additional four years.

In October 1933, Henry Veeder, vice president of Swift and Company, remained the assistant secretary of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. He refrained from signing a bank deposit form and asked the secretary to do it "to avoid raising any question with the bank," he said. J. Ogden Armour had resigned as a director of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company as of 11 April 1922.

106 A summary of forty years of litigation which cited this 1931 court order was included in United States v. Swift & Co. 189 F. Supp. 885 (1960). See also "Packers Consent Decree Modified," The Cattleman 17(February 1931):7, 9.

107 Prospectus, United Stockyards Corporation $4,500,000 Fifteen Year Collateral Trust 4\% Bonds, Series A, 1 October 1936, p. 3, Havard Coll.


Finally, in compliance with the court order, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company sold the Fort Worth Belt Railway on 1 May 1931 to the Missouri Pacific Railroad and the Texas and Pacific Railroad for $1,500,000. Part of the proceeds retired the funded debt of $1,000,000 first mortgage bonds. The company had planned to sell the railroad only to the Texas and Pacific, but the Missouri Pacific and others objected, fearing that the other lines would not obtain equal treatment; thus two major lines jointly purchased the Belt.

The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company sold the Belt Railway a tract of land later in the year, and Armour, Swift, and the stock yards company all received apportioned charges for hiring the land survey.

110 Prospectus, United Stockyards Corp., p. 17. Also Board of Directors Meeting, 11 March 1931, Corporate Record, 1917-1934 unnumbered vol. pp. 174-75. A letter from the vice president of the Texas and Pacific Railroad in 1932 to A. G. Donovan revealed how closely the stockyards and Belt railway had previously operated. The T & P officials informed Donovan that the Belt would no longer be paying 50 percent of the cost with the stockyards for dues to the Fort Worth Club, the East Texas Chamber of Commerce, the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, the hog campaign, the Telegraph News Service, the Purchasing Agent's Association, the North Fort Worth Kiwanis Club, the Fort Worth Community Chest, Traffic World, and seven other newspapers and journals as well as numerous other joint charges. J. A. Somerville to A. G. Donovan, 29 September 1932, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

111 "I.C.C. Hearing Here Friday on Sale of Belt Ry."

Another major holding of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, the Stockyards National Bank, merged with the Fort Worth National Bank as of 13 October 1934 as the company complied with the court order to divest itself of bank holdings. The Stockyards Bank had approximately four thousand depositors with $2,750,000 on record which both were transferred to the downtown Fort Worth bank. W. L. Pier, former president of the Stockyards National Bank, became a vice president of Fort Worth National, and the former cashier became an assistant cashier at the larger bank.113

The crackdown on the Big Five meat packers, two of whom owned the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and numerous other interests in Fort Worth, represented the major event of the decade of the 1920's for all the nation's major stockyards, including Fort Worth. Neither the federal regulatory legislation nor a Packers' Consent Decree ended the dominant position of the Big Five114 or accomplished what it set out


114The Big Five in 1923 became the Big Four because Morris sold out to Armour. Lewis Corey, Meat and Man, p. 89.
to do. The packers were unable to increase their power any further, however. 115

The value of government regulation does not always remain apparent, nor are its results necessarily seen clearly, but a feeling persisted among many that without it conditions would have been much worse. Others continued to oppose regulation. Within the industry the attitude developed that with the proper ingenuity of corporation lawyers one could legally avoid a portion of the government regulation. Such maneuvering in the ensuing years no doubt lowered profits, but probably not as severely as the regulation would have done. What regulation the stockyards endured certainly did lower profits and eventually contributed to the changed method of livestock marketing in the country. Following the 1920's, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company experienced a different relationship with its former mentors, Armour and Swift. The company existed before they arrived on the scene, and it continued to exist after they left, but the departure of a rich benefactor undeniably alters one's circumstances!

115 Lewis Corey, Meat and Man, p. 89.
CHAPTER IX

DEPRESSION DOLDRUMS

The decade of the 1930’s arrived in the stockyards district with an incident that oldtimers still recalled vividly fifty years later. About noon on 9 August 1930, a man carrying a satchel approached the desk of William L. Pier, president of the Stockyards National Bank. At that time the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company still owned the bank. The man demanded $10,000 in cash and informed Pier that he carried a bottle of nitroglycerin in his satchel. Fred L. Pelton, vice president and cashier of the bank, engaged the man in conversation while Pier went behind the cages to ask the tellers to count out the money. Then Pier called the police, urging them to wait for the man to leave the bank to apprehend him. When the police arrived, they assumed that the man would already have left the bank, and so walked right in. The bank robber, a deranged man named Nathan Monroe Martin, about thirty years of age, saw the police and then dropped the two ounces of nitroglycerin on the floor.

The explosion killed Martin and Pelton instantly, scattering their bodies, bank furniture, and fixtures as well as money and checks throughout the room. Only two other persons suffered injury. People heard and felt the blast a
half mile away, and some trees within one hundred yards of
the building lost leaves. The building, located just west
of the coliseum on the north side of Exchange Avenue, suf-
fered $3,000 damage. Contractors worked around the clock
over the weekend to replaster the building, replace window
panes, and to clean up the debris. The bank opened as usual
at 9 a.m. on Monday morning. Pelton, the vice president, had
been from Omaha, Nebraska, and his wife and child were visit-
ing there at the time he was killed. Al G. Donovan, general
manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and a director
of the bank, accompanied Pelton's body to Omaha and repre-
sented the bank at his funeral.¹

Events of the depression decade, which the attempted
robbery so dramatically introduced, encompassed erratic mar-
ket receipts, caused livestock prices to plummet, and brought
about federal programs designed to stabilize the market.
Less profits came to stockyard owners, for in addition to the
national business decline the use of trucks and the expansion
of feedlots nationwide began to break the power of the meat
trust. Also, packers completed their mandated task of
selling their stockyards, railroads, banks, and other

¹"2 Killed, Two Are Hurt As Stock Yards Bank Robbed," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 9 August 1930 (eve.), pp. 1-2; also "Bomber Identified, Motive Sought," ibid., 10 August 1930, pp. 1,6; "Bombèd Bank Open As Usual," ibid., 11 August 1930 (eve.), pp. 1,4; and "Bomber Anticipated Death, Note Reveals," Fort Worth Record Telegram, 11 August 1930, p. 1. W. L. Pier later became president of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, serving fifteen years in that position.
businesses. However, Armour and Swift created additional corporations—which they owned—to purchase their stockyards.

Locally, a business newspaper reported that Fort Worth employment enjoyed a 10 percent advantage over the state as a whole\(^2\) owing in part to the activities encouraged by the livestock market. Capacity of the yards by 1930 reached 37,000 cattle, 20,000 hogs, 20,000 sheep, and 5,000 horses and mules. Thirty-nine commission companies handled the stock.\(^3\) Despite the capability for large daily receipts, totals in 1930 included 637,515 cattle, 331,443 calves, 279,331 hogs, 432,082 sheep and 27,047 horses and mules for the entire year.\(^4\) Receipts actually fluctuated wildly. Later in the decade a drought created daily cattle runs of from 12,000 to 15,000 head.\(^5\)

Receipts of all classes of livestock except calves decreased in 1930. Of the ten major national markets, Fort Worth ranked fifth in calves, seventh in cattle, and tenth


\(^3\)Annual Report for 1930, 10 January 1931, pp. 4-5, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.

\(^4\)Ibid.

in both hogs and sheep that year. The stockyards tallied fewer receipts in cattle, calves and hogs in 1931 than the previous year, but a record 1,173,326 sheep arrived, making 1931 the first time sheep surpassed a million. While hogs, sheep, horses, and mules increased receipts in 1932, the 444,061 cattle marketed represented the smallest number of that species to arrive at Fort Worth since 1903. The year 1933 brought in an even smaller number of cattle, 416,975, although calves, hogs, horses, and mules increased, hogs particularly, from 255,202 in 1932 to 497,873 in 1933.

Naturally the business situation influenced conditions in the cattle industry, but internal factors affected the market as well. As numbers of cattle began to increase, slaughtering decreased, with most of the cut-back being in cows and heifers, not steers and calves. Thus, the nation's cattle herds contained a larger-than-usual proportion of breeding stock, particularly milch cows. The low prices paid...

---

6 "Live Stock Market Succumbs To Depression Affecting All Lives In Industry in 1930, Declines on Various Classes Averaging From $2.50 to $4 Per Hundred Wt.," Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 29 January 1931, p. 1. In fact, for the first time in its history Texas had more people than cattle—5,824,715 people to 5,567,175 cattle. "Texas Has More People Than Cattle," The Texas Pioneer 10(September-October 1931):17.


8 Annual Report for 1932, 12 January 1933, ibid.

9 Annual Report for 1933, 12 January 1934, ibid.
for cows, compared with those paid for steers during 1930 and 1931, and the relatively favorable position of the dairy industry during the period, represented the principal factors causing cattlemen to hold back cows nationally, beginning in 1932.¹⁰

A United States Department of Agriculture official, W. L. Endsley, explained that the decline in receipts on the Fort Worth market from 1927 to 1930 came because people had a tendency to eat less meat because of the depression. Also, he said, the buyers often obtained stocker and feeder cattle directly from the range.¹¹

The feeder and breeder movement, a phenomenon which later grew to massive proportions and altered the entire livestock marketing process nationwide, had its official Texas beginning as an organization at the State Fair in 1929. The purpose of the movement was to put livestock on the farms of the black belt area in Texas where the one-crop system rapidly depleted the soil. The planting of feed crops and the marketing of such crops through livestock finished on the farm would restore the fertility of the soil


and establish another permanent crop in addition to cotton. The movement spread to every section of the state where farmers raised feed. As a result, the number of livestock fed in Texas during 1930 exceeded considerably that of any previous year. A. L. Smith, livestock specialist in the extension service of the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, reported in January 1932 that Texas possessed nearly twice as many cattle feeders as the previous year and about 50 percent more cattle on feed. Farmers seemed to be turning to feeding livestock as a way to dispose of surplus grain.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instituted during the Hoover Administration, established in the fall of 1932 a Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation with headquarters in Fort Worth and branch offices in San Angelo and Houston. Stockyards officials hoped that some of the funds could be used to feed livestock and thus encourage people to purchase animals as a means of marketing their crop. Local market people hoped that the demand for feeder cattle and sheep would increase.

The depression affected the local market more than in decreased cattle receipts and falling prices. Certain

12 "Texas Fast Becoming a Feeder State," The Cattleman 18 (October 1931): 5.
14 "Fort Worth Gets Credit Corporation," The Cattleman 19 (September 1932): 8.
economies had to be instituted. Effective 1 February 1932 the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company discontinued their regular monthly contribution to the market newspaper they once owned and still had subsidized, the Weekly Live Stock Reporter. They did plan to keep advertising occasionally, the general manager assured the editor.\textsuperscript{15} For several years the company had contributed $500 per year for its support. Business and advertising receipts slowed down considerably for the newspaper, so much so that they gave free full page ads to the company in 1933 simply "to fill up space."\textsuperscript{16} As another cost-cutting measure, the directors of the company authorized the president to reduce the payroll expenses by 10 percent.\textsuperscript{17}

The market news service of the United States Department of Agriculture also felt the crunch of the reduced business. As of 1 July 1933, the government eliminated reports from the Fort Worth market and only retained offices in other markets because of drastic protests by producers.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15}A. G. Donovan to Mr. McCain, 21 January 1932, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{16}A. G. Donovan to W. K. Wright, 22 June 1933, FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{17}Board of Directors Meeting, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, 21 April 1933, Corporate Record, 1917-1934 unnumbered vol., p. 282.

\textsuperscript{18}The service was kept with reduced staffs in Boston, New York, Chicago, Kansas City, Omaha, St. Louis, Sioux City, St. Paul, Des Moines, Denver, San Francisco, Casper, and Ogden. "Market News Service on Reduced Basis," The Cattleman 20 (August 1933):5-6.
continued its own livestock market broadcast twice daily over KTAT radio and the Livestock Marketing Association over WBAP twice daily.\textsuperscript{19} The federal government restored its market news service in Fort Worth as of 1 October 1933 with Sterling Emens in charge.\textsuperscript{20}

The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company maintained an intense advertising campaign during the depression years to try to encourage increased receipts. Full page advertisements appeared in \textit{The Cattleman} magazine and in annual rodeo programs, arguing the case for shipping to Fort Worth—its closeness, steady demand, accessibility by rail, and the real home town service provided.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, the stockyards company and Armour and Swift each contributed $500 to the West Texas Chamber of Commerce because it promoted the Fort Worth market in its member communities.\textsuperscript{22}

Arising out of the problems common to stockyards nationwide came the creation in 1933 of the American Stock Yards Association. Formed as a national trade association,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{19}Ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{20}"Market News Service Enlarged," \textit{The Cattleman} 20(September 1933):9.
  \item \textsuperscript{21}Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement, \textit{The Cattleman} 19(June 1932):inside front cover.
  \item \textsuperscript{22}H. O. Hogue (Armour) to West Texas Chamber of Commerce, 25 August 1930; S. A. Middaugh (Swift) to West Texas Chamber of Commerce, 7 August 1930; A. G. Donovan (Stock Yards) to West Texas Chamber of Commerce, 5 September 1930, Donations Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
\end{itemize}
the organization included as directors representatives of the stockyards companies at the leading markets of the country. The Fort Worth Stock Yards joined the association, but none of its officials served as executive officers during the organization phase.23

Cattlemen's organizations also worked together for solutions. Dolph Briscoe, president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association in 1933, suggested that an orderly market program be instituted.24

Of course, federal reaction to the pressing depression problems of agriculture came mainly with Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal measures, most notably the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Affecting the local yards more than anything else were the hog reduction program and the drought-inspired cattle purchase plan.

For years the Fort Worth market consistently had maintained higher hog prices than Chicago and Kansas City because local packers never obtained enough receipts. Packers thus tried to encourage more animals to be marketed locally, which would be cheaper for them to do than shipping the hogs in from other markets for slaughter in their plants. This they consistently had to do. The Fort Worth Stock


Yards Company through the years had tried to encourage more hog production in the state, even instituting the "pig clubs" through the efforts of their public relations representative Charles C. French. The company launched "another campaign to import gilts from the North" during the summer of 1930 to encourage more hog production, but reported that their efforts had met with little success owing to "lack of feed, the present low market price for hogs, and farmers' inability to finance the purchase of the gilts."25 Once the hog-reduction program of the federal government got underway, the company discontinued its efforts to increase the production of hogs in the state.26 The company never really pushed hog production to any great extent again.

As administrator of its AAA program as it applied to packinghouse products, United States Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace appointed Guy C. Shepard of Evanston, Illinois, former vice-president of Cudahy Packing Company who had retired in 1931 after forty years in the meat packing industry. Thus an expert in pork merchandising would head up the government's hog-reduction program.27

At first, Texans approached the government program with some trepidation. They basically preferred a self-help and

26Annual Report for 1934, no date, FWSY Co. Coll.
27"Packer Administrator," The Cattleman 20 (July 1933) :27.
rugged individualism philosophy, although a few Populists existed who felt the federal government had a responsibility to help. During the Hoover Administration most elected leaders such as Senator Morris Sheppard and Governor Ross Sterling made pronouncements that seemed to oppose federal aid. Unfortunately, local and state sources did not provide relief during this period either. By the time many Texans got over their aversion to federal assistance which Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal provided, the situation had reached serious proportions. Although many grumbled that the New Deal would destroy initiative, states rights, and the American way, they abandoned their philosophy "temporarily" and accepted the assistance.

When finally worked out, the emergency program for reduction of the nation's hog surplus meant that AAA planned to buy four million pigs and one million sows within six weeks beginning 23 August 1933. The program, recommended to the government at a meeting in Washington on 10 August by representatives of producers, processors, marketing agencies, and wholesale and retail meat dealers, began at Fort Worth

---


29 Ibid., 111.

on 28 August. Secretary Wallace reported that the program would cost $55 million, which would be paid by a processing tax on hogs and pork imposed on all packers. Only federally inspected packers purchased livestock in the government program, and they bought in the regular way through commission firms. The government then reimbursed the packers for their costs. The Agriculture Department withheld the meat from entering regular market channels in order to prevent it from affecting prices of meats. Prices of pigs varied by weight from $8.90 per one hundred pounds to $5.40.

During the emergency six-week campaign ending 7 October 1933 the government purchased a total of nearly 6.5 million pigs and sows. The plan cost $33 million, $30.5 million of this for the animals, and $2.5 for processing. The campaign, however, appeared to have little if any effect on hog prices during the last half of 1933. The government made a second purchase of two million hogs between November 1933 and September 1934, and the program even continued into 1935 with those farmers willing to sign contracts to sell to the government.

31 Ibid.
34 Ibid., pp. 70-71.
At the Fort Worth yards, farmers marketed approximately eighty-four thousand pigs during the government hog reduction program which made 1933 receipts somewhat larger than usual.\textsuperscript{35} New canning plants opened on the North Side to take care of government-purchased meats, providing some jobs to destitute individuals. A Texas Relief Commission canning plant opened 18 December 1933 at 2204 North Main for a trial run. Workers canned five thousand cans on the first day. The capacity output for the 572 workers could reach between fifteen thousand and twenty thousand cans daily, depending upon receipts.\textsuperscript{36} The plant worked four shifts of six hours each, with each shift employing about one hundred women and twenty-five men. According to state requirements, the employees had to come from the city's relief rolls, and were paid forty cents an hour.\textsuperscript{37}

Cattle raisers continued to complain of increased supplies and dropping prices, but many, like Dolph Briscoe of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, did not feel that government legislation to fix prices would work. The American National Cattlemen's Association opposed including cattle as a basic commodity under the AAA subject

\textsuperscript{35}Annual Report for 1934, FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{36}"Canning Plant In Full Blast," Commercial Recorder, 20 December 1933, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{37}"Beef Plant Will Use 525 Employees At 40¢ an Hour," Commercial Recorder, 12 December 1933, p. 1.
to its provisions and controls. As an alternative, the Association advocated legislation to restrict importation of beef and competing fats and oils, to raise the tariff on hides, to lower the costs of transportation and marketing, and to foster more orderly marketing. Congress deferred to them and did not include cattle in the AAA program. In 1934, however, drought conditions and government efforts to develop a production control program coincided. The worsening economic conditions and the AAA programs for other producers caused cattlemen to change their minds. At their annual meeting in 1934 the American National Cattlemen's Association recommended that cattle be made a basic commodity. As a result, Congress passed the Jones-Connally Farm Relief Act which amended the AAA to add cattle.

The first announcement of a proposal to purchase cattle to aid the drought-stricken areas of the Great Plains came on 14 and 15 May 1934. The government authorized $50 million for drought relief and $200 million more to finance production

---


39 Ibid. The resolution was very controversial, however. See also Roger Lambert, "Drought Relief for Cattlemen: The Emergency Purchase Program of 1934-35," Panhandle-Plains Historical Review 45 (1972): 21 and John T. Schlebecker, Cattle Raising on the Plains 1900-1961 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), p. 139. The law was H.R. 7478 or Public Law 142. Chap. 103, Vol. 48 U.S. Statutes at Large, p. 528.
control and surplus reduction and "to support and balance the market." The government purchased the first cattle under the program 12 June 1934. An Emergency Appropriation Act approved 19 June 1934 provided funds.

Purposes of the Emergency Cattle Purchase Program included removing surplus cattle from the drought stricken ranges, stabilizing the beef market by removing the surplus, and providing more wholesome food for the needy. In addition, removing poorer cattle from the farmers' herds would improve their foundation herds for future production. The Federal


41 This was H.R. 9830, Public Law No. 412, Chap. 648, Vol. 48 U.S. Statutes at Large, p. 1021. These purchases were made by government agents in the field and not in stockyards. Edwin G. Nourse, Joseph S. Davis and John D. Black, Three Years of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1937), p. 106.

42 Irvin May, Jr., "Welfare and Ranchers: The Emergency Cattle Purchase Program and Emergency Work Relief Program in Texas, 1934-1935," The West Texas Historical Association Yearbook 47(1971):15. See also "Government Provides Drought Relief," The Cattleman 21(July 1934):5. Some controversy exists in the 1980's as to whether these cattle slaughtered by the government in 1934 consisted only of poorer cattle or if better grades also were killed. Chief of the U.S.D.A. Agricultural History Branch Wayne D. Rasmussen is under the impression "that most of the cattle sold were in bad shape," Wayne D. Rasmussen to author, 26 January 1982. However, Mr. Rasmussen admitted that he judged by what he read and his own observations on a Montana cattle ranch in the 1930's. From a discussion with a Texas farmer of the 1930's this writer learned that at least some good, fat cattle were slaughtered, so apparently state practices varied in the enforcement of the law. Interview with Vernon Rogers, Fort Worth, Texas, 31 January 1982.
Surplus Relief Corporation became the buyer and the Texas Relief Commission handled the canning and distributing. They gave six cans of beef consisting of one and one-fourth pounds of meat per can to a family of five each month.\textsuperscript{43} Relief officials intended that the canning plants (nineteen throughout the state, including Fort Worth) exist primarily to provide work for the unemployed. Consequently, inexperienced workers made plant operations costly, and a poor quality of meat resulted. Bone and hide frequently turned up in the canned beef.\textsuperscript{44}

Locally, Dr. H. L. Darby of the Fort Worth office of the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, became the inspector in charge. During the emergency campaign, the government bought cattle in 233 of 254 Texas counties, including Tarrant where the Fort Worth Stock Yards were located. Government officials purchased 8,154 cattle in Tarrant County and condemned 5,041 more. Statewide, they accepted 1,292,339 cattle and condemned 677,048.\textsuperscript{45}

Stories are told that strong men wept as they watched the condemned cattle being shot under the program, while

\textsuperscript{43}May, "Welfare and Ranchers," 14.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., 13-14.
\textsuperscript{45}"Government Buying and a Cattle Shortage," The Cattleman 21(March 1935):14. Many Texas farmers refused to cooperate in the program and ridiculed their neighbors who did. Interview with Berta Rogers, Fort Worth, Texas, 1 July 1979.
other outraged ranchmen refused to sell to Uncle Sam. The Swenson Brothers at Stamford would not allow their cattle to be killed. They rounded up their surplus animals and shipped them to market, presumably Fort Worth, selling them at $6 per head, half the price paid by the government. Other cattlemen, however, reacted with gratitude to Uncle Sam claiming that the program saved the industry. Of these was W. T. Coble, who became president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association in 1934 and served until the end of the depression. He said, "This program accomplished the saving of a large food supply which was necessary for the needy, furnished a market for cattle which could not have been found otherwise, and resulted in the removal of the surplus."47

Cattle indeed sold on the Fort Worth market at prices much lower than the government paid for scrub cattle. Market reporter Ted Gouldy remembered when a load of cattle brought only enough to pay for train freight, yardage fees, and the commission, with not even enough to pay for the hay they ate, much less any left over for the owners.48

47 Ibid., p. 177.
48 Edith Wharton Taylor, Money on the Hoof—Sometimes (Fort Collins, Colo.: Old Army Press, 1974), p. 75. In contrast to this, Commission agent Tom B. Saunders, II said he made more money on cattle in the depression than he did
By June 1934 the drought relief service, which originally had intended to purchase forty thousand cattle a week, was buying over five times that amount. By the week ending 11 August the agency bought 588,000 head and remained at or above that level of purchases through the second week of September. They sent some cattle to relief agencies, some to commercial canners, others to pasturage, and killed and buried the rest. In the latter instance, they let farmers salvage the hides. 49 By September 1934 the Administration began to worry about when and where the cattle purchase would end and tried to put a stop to the program. The public kept demanding large scale purchases, so the government continued the program through January 1935. 50 During an eight-month period, from June 1934 to January 1935, the government bought almost 8.3 million cattle and provided to cattlemen and their creditors some $111 million. Most cattlemen seemed grateful, but they still refused to join a plan to control pork, grain, and beef output in the future and opposed the levy of any processing tax to recover

in the 1940's or 1960's because he made fifteen cents per head on a cow that sold for $20 in 1933, while in 1969 he made forty cents on a cow selling for $140. Interest rates were 3.5 percent in 1933, but they reached 8.5 percent in 1969. It cost him more money to handle the cattle at the later date. Tape of conversation with Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Tom Saunders, II, and Ted Gouldy, Tape 2, side 1.

49 Roger Lambert, "Drought Relief for Cattlemen," 27.
50 Ibid., 30.
part of the cost of their aid.\textsuperscript{51} By mid-decade rising cattle prices brightened the economic scene for Texas cattle producers, and thus most refused any more government assistance.

Of this 8.3 million purchased, the government bought nearly 25 percent in Texas and over 20 percent in the Dakotas. They condemned an overall percentage of 18 percent nationwide, but in Texas the proportion rejected reached 34 percent.\textsuperscript{52} The program reduced the number of beef cattle by 17 percent, which not only improved the market, but brought a better balance between feed and cattle.\textsuperscript{53}

Had not drought relief taken center stage, the government might have worked out some feasible plan of benefit payments funded by a processing tax, but they abandoned any such plans in the emergency purchase program. All cattlemen wanted was temporary emergency aid, and so the government followed that plan. By 1935 herds began to improve.\textsuperscript{54}

While some farmers in the mid-West thought that the drought was God's way of punishing Roosevelt for plowing under cotton and killing millions of little pigs in 1933, many more found the drought a convenient way to justify the

\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., 35.

\textsuperscript{52}FitzGerald, \textit{Livestock Under the AAA}, pp. 207-08.

\textsuperscript{53}Schlebecker, \textit{Cattle Raising on the Plains}, p. 142.

government's increasing involvement in the agricultural economy. Some who opposed, however, filed a case in a United States district court in Philadelphia in 1935, attacking the constitutionality of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Six pork packing concerns challenged the section establishing a "processing tax" on hogs and pork products. Federal Judge William K. Kirkpatrick issued temporary restraining orders enjoining the Internal Revenue Department from carrying out threats to place liens against the properties of the six companies unless they paid a total of $891,168, the balance due in taxes since the law went into effect. The six companies already had paid an aggregate of $3,228,129, and they claimed they faced ruin through the taxes, as they could not absorb the assessment because of a drop in the pork business. They called the law "an invalid means to accomplish an illegal end." The Supreme Court in a different case eventually declared the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional.

The adopted child of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, continued

---


57The case which resulted in the Court's ruling the AAA unconstitutional was United States v. Butler et al 297 U.S. 1 (1936). The processing tax was declared regulatory in nature.
annual shows in the coliseum and exhibit buildings throughout the depression decade despite financial setbacks. Prior to the 1930 show, officials spent $250,000 on two new exhibit halls and other improvements, doubling the amount of room previously available.\textsuperscript{58} In 1931 all classes of livestock totaled forty-five hundred head, the largest number ever entered at a Fort Worth show.\textsuperscript{59} The next year officials broadcast a performance of the rodeo over WBAP in its entirety, the first such action ever to occur anywhere in the country.\textsuperscript{60} The show that year, however, showed a $20,000 deficit, and exposition officials still owed outstanding debts at three local banks of $55,000 from the previous construction.

The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company accepted a note for $5,000 at 6 percent interest covering the rent due to the company for the coliseum and grounds.\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{59}"Fort Worth Fat Stock Show," The Cattleman 17(April 1931): 8.

\textsuperscript{60}Tom B. Saunders, "How the Word Rodeo Originated As Applied to Western Events," The Quarter Horse Journal 20 (June 1968): 50.

\textsuperscript{61}A. G. Donovan to William B. Traynor, 24 March 1932. Also Board of Directors Meeting, 21 April 1933, Corporate Record, 1917-1934 unnumbered vol., p. 282.
Show entries in beef cattle, sheep and goats, and hogs declined in 1933, but entries set new records in several smaller departments such as Hereford, Shorthorn, Angus, club calves, Jersey, Holstein, dairy club calves, and horses. That year officials offered one thousand seats to rodeo performances at what they called "Depression Prices," the lowest in history.\textsuperscript{62} That year the city manager of Fort Worth, G. D. Fairtrace, suggested that the stock show of Fort Worth and the state fair of Dallas consolidate and hold these events at Arlington Downs, the stock show in the spring and the fair in the fall. No one took him very seriously, although space for the show began getting scarce on the North Side.\textsuperscript{63} By the close of the 1933 show and its $16,000 deficit, the officials then owed the stockyards company $10,000 for two years rent, plus $5,000 for the Livestock Reporter building which the stock show purchased in 1932 and tore down to make room at the entrance to the midway.\textsuperscript{64}

Rent on the coliseum had been scheduled to increase from $5,000 to $7,500 as of 1934 according to an earlier


\textsuperscript{63}"Combine Stock Show and Fair," The Cattleman 20 (July 1933):5.

\textsuperscript{64}A. G. Donovan to W. K. Wright, 10 April 1933, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
agreement, but the company maintained the rent at $5,000 through 1938 to help the show. Then the rental rate jumped to $8,000. By 1935 and for several years promoters held the World Championship Rodeo in Fort Worth in March as a part of the regular rodeo, allowing cowboys to be named to world titles.

Texas also began planning its official centennial celebration and the legislature appropriated $3 million in funds to be used by communities for centennial activities. A delegation of Fort Worth citizens traveled to Austin in July 1935 to try to obtain some of this money for a "gigantic new plant" to house the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show west of the city on Camp Bowie Boulevard at a cost of $1,500,000. They wanted $300,000 from the centennial funds. City officials held a bond election in the fall of 1935 to approve funding for playgrounds, parks, and to build a coliseum and auditorium for the show at the west side site as their centennial project. North Side residents opposed the issue.

---

65 A. G. Donovan to Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, 14 April 1934, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also A. G. Donovan to John B. Davis, 1 May 1934, ibid., and A. G. Donovan to John B. Davis, 10 June 1935, and A. G. Donovan to C. F. Topping, 19 October 1940, ibid.


because they did not want to lose the show in their area.

Twelve of these residents obtained an injunction to stop the sale of $687,500 of bonds, but the Texas Supreme Court finally ruled that the bonds to build the show facilities could be sold. The plans to build the facilities, eventually named to honor the nation's beloved humorist Will Rogers, had to be submitted to the Public Works Administration for approval. Their proposal called it a centennial stock show auditorium, memorial tower, and coliseum at an estimated cost of $880,000 and six other exhibit buildings at $446,000.

The stock show did not move to the new buildings as soon as they were completed, but the stockyards company made plans to sell their coliseum to the City of Fort Worth in 1936. Manager Donovan explained to the Chicago owners,

While there was a substantial difference in the sale price and the values carried on our books, we considered it advisable and to our advantage to accept the city's offer for our site, in order to retain and assure the permanency of the livestock show at the stockyards; the removal to some other location would have left the majority of these improvements unused, naturally resulting in rapid deterioration, whereas through the above sale of our properties, the city will not only maintain the old improvements but have


since invested approximately $200,000 in a substantial and commodious building. 70

Although the coliseum cost $155,305 to build in 1908, the stockyards company declared the book value to be $232,128 less $60,257 depreciation when the city purchased the facility for only $100,000. The company also sold some show sheds, paving on the show grounds, the show office, and other improvements, and simply took a book loss for all in excess of $100,000. Company officials seemed satisfied, for they reduced their taxable property by the total amount of $341,443. 71

In September 1936 the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company lent the stock show $6,666.67 to help it raise enough money to hold a centennial celebration 3-11 October. Show officials needed until 1939 to repay the loan. 72 This "Frontier Fiesta" held at the new buildings on Camp Bowie Boulevard featured a rodeo, a Wild West show, a saloon, a musical theatre (Casa Manana), a circus, and beauty contests. Sally Rand and her "Nude Ranch Review" made an appearance too. 73

---

72 Agreement from Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, 14 September 1936 signed by VanZandt Jarvis and A. G. Donovan, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also J. B. Davis to Stockyards Co., 29 March 1939, ibid.
The Fiesta proved such a success that city officials repeated it in 1937.

More than three hundred thousand persons attended the forty-first annual fat stock show in 1937 held in the usual stockyards area, and broke all attendance records. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt visited the 12 March 1939 stock show as a guest of her son, Elliott, who lived in Fort Worth.

Another City of Fort Worth-stockyards related project completed during the 1930's involved the new Tarrant County Water Control District No. 1, first of its kind in the state, created under the major influence of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company engineer Kennerly Robey. Many considered the two lakes created by the two dams on the West Fork of the Trinity River when completed by 1935 as among the ten largest artificial lakes in the country. Many local Fort Worth officials even discussed a possible canalization of the Trinity from the Gulf of Fort Worth and knew that the two lakes would make this possible because they would provide enough water to operate canal locks.

---


76 T. C. Richardson, "Fort Worth Where the West Begins," Holland's 54 (February 1935): 29.

While these much needed improvements helped the stockyards locally, a national problem still needed to be resolved. Armour and Swift faced court orders to divest themselves of direct ownership of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. In fact, as early as 29 December 1927, Armour officials requested the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company to transfer 9,230 shares of stock from J. Ogden Armour, Trustee to F. W. Ellis.  
Ellis then on 18 January 1928 transferred the stock to a new corporation set up for that purpose called General Stockyards Corporation. By 30 November 1931 people still were signing dividends of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock over to General Stockyards Corporation, for it was buying shares of those who wished to sell.

---

78 Certificates of Capital Stock, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Gary Havard Personal Collection, Fort Worth, Texas.

79 Paul M. Johnson to Julian E. Simon, 12 May 1958, United Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also A. G. Donovan to F. W. Ellis, 10 January 1931 in Annual Report for 1930, ibid. Ellis was president of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company at this time.

80 Certificates of Capital Stock, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Book 2 (1931). Lester Armour still seemed awfully interested in the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company as of August 1936, even if General Stockyards Corporation had owned it since 1928, for Armour suggested that the company put the $371,000 of cash they had into government obligations "rather than have it simply lie idle in the bank and earn nothing." Lester Armour to A. G. Donovan, 13 August 1936, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Lester Armour and his brother Philip D. Armour both were directors of the FWSY Co. in 1936. Stockholders Meeting, 21 January 1936, Corporate Record, Vol. 5, pages not numbered. Laurance Armour in 1939 made a request that the FWSY Co. deposit money in his Chicago bank and directors unanimously approved the request at their next board meeting.
Swift's new corporation, which they created to buy all the stockyards stock owned by Swift and Company, United Stockyards, originated under the laws of Delaware 15 May 1936. A federal district court in Washington on 13 August 1936 approved the sale of six stockyards owned at least partially by Swift to United Stockyards of Chicago. United Stockyards "was formed for the primary purpose of acquiring and thereafter holding the issued capital stocks and other securities of various corporations operating public stockyards at various points in the United States." The new corporation spent $8,873,340 to acquire shares in at least eight companies. Of the 110,000 shares outstanding of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock United bought 46,692 shares or 42.447 percent at $32 per share for $1,494,144.

and deposited $50,000. By 11 September 1939 the company had deposited $100,000. Laurance Armour, 3 May 1939 to A. G. Donovan, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Also A. G. Donovan to Laurance Armour, 28 April 1939 and 11 September 1939, ibid.


83Copy of an agreement between United Stockyards Corporation and Wesley K. Wright, 29 September 1936, Harvard Collection.

84Prospectus, United Stockyards Corporation, 1 October 1936, pp. 2, 15, Harvard Coll. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock as of 25 January 1936 broke down as follows: Swift interests, 38,640 shares or 35.13 percent; personal Swift holdings, 1,212 for a total of 39,852 or 36.23 percent of the total. General Stockyards Corporation held 39,136 or
W. K. Wright, a former official of Swift and Company, became president of United Stockyards by October 1936. As of 2 November 1936, United became the holder of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Stock. During the nearly thirty-four years that Swift owned one-third of the company, from January 1902 through 1 November 1936, total dividends paid by the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company on its capital stock to Swift amounted to $2,332,275. In a comparable time Armour and Company earned $2,357,025.

As further indication that the new corporation had replaced Swift's holdings, A. G. Donovan, president and general manager of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, received a message from Swift to discontinue remitting $500 per month to Swift and Company for legal service expense, as of 4 November 1936, but to send future financial statements and reports to W. K. Wright of United Stockyards. The

35.62 percent. Niles interests held 11,118 or 10.11 percent. Holders of four hundred shares or more, had 11,048 or 10.04 percent. Some 135 other shareholders held 1,812 or 8 percent. A. G. Donovan to W. K. Wright, 12 February 1935 with attachment. Stocks Dividends Transfers, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

Wright entered the employ of Swift and Company in 1917 as an assistant to Louis F. Swift. From 1922 to 1936 he headed stockyards operations for Swift and Company. Prospects, United Stockyards Corporation, p. 4.


Ibid.

stockyards company had been paying these monthly management charges to Swift for at least five years.\(^8\)

Soon after the transfer of the Fort Worth stock owned by Swift to United, the latter corporation began buying up stock in small amounts.\(^9\) Then on 25 May 1937 United Stockyards Corporation bought 39,178 shares of Fort Worth Stock Yards stock from General Stockyards Corporation, the previous Armour shares.\(^9\)

Not only did Armour and Swift create new companies to own their stockyards, members of the Louville V. Niles family decided to transfer their shares to another organization, too, even before the meat packers did. As early as 1928 the Hundreds Circle Trust had begun acquiring Niles's former shares, with the Niles heirs serving as trustees.\(^9\) Then in 1936 the Niles family sold seven thousand shares of Fort Worth Stock Yards Company stock to United Stockyards, but retained two thousand shares. They indicated that they did

---

\(^8\)Paul M. Johnson to Julian E. Simon.

\(^9\)Certificates of Capital Stock, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Book 7 (1936-37), Havard Collection.


\(^9\)Certificates of Capital Stock, Books 2, 12, Havard Coll.
not wish to terminate completely their association with the company, although United apparently wanted to buy all their stock.⁹³

To separate fully from the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, the two Big Four meat packers had a few more tasks to complete. Armour and Company and the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company jointly owned a ranch in Reagan County of some 1280 acres which they sold in late 1938.⁹⁴

Unlike many businesses that declared bankruptcy during the depression, the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company paid dividends during the entire decade, although sometimes small ones. Generally they paid $2 quarterly dividends until 1931 when they increased their shares from 27,500 par value to 111,000 shares without par value at a special stockholders meeting 8 June.⁹⁵ After that they paid $1.50 on the par value shares and thirty-seven and one-half cents per share on non-par value shares throughout most of the decade with even a few extra dividends occasionally.⁹⁶

---


⁹⁵Special Stockholders Meeting, 8 June 1931, Corporate Record, unnumbered vol. 1917-1934, pp. 176-77.

⁹⁶Board of Directors meetings, 1930-1939, Corporate Record.
The new labor union that emerged from the depression years, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, signed up the stockyards handlers union and by a vote of more than three to one gained recognition 20 September 1938 as the sole bargaining agency for its class of employees at the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company. This action constituted the first major election in which the CIO figured in the Southwest cattle industry, according to Joseph Barrett of Chicago, regional director of the packinghouse workers organizing committee. Company officials believed that they could work harmoniously with the Union. The stockyards still paid less than the local packers.

Cattle prices during the latter half of the decade began to pick up on the Fort Worth market. The company continued to give twenty-four hour round-the-clock service in receiving the livestock, retaining an average of 184 employees to do so. The company estimated that the value of cattle, calves,

---


99 These figures rose to 198 in 1936, 212 in 1937, 214 in 1938, 209 in 1939 and 201 in 1940. Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Statement of Average Number of Employees, 1 January 1935 to 31 December 1940, Fort Worth Livestock Handling Company Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
sheep, and hogs in 1935 equalled $50 million, an increase of some $10 million over the previous year.\textsuperscript{100} On a typical day cattle came from Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and at least 42 percent of the 254 Texas counties.

By 1936 Texas had become the largest producing state for both cattle and sheep.\textsuperscript{101} For one week in the spring of 1937 Fort Worth received more sheep and lambs than any other principal market in the United States.\textsuperscript{102} In fact, in May, 1937 for the first time in history, total receipts in Fort Worth were the largest in the nation, exceeding even Chicago and Kansas City.\textsuperscript{103} The year 1937 proved to be the largest since 1917, for over three million head were received, with more than 70 percent arriving by truck.\textsuperscript{104}

By 24 March 1938 forty-two commission companies operated on the Fort Worth market\textsuperscript{105} and prices during the last half of the year climbed higher than those during the first

\begin{footnotes}
\item[100]{"The Big Corral," Fort Worth Stock Yards Company Advertisement, The Cattleman 22(\text{January 1936}):inside front cover.}
\item[101]{Prospectus, United Stockyards Corporation, p. 17.}
\item[102]{"Livestock Receipts Soar," Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce News 11(\text{June 1937}):4.}
\item[103]{"Fort Worth's Livestock Receipts For 1937 Largest in History," Commercial Recorder, 18 July 1939, p. 7.}
\item[104]{Ibid.}
\item[105]{Typed list in Commission Firms and Dealers Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.}
\end{footnotes}
six months.¹⁰⁶ Cattle passing through the Fort Worth Stock Yards were shipped to thirty-eight states that year and producers selling to the local market earned over $90 million for their animals.¹⁰⁷ In November, however, the company decided to close the Saturday market in order to comply with the wage-hour act. Trade on Saturday had remained small anyway.

Optimism began to return to Fort Worth by the close of the decade. Publicity about the city called the 253-acre yards the third largest in the nation and cited the two packing plants as second only in size to the home plants in Chicago.¹⁰⁸ Rising livestock prices helped create this enthusiasm.

William L. Pier, former president of the Stockyards National Bank, and in 1939 a vice president of the Fort Worth National Bank, served as chairman of the Agriculture and Livestock Committee of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce from 1936 to 1939. While in that position he organized a


¹⁰⁷Ed C. Walsh, "The Livestock Hotel" (Fort Worth: Fort Worth Stock Yards Co., 1941) no page numbers. In T. B. Saunders Collection, Texas Christian University Special Collections.

committee of ten farmers representing ten counties surrounding Tarrant as an advisory group to the Chamber's Agriculture and Livestock Department. This committee naturally helped business at the stockyards, where Pier's loyalties still resided. On 6 February 1939 Pier became president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. In addressing the group a month later to talk about the future of Fort Worth, he abounded in the optimism that many persons at the local market shared. He told his receptive audience that Fort Worth was "the best city in the best state in the best country in the world." As the city and the livestock market began to emerge from the throes of the depression to embark on a decade that would bring its largest receipts ever, such optimism seemed justified.

109 "Agriculture and Livestock," This Month in Fort Worth 12 (July 1938): 10. Pier, originally from South Dakota, was employed by the Stockyards National Bank in Omaha, Nebraska before he came to the Stockyards National Bank in Fort Worth as vice president in 1928. W. L. Pier to John P. McQuillen, 6 July 1956, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

110 "President Pier Addresses Membership Forum," This Month in Fort Worth 13 (March 1939): 1.
CHAPTER X

WARTIME CHANGES

Bawling steers in the background provided just the proper sound effects for the new radio program that started in July 1940 in the broadcast room of the Livestock Exchange Building. Ted Gouldy, market reporter for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, who was just beginning his Monday-Friday program for the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company and the approximately forty commission firms on the local market, did not have to provide any taped sounds; the pervading animal noises were real. The Fort Worth Stock Yards began the programs to provide reliable market information, but also to build up their local market which faced a new threat from small town country auctions.\(^1\) New beginnings seemed common in Fort Worth in 1940. As of 25 January the government mailed the first Social Security checks to the nation's elderly; in May Fort Worth women found nylon hosiery on sale in local stores for the first time; and in September movie

\(^1\)Board of Directors Meeting, 24 July 1940, Corporate Record, Fort Worth Stock Yards Company, Vol. 5, pages not numbered. See also "Special Program on Live Stock To Be Put on 'Air,'" Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 18 July 1940, p. 1; and "Sound Effects," This Month in Fort Worth 14(August 1940):5. The program, at 12:45 p.m. on KGKO radio in Fort Worth, lasted fifteen minutes five days a week. The company and the commission firms divided the costs fifty-fifty.
buffs witnessed in Fort Worth the world premier of a movie starring Gary Cooper called "The Westerner."  

The new decade presented new beginnings for many persons in the livestock industry, too. Not only was the depression ending and prices rising, one felt more inclined to begin new projects, such as the radio broadcast. The Fort Worth Stock Yards Company even gradually began to change the spelling of its name, making "Stockyards" one word instead of two. The company also began a program of inviting 4-H and Future Farmers of America boys to tour the stockyards and packing plants. Youngsters enjoyed the hospitality and atmosphere so much that participation doubled by the second year of the program.

Another addition for the Fort Worth Stockyards was a new company called the Fort Worth Livestock Handling Company, which officials organized 24 May 1940 to do all the loading and unloading services previously performed by the stockyards.

---


3For the sake of consistency this paper will use the spelling Fort Worth Stockyards Company from this point to the conclusion, although the company itself never was that consistent in the spelling of its own title.

4"Cow Country Friends for the Future," This Month in Fort Worth 15(November 1941):3.
company. Officers of the stockyards created the handling company after the court announced decisions in Ex Parte 127 on the Status of Public Stockyards. The company learned that because of its ownership and operation, it probably would be classified as a railroad. The firm's counselor explained:

The Stock Yards Company is already under the supervision and control of the Secretary of Agriculture, and the imposition of dual control by the Secretary of Agriculture and the I.C.C. would be burdensome; furthermore as a "railroad" the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company might and probably would be the subject in its entire payroll to the Carriers' Taxing Act. Therefore, we decided to separate the two operations, and maintain them as distinct individual corporations.

Arrival of livestock by railroad car had been declining, but as long as some animals still entered the yards that way, federal regulation would be a factor on the entire market. Following the creation of the new company, the Fort Worth Belt Railway (not owned by the stockyards anymore) did all switching to and from the loading and unloading docks; the Livestock Handling Company performed the service of loading and unloading livestock from the cars; and the Fort

---

5Lester P. Shoene to A. G. Donovan, 2 April 1941, Fort Worth Livestock Handling Company Folder, Dies Correspondence, Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.

6Philip R. Wigton to F. C. Black at St. Joseph and John Dies at Fort Worth and enclosure, no date (June 1943), Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Wigton was the lawyer advising the company. Also Board of Directors Meeting, 25 April 1940, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Corporate Record, Vol. 5, pages not numbered.
Worth Stockyards Company then provided the feed and rest facilities and other services necessary to handling livestock.\(^7\)

Americans added more and more meat to their diets because of the promotional efforts of the American Meat Institute, an enterprise supported by the nation's meat packers. Locally, the industry employed five thousand workers and furnished a $6.25 million portion of Fort Worth's payroll in 1941.\(^8\) Texas ranchers and farmers marketed their 1941 animals for more net money than they had seen for several years.\(^9\) World War II, raging in Europe, had no appreciable

\(^{7}\) The Livestock Handling Company still existed in 1981, although the last livestock to arrive in Fort Worth by rail came in the early 1970's. It remained somewhat active until the 1960's. Letter from T. H. Hard to C. W. Emken, 23 February 1960, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Letter from Fort Worth National Bank to Fort Worth Stockyards, 21 August 1961, ibid. After the court's decision in Status of Public Stockyards was made, several yard companies notified the commission that since the hearings relating to them, their operations with respect to loading and unloading had been changed. Besides Fort Worth, these included Cleveland, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Sioux City. "Proposed Reports in I.C.C. Cases Status of Public Stockyards," Traffic World, 2 November 1940, pp. 1077-1078. Clipping in Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. The I.C.C. discontinued their proceedings against the stockyards after determining that they were not common carriers. The Livestock Handling Company was the common carrier and had to publish rates. The Stockyards Company had not published rates with the I.C.C.

\(^{8}\) "Where Values are Stabilized," (Fort Worth Stockyards Company Advertisement), The Cattleman 28 (April 1942): inside front cover.

effect on the Fort Worth market prior to the entry of the United States except that the sale of horses and mules boomed, and Fort Worth again became a leading market for these animals. Once the United States entered the war, however, the demand for meat and meat products multiplied, for the nation needed to feed its own troops and those of its allies. A consuming public that had happily been convinced to eat more meat soon found steak and bacon scarce at a time when public markets like Fort Worth broke records for livestock receipts and as farmers and ranchers increased production.

As early as January, 1942, Fort Worthians felt the closeness of war as blackouts began. A flood that spring, however, briefly diverted attention from the war. On the Sunday evening of 19 April 1942 a flash flood hit North Fort Worth. Then three hours after the first one, a second wall of water, this one seven feet high, came down Marine Creek, and the stockyards area flooded a second time. Waters covered the lower end of the cattle yards which caused hundreds of losses in the horse and mule barns, sheep yards,

10 "Among the Three Largest Horse and Mule Markets in the United States," (Fort Worth Stockyards Company Advertisement) The Cattleman 28(September 1941):inside front cover. Foreign governments were not buying the animals so much for cavalry mounts as in World War I, but for a cheap source of food for its armies.


and hog pens. The *Weekly Live Stock Reporter* even missed two of its issues. Businesses in a six block area of North Main and Exchange Avenue sustained damages.

Because beef producers had not yet geared up for wartime production, a beef shortage in 1942 caused a heavy slaughtering of unfinished, light cattle. Mostly the beef shortage came from a sharp increase in consumer buying power owing to heavy concentration of laborers in war production plants. A further drain on beef supplies developed in 1943 as the beef consuming public grew when seven to eight million men entered the Armed Forces. For the first time in their lives, most of these men came to be well fed. As civilians they apparently had eaten less than half the meat they wanted. Cattlemen now could not produce enough beef to meet the demand, and prices shot up.

13"Announcement," *Weekly Live Stock Reporter*, 7 May 1942, p. 1. Mrs. Nita McCain, who with her husband M. L. McCain, Jr. ran the North Fort Worth News, remembered that flood waters came up to the wall of their newspaper office and stopped at the date of the flood on a calendar on the wall. Interview with Mrs. Nita McCain, Fort Worth, Texas, 28 October 1977. Also carcasses of three mules were found under debris in the lobby of the Maverick Hotel. "Most Flood-routed Families Venture Back to Homes; Red Cross Survey Is Due Today," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, 22 April 1942, p. 1.


Producers marketed a million more head of livestock at the Fort Worth Stockyards in 1943 than they had in 1942, making the nearly 4.5 million head in 1943 a new record.\textsuperscript{16} Sheep receipts accounted for two million of these animals. For about five years Fort Worth had been developing into a growing sheep market, but the war years brought over two million sheep each year into the yards. The biggest run was fifty-nine thousand sheep in one day.\textsuperscript{17} Fort Worth quite definitely had developed into the largest sheep market in the country. On some days the city received more sheep than the combined total of those animals in the eleven other major markets in the nation.\textsuperscript{18} In 1944 over 2.5 million sheep passed through the Fort Worth market, making it the third year in a row that sheep reached the million mark. For only the third time, in 1944 over a million hogs reached the market in one year, and for the fourth time, a million cows. The grand total surpassed 5.25 million animals, and 1944

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{16} "Thanks a Million," (Fort Worth Stockyards Company Advertisement) \textit{The Cattleman} 30(January 1944):inside front cover.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Tape of a conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Ted Gouldy, and Bob Bramlett, Fort Worth, Texas, 24 June 1971. In possession of Ted Gouldy, Tape 3.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Jim McMullen, "Fort Worth Livestock Industry—First in War and First in Peace," \textit{This Month in Fort Worth} 18(June 1944):5. Two goats named Judas and Popeye acted as "Judas goats" and led the unsuspecting sheep along the ramp to the slaughtering house. Ted Gouldy, "Minnesotan Is Skeptical About Judas Goat Story," clipping in files of W. L. Pier Advertising Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
\end{enumerate}
remained the largest year ever in the history of the market. Packers' purchases, including those by Armour, Swift, and five smaller packers, amounted to less than half the total receipts of the stockyards. Many animals supplied stocker-feeder demands.

During the early war years, United Stockyards Corporation continued with plans to buy up all the stock of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company. In January 1942 the larger corporation purchased 1,324 shares and by December bought any stock it could, from two shares to one hundred. Reasons for United's decision to buy all the Fort Worth Stockyards Company stock grew out of the Federal Revenue Act of 1942, which contained certain relief provisions for the benefit of corporations when 95 percent or more of all classes of their stock was owned by a parent corporation. Such provisions afforded substantial income tax savings by permitting the filing of consolidated income tax returns. The Fort Worth Stockyards had outstanding 110,000 shares of capital stock


of which the parent company, United Stockyards Corporation owned 80.571 percent in March 1943. "If such percentage of ownership be increased to 95 percent or more, this corporation would be able to avail of the benefits of such relief provisions and would thereby be enabled to effect substantial income tax savings," President A. G. Donovan wrote stockholders. United needed to purchase 16,708 shares owned by others. Value of the stock in March 1943 amounted to $22.80 per share. The corporation offered $23 to any who would sell, and included an acceptance form with Donovan's letter.

The appeal did not bring in enough shares, so at a stockholders meeting 28 October 1943, officials reduced the capital of the Fort Worth Stockyards Corporation by $24,462.50, accounting for 1,957 shares, and then retired those shares. At a directors meeting the same day, the directors decided not to declare a dividend on the capital stock of the company but to pay $75,000 on a $300,000 loan from United Stockyards Company and to lease seven and one-half acres of land to Great West Grain and Seed Company. They also redeemed two United States bonds of $5,000 each.

---

22 Letter to Stockholders of Fort Worth Stockyards Company from President attached to a 30 March 1943 waiver of notice from, Stockholders and Directors Corr., Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.


24 Ibid.
At the next directors meeting on 27 April 1944, four of the seven directors met in Chicago to finalize plans for the complete liquidation and distribution of all property of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company and assets in complete cancellation of all its shares of capital stock. They voted to dissolve their corporation after selling all property and assets, to divide assets among those entitled to them, and to pay all debts and liabilities. United by that time held more than 98.5 percent of the capital stock, and the holders of 19,085 shares voluntarily sold at $23 per share when requested to do so. Directors decided to advertise for bids in newspapers in Chicago, New York, and Fort Worth for the sale of the property and assets and determined not to allow United automatically to purchase the property unless its bid actually was the highest. Stockholders also received a dividend of $1.50 per share as of 27 April 1944.25

On 2 May 1944 officials issued a public invitation for bids for all property and assets of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company. The notice announced that no bid of less than $2,700,000 would be considered.26 At a special stockholders

---

25Ibid. See also letter to the Stockholders of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company from the Company, 1 May 1944. Copy in possession of author. Directors present were A. G. Donovan, J. W. Dies, David F. Hunt, and W. L. Pier. Those absent were Harold L. Niles, Louville F. Niles, and W. K. Wright.

meeting held on 31 May 1944 in Chicago, stockholders examined the only bid received, $2,791,000 from David Hunt of United Stockyards. The stockholders voted to accept it and to dissolve the corporation, "so the business of the Fort Worth Stock Yards Company officially ended and the corporation was dissolved."27 The stock of the Fort Worth Livestock Handling Company was to be transferred to United as soon as permission was obtained. Locally, operations continued much as usual, but soon Fort Worth Stockyards Company advertisements carried the statement underneath the name of the company, "a division of United Stockyards Corporation."28

By 1945 only 15 percent of livestock shipments to the Fort Worth market arrived by rail.29 Buyers at the local market paid $145 million to ranchers and farmers for their livestock,30 most of it driven in by truck. Even so, livestock receipts for 1945 fell a little short of the record


number marketed in 1944. The 4,787,660 that did arrive during 1945, however, made the second largest number of cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, horses, and mules to be received in any calendar year at Fort Worth, and the 1945 sheep supply became the largest number of sheep and lambs ever marketed in Fort Worth in one year--2,713,524.\textsuperscript{31} Fort Worth naturally remained the largest sheep market in the nation, but dropped to second in calves, fourth in horses and mules, seventh in cattle, and did not even make the top ten in hog receipts.\textsuperscript{32} Texas in 1945 produced nearly 10 percent of the nation's cattle and calves and almost 20 percent of the sheep and lambs.\textsuperscript{33}

Government regulation of the livestock industry during World War II generally meant price ceilings set by the Office of Price Administration of the War Food Administration. Market analysts believed that government regulation more often influenced price levels during the war than market trends shaped by seasonable or other normal price determining


\textsuperscript{33}"42 Years of Square Dealing," (Fort Worth Stockyards Company Advertisement) The Cattleman, 31(April 1945):inside front cover.
conditions. The War Food Administration extended price supports on certain weights of hogs to protect farmers from prevailing heavy discounts for swine weighing more than 270 pounds. Government regulations greatly affected hog receipts in 1945 and cattle too, but less so than hogs. Sheep and lambs were not subject to price ceiling orders and were marketed under normal competitive conditions. Sources close to the stockyards called the period the "darkest days of the industry" when the packers continued to offer OPA compliance prices while meat went to black market killers in small auction centers around the state who were paying excessive prices. Conversely, however, a historian of the cattle industry believed that two results stood out clearly from the government regulation of marketing during the war: 1) the system worked well in properly distributing meat and in keeping prices down, and 2) cattlemen accepted the government intervention with little complaint. The cattlemen made

handsome profits and saw that government aid during the depression did not turn out too badly, he explained.38

The war affected greatly a real stockyards institution—the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show. In 1943 show officials cancelled the entire exposition because of the war; then in 1944 they held it in the new facilities built by the city for the 1936 Texas centennial and never returned the show to the North Side area. This move occurred even though the show officials had made a long term lease in 1940 for fifteen years at $8,000 per year for the coliseum and other facilities. Stockyards manager Donovan had thought then that "The new lease-contract should eliminate in the future any question or suggestion as to having the stock show in the new location on the West Side improvements of which were made in 1936."39 Donovan misjudged. The move took place anyway.

John B. Davis, secretary-manager of the stock show, called it off in 1943 because the city needed to gear all its efforts for food production, because of transportation difficulties of out-of-town people with gasoline rationing in effect, and because some of the buildings customarily

---

38Schlebecker, Cattle Raising on the Plains 1900-1961, p. 175.

39A. G. Donovan to C. F. Topping, 19 October 1940, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
used for the show were housing industries engaged in "vital
war work." Then in 1944 officials still could not hold
the show in the stockyards area because all the North Side
buildings except the coliseum were on lease to Globe Air-
craft Corporation to manufacture war planes. Thus they
decided to move to the new $1.5 million Will Rogers complex
in the west part of the city. The move when announced
appeared only to be temporary because of the wartime condi-
tions. However, attendance at the 1944 stock show exceeded
all previous records, and the rodeo drew the largest crowd
in history. Every evening performance was a sellout, and an
extra performance had to be added at 1:30 a.m. Sunday so de-
defense workers could see the rodeo. The stockyards company
had even joined with other businessmen to help underwrite
the cost of having the stock show in the new location up to
a pledge of $2,000, but when the show made money, they did
not have to contribute. In June 1944 directors decided to
hold the 1945 show at Will Rogers as well because Globe

40 "Fort Worth Show Called Off," The Cattleman, 29(January
1943):8.

41 "Fort Worth Stock Show Dates Set," The Cattleman,
30(November 1943):47.

42 "Greatest Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show,
The Cattleman, 30(April 1944):22.

43 Homer Convey to A. G. Donovan, 13 April 1944, South-
western Exposition and Fat Stock Show Folder, Dies Corr.,
FWSY Co. Coll.
Aircraft Corporation was still using the North Side site. Besides, the 1944 show had been "the most successful one ever held in Fort Worth."44

Nearly half a million persons attended the stock show in 1945, setting another all time attendance record. Nearly every rodeo performance was a sellout. Thus it was no real surprise to many that the directors voted in May 1945 to hold the 1946 show at the Will Rogers complex.45 Yet it was a disappointment to the Fort Worth Stockyards Company, other livestock interests at the stockyards, and the citizens of the North Side area for the show to move away permanently after they had nurtured it for nearly fifty years. Thirty-five years later many persons still expressed regrets. "It's not the same show now. People used to come to the stock show from all over Texas to soak up the atmosphere. It's just a big show now. It was real then," one oldtimer said.46

When the stock show celebrated its fiftieth anniversary at its new location across town in 1946, officials instituted

44"Will Hold Show in Coliseum," The Cattleman 31(June 1943):7. See also "Coliseum Selected As Site for 1945 Fat Stock Show," This Month in Fort Worth 18(June 1944):8.


46Interview with Frank Kirli, Fort Worth Texas, 14 August 1979.
another of the many innovative features. They brought in a celebrated entertainer for a halftime performance. Gene Autry agreed to be the special attraction, the first such arrangement in any rodeo. Also featured were the Budweiser Clydesdales in "shining harness." Edgaret Deen, secretary-manager of the show, had an idea to have one hundred Fort Worth businessmen patrol the grounds daily, extending greetings to visitors and offering assistance to any person who might need help. Officials called this 1946 show the "most successful in history" from the standpoint of rodeo entertainment, sellout performances, new record gate attendance, and quality of livestock. The Fort Worth Stockyards Company during these years sent a season pass to the stock show to the president or general manager of several other stockyards throughout the country as a goodwill gesture.


50 The first year that the present January-February dates for the show were used, rather than March, was 1948 which coincided better with other livestock shows so that exhibitors could move directly from one to another. It would result in
Al Donovan retired from the Fort Worth Stockyards Company in January 1946 after thirty years, having been president of the company since 1931 and division manager since 1944 when the company became a division of United Stockyards. Donovan started his career at age fourteen when he got a job as office boy in the Armour and Company plant in Kansas City.\textsuperscript{51}

W. L. Pier took Donovan's place as division manager. Pier, while retaining close livestock interests, had been a banker during his career.\textsuperscript{52} Pier also became a director of the Fort Worth Belt Railway and received annual passes for himself, his wife, and daughter on the Texas and Pacific Railroad. His position as division manager of the Fort

more and better stock being exhibited, officials believed. It also would work out better for the sale of bulls for breeding. "New Dates for Fort Worth Show," The Cattleman 33 (April 1947):16. See also "It'll Be January or February For Fort Worth Stock Show Again in 1949," The Buckboard 3(March 1948):6.

\textsuperscript{51}"Pier is New Head of Stockyards Co.," Fort Worth 20 (February 1946):28.

\textsuperscript{52}Pier served as cashier and later as president of the First National Bank in Midlane, South Dakota, 1915-1920; vice president, Stockyards National Bank, Omaha, Nebraska, 1920-28; vice president then president, Stockyards National Bank, Fort Worth, 1928-34; then a vice president of the Fort Worth National Bank upon consolidation with the Stockyards Bank. Since 1928 he had been a member of the board of directors of the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show and served as treasurer of the show for eight years. "Pier Succeeds A. G. Donovan As Yards Mgr." Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 16 January 1946), p. 3. Also "William Lauren Pier," Vita in General Miscellaneous File Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
Worth Stockyards Company meant that he also became a vice president and director of United Stockyards.53

During a trying time in its history, the Fort Worth Stockyards Company came under the leadership of an efficient and kindly man. He faithfully and graciously answered every complaint by a shipper, enquiry by a school child for a report, or a request for a list of commission men. He constantly was deluged with requests for money, for advertising, invitations to dinners, tours, rodeos, and fairs. He accepted some invitations and respectfully declined others.

Pier accepted the leadership of the Fort Worth division of United Stockyards during the frustrating time of readjustment after World War II. In a speech to the Dallas agricultural Club shortly after he took office, the new manager reviewed the problems of the local market. The beef cattle population of Texas was not increasing as rapidly as it should. In normal years about two million beef animals disappeared from Texas ranges, going either to grass in Oklahoma or Kansas, or to the feedlots in the North. "If these animals were all finished at home, Texas would soon be in the front rank of the nation's packing industry," Pier said. He believed that adjustments must be made on

the part of the government to bring about better relations between producers of livestock and processors, enabling both to make money while being unhampere...
government. They promised to await the decision of the fact-finding board. The National Wage Stabilization Board assumed jurisdiction and on 29 April ordered an increase in wages of sixteen cents per hour retroactive to 26 January.

Besides the strike, the year 1946 became a most hectic one for the yards because of the lifting and then restoring of price controls which made rapid changes in the marketing system. While the controls were on, "the black market in meats was more often discussed and cussed than the weather," according to the market newspaper. The Office of Price Administration Act expired 30 June 1946. Producers waited until after that date to move their animals to the stockyards and did so in unusually large numbers in July and August. The government then ordered meat price ceilings and subsidies restored 20 August 1946 which brought an outcry from the industry that all the evils of the black market might return. The government board freed most grains and all dairy products from renewed price control, but placed price controls


back on cottonseed products and soybeans as well as all meat and livestock. 60

Local managers of both Armour and Swift expressed their ire at charges that big packers could operate at a profit under OPA ceiling prices but were just refusing to buy cattle. They both explained that they were only buying small percentages of cattle because all others were selling at higher than OPA regulations permitted. Packers would violate regulations if they paid those prices. Operators not regulated by the government remained ready and willing to pay the higher price and thus were buying most of the cattle. Meanwhile the two major packers at Fort Worth had to lay off workers because they could not buy enough livestock to keep the plants fully operational. 61

When the controls ended on 15 October, livestock receipts boomed and prices shot skyward to put the Fort Worth market back in the big business bracket after receipts had dwindled earlier in the year to only a trace of normal prewar totals. For the fourth consecutive year sheep receipts hit the two million mark, although the figures dropped from the

---

60 Annual Report, United Stockyards Corp. Year Ended 31 October 1946, FWSY Co. Coll.

previous year by over one-third million head. For the third year in a row, the local market led the nation in sheep receipts. Also, the horse market doubled over the previous year for several reasons: (1) mares being purchased by United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration to restock depleted areas of Europe, (2) marketing of fat horses for slaughter to reduce the food shortage in areas abroad, and (3) for riding horses in the nation's dude ranches.

Early in December 1946 the Fort Worth Stockyards Company publicized another of its many innovations when a load of twenty commercially grown calves was transported for the first time by airplane from a livestock market in this country. A DC-4 transport plane took off from Fort Worth's municipal airport, Meacham Field, just north of the stockyards and headed for New York. Within a few minutes after becoming airborne, the plane crossed the site of the old cattle trail by which millions of head of stock had entered the Chisholm Trail in Indian Territory and headed for Kansas railheads.


The trail lay one mile east of the airport and about a half-mile east of the stockyards complex. 64

In 1946 the stockyards still pleaded for hogs in their advertisements, although not as strenuously as they had done during the two decades after the big packers came. 65 Per capita consumption of pork exceeded that of beef by a little over two pounds per year according to the American Meat Institute in 1947, 70.9 pounds of pork and 68.6 pounds of beef, 66 yet meat packers began to urge consumers to cut back on their pork purchases because of the high prices of pork cuts. Because of strong consumer demand and short supply the packers claimed to be losing money in hog operations. Fixed operating costs meant that regardless of the number of animals dressed, packers lost less money by paying high hog prices than by letting plants stand idle. Packers urged consumers to turn to other meats and cheaper cuts of pork to bring the

64 "Texas Calves Cross Old Chisholm Trail in Plane," Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 2 January 1947, p. 1. Bob Mason, vice president of World-Wide Trading Corporation with headquarters in Fort Worth, bought the calves. They had been bred and fattened on the George A. McClung Ranch in Cleburne. See also "Twenty Bawling Calves Set New Aerial Record," (no date) Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Livestock" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.


66 "Pork Is Most Popular Meat Dish on American Table; Beef Second," Commercial Recorder, 14 April 1948, p. 4.
demand closer to the small pork supply and thus reduce prices. Even the United States Department of Agriculture in 1947 called for a cut in hog production from the fifty-three million pigs in 1947 to fifty million the following spring. "In making the announcement the government re-emphasized to farmers its request for feeding hogs to lighter weights as a grain conservation measure." Apparently the Fort Worth Stockyards was never meant to be a great hog market, for too many other factors kept working against them. When they urged farmers to raise more hogs, the government, the packers, or somebody told them not to do so.

Manager Pier felt more optimistic about his market as 1947 began. He wrote that once the government lifted price controls, the meat on the hoof began to crowd the yards and allay the fears of many that the central market system of handling livestock was doomed, because thousands of animals had been going to the hundreds of small auctions over the state. He was overly optimistic about the continuance of the central market dominance as later events revealed.

Pier with his banking instincts tried to operate more efficiently as he saw terminal markets in trouble. He began selling the fifty-five rent houses that the stockyards

---


company still owned, mostly on Decatur Avenue, because the upkeep and depreciation made them a questionable investment. He also cut back on advertising by cancelling ads in many stock journals in which he had previously bought space.

Whether the efficient Pier or one of his associates discovered it is not known, but in 1947 the Fort Worth Stockyards Company suddenly realized that they were nine years older than they thought. For forty-five years they had been dating everything from the time the packers Armour and Swift arrived in 1902, assuming that the company began on that date because the two packers bought two-thirds of its stock and reorganized it. Someone apparently found the original charter dated 23 March 1893, for the company revised its advertisements and stationery to reflect the 1893 date and began bragging that the market was fifty-four years old and open twenty-four hours a day most of that time.

69 W. L. Pier to David F. Hunt, 14 February 1947, Lease Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Maximum legal rent for their houses during World War II had been from $13 to $20 per month. Form letter from Lucien H. Wright, area Rent Director of Office of Price Administration to C. Redmond, 26 January 1943, Dies Corr., ibid.

70 H. M. Phillips to W. L. Pier, 7 May 1947, Advertising Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll.

In mid-1947 the stockyards introduced a new service to their customers by arrangement with W. C. Rickel and Son for stocker and feeder buyers to spray their livestock with .25 percent DDT suspension applied at high pressure. One application assured protection against flies and lice for a period of four to six weeks, "allowing livestock plenty of time to respond readily to grazing or feeding at their new home." The company still felt affluent enough to sponsor a half-day picnic in Forest Park for its employees in June and to give most of the office staff free turkeys at Christmas.

The problem in the livestock industry at the beginning of 1948 was an "out of joint" condition between supply and demand with demand high and the supply lacking. Cattle in production had been reduced while a short corn crop and high prices for all classes of feeds utilized in producing meats led to the short supply. In addition, an embargo against Mexican cattle because of foot and mouth disease had been in effect for over a year, preventing annual in-shipments of

---

72 Fort Worth Stockyards Company Advertisement, The Cattlemen 34 (June 1947): inside front cover.
approximately one-half million head of Mexican cattle. Record employment rolls, high wages, and the ability of labor to select and pay for the food it liked best caused the abnormal demand. Although Fort Worth ranked first in the Southwest in the bovine business in 1948 and remained the largest livestock market south of Kansas City, aircraft had surpassed livestock as the city's number one industry. Cattle and meat packing dropped to second place.

Supplies of livestock on the local market thus declined in 1948 from the previous year, and the same held true in 1949 as over a million less head passed through the market than the year before. The biggest decline came in sheep receipts. Previous years of drought conditions brought on the depletion of herds, then in 1949 adequate moisture for forage production induced producers to hold their stock for

---

75Annual Report, United Stockyards Corp., Year ended 31 October 1948, United Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.


rebuilding. They thus marketed fewer animals in Fort Worth.  

Walter Rice became traveling field representative during these years for the company. He traveled throughout West Texas during the last three years of the decade, visiting small towns, judging livestock shows, and showing a film advertising the terminal market. When in Fort Worth he handled 4-H and FFA tours. He also served as assistant livestock superintendent for the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show for several years.  

Two fires damaged company property in 1947 and 1948. On 22 August 1947 a part of the sheep division was destroyed by a fire that brought a "net book value" loss of $86,964.90 to the company. Another bad fire did over $100,000 damage 9 November 1948 to a hay barn. A unique aspect about the


79 W. A. King to Walter Rice, 9 July 1953, W. W. Rice Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Rice's job seemed similar to the one held by C. C. French for so many years.  

latter fire was that it burned for five months and two weeks, ending in April 1949. Officials attributed the long life of the fire to thirty-seven thousand bales of stacked hay and alfalfa inside the barn that continued to smoulder until they could be removed. Local firemen cited it as the longest fire in their memories.  

A flood occurred in the spring of 1949 which did more damage to the west part of the city of Fort Worth than to the stockyards area, although the water from the Trinity backed up Marine Creek, making it necessary for the company to move the sheep, hogs, horses, and mules across Exchange Avenue to the cattle division. The water covered Exchange Avenue a few inches in some places, but it soon receded.

In the late 1940's the major issues became the problem of decentralized markets in the various country towns closer to the farms and ranches where producers sold their stock rather than at the larger public stockyards such as Fort Worth. A Farm Journal article announced decentralization as a fact as early as April 1946 and reported that livestock

---


82 W. L. Pier to R. B. Pendergast, 20 May 1949, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Three employees living in the flood area lost furniture and had their homes damaged. Also interview with Mrs. Nita McCain.
receipts at the nation's foremost terminal market—Chicago—tallied the smallest since 1879, although the volume of meat produced in the United States had reached the third largest in its history. Part of the reason seemed that during World War II in some instances the big packers sold their branches because they could sell in great volume to the government. This situation left openings for small independent packers to operate. The ordinary consumer during the war bought from these small independent packers or they did not get any meat. Smaller packers thus obtained a foothold and a chance to develop, eventually obtaining government inspection and government grading. The small country auction barns came along to accommodate them.

In the 1930's and earlier the bulk of the livestock slaughter and packing had been done in some twenty of the nation's larger cities with Fort Worth ranking high on the list, but as of 1946 thirty-five hundred meat packing plants in all sections of the country and twenty-six thousand other commercial establishments slaughtered the nation's meat animals. The trend also began in part when packers sought to sidestep mounting operating costs in the cities, to buy

---


84 Tape of Conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Ted Couldy, and Bob Bramlett. Bob Bramlett was the one who spoke.
livestock cheaper, and to take advantage of favorable freight rates by opening plants nearer the farms. Good highways and trucks speeded this process up considerably.85

Opponents of the trend including the large terminal markets argued that decentralization and "direct selling" to order buyers and packers representatives resulted in lower prices to farmers in the long run. Yet the practice continued because: (1) government regulations let any local buyer or trucker pay as much (and more on the black market) as central markets would, (2) farmers liked decentralization for it avoided shipping shrinkages and terminal market expenses, and (3) farmers could dicker with buyers while they still had their livestock in their own possession. Also some farmers tried cooperative packing.86

Commission agents began going out of business as the central market declined. One agent wrote, "it looks as though the auction rings have got us, so I am trying to

85Anderson, "Farmers Intend to Get More Livestock Money," p. 23. When the Packers and Stockyards Act came into being in 1921, sixty-seven markets were posted under the Act and they handled 90-95 percent of the livestock slaughtered under federal inspection. In 1946 there were 196 posted markets and the number of animals going for slaughter under federal inspection at those markets had dropped to 45-50 percent. L. T. Skeffington, "Where to Sell Your Livestock," Breeders' Gazette 111(March 1946):8.

86Anderson, "Farmers Intend to Get More Livestock Money," 23.
figure out some way that we can stay without starving completely."\(^{87}\)

Locally, W. L. Pier of the Fort Worth Stockyards began sending out pamphlets to producers and other friends of the local market warning of the dangers of direct marketing.\(^{88}\) In editorials, advertisements, and pamphlets, Pier argued the same case as other terminal market managers, that the central market remained the only place where volume could be sufficiently large enough to attract all kinds of buyers and thus the only fair place for prices to be set. Dealers at the small auction markets based prices on the going rate at the nearest large terminal market, but if the large market dropped off, the competitive situation would not be such as to constitute the proper place to set prices. Terminal market officials argued that in the long run it would be the cattle producer who would suffer. At the smaller markets an uninformed farmer faced an experienced, informed buyer and placed himself at a disadvantage.\(^{89}\) Also, when packers bought

\(^{87}\)C. B. Johnson to Tom Saunders, 28 June 1949, 1940's Folder, Tom B. Saunders, Jr. Collection, Texas Christian University Special Collections, Fort Worth, Texas.

\(^{88}\)Eugene Fish to W. L. Pier, 13 April 1946, Advertising Corr., PWSY Co. Coll. The American Stockyards Association published a booklet arguing the case for terminal markets entitled, "Dollars and Sense in Livestock Marketing" that they distributed in bulk to member stockyards to give producers at their market. A. Z. Baker, president American Stockyards Association, to W. L. Pier, 13 July 1948, American Stockyards Association Folder, Pier Corr., ibid.

\(^{89}\)Skeffington, "Where to Sell Your Livestock," 8.
directly from farmers, they knew they had their daily supply, so they did not have to be as competitive or aggressive on the price-making larger markets.90 Pier ordered ten thousand copies of a pamphlet entitled "Livestock Farmers in Fight for Existence" to mail out to producers. The writer argued that direct buying would destroy the producers' greatest economic defense—their own competitive marketing system.91 Of course, the terminal markets such as Fort Worth were entering a fight for their own existence.

One local situation that aided the country auction phenomenon and hurt the local market was that the Fort Worth Stockyards closed for Saturday sales at the request of the commission firms so they did not have to work six-day weeks. The small country markets, however, operated usually on Saturday. Another thing that probably hurt Fort Worth was that as of February 1949 the radio program ceased because the noon hour became unavailable and that was the best time.92

Instead of estimating profits during the summer of 1949, Pier began sending in losses of anywhere from fifteen

---

90 Ibid. Skeffington was the manager of the Livestock Service Council, Bourbon Stock Yards, Louisville, Kentucky. Also letter and enclosed ad copy to Harry Holt of Abilene Reporter News from W. L. Joyce, 20 February 1948, Advertising Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.


92 W. Pier to A. L. Olson.
hundred to five thousand dollars in his weekly reports to United. But Fort Worth had not yet lost its status. Of 211 posted public stockyards in the nation late in 1949, the USDA classified only twelve as major markets, and Fort Worth remained one of these. It received the second largest amount of sheep and lambs in the nation that year and remained the principal livestock market in the Southwest.

Fort Worth still retained its pride in its "first love"—the cattle industry and packing plants which gave the city its first real start toward prominence. Fort Worth's image of itself as the decade ended might be described as a cowhand sitting in the shade of an oil rig watching a B-36 airplane take off from Carswell Air Force Base. To retain a cowhand in that image in a future of expanding market decentralization and plummeting local livestock receipts, the Fort Worth Stockyards Company—that cowhand—had to stand up, load all his guns, and fight.

---


95 Caption under picture of stockyards in Table of Contents, Fort Worth 22 (August 1948):5.
CHAPTER XI

PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS ACCELERATE

The Fort Worth Stockyards Company, like a stubborn cow-hand, did not accept the threat to its market calmly, but pulled out loaded pistols for a fight. Ammunition consisted of promotional gimmicks, multi-media publicity, and new organizations or programs. But before it could get off a telling shot, one quick blow damaged its ego a bit.

On 11 January 1950 the United States Department of Agriculture issued a press release which referred to charges of "unfair and deceptive practices" in violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act on the Fort Worth market. It implied a blanket indictment of all those on the market, and "coupled with very light receipts" everyone became terribly depressed. Division Manager W. L. Pier asked A. Z. Baker, president of the American Stockyards Association, to come to Fort Worth to speak to the livestock interests and cheer them up.

The government charged (1) that owners of commission firms used fictitious names and speculated in livestock,

1W. L. Pier to A. Z. Baker, 7 March 1950, American Stockyards Association Folder, Pier Correspondence, Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Hereafter cited as FWSY Co. Coll.
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(2) that commission firms encouraged employees to speculate, hiring them at low salaries with that understanding, (3) that salesmen and commission employees worked closely with speculators, selling to them, and frequently reselling livestock daily for them, (4) that registered agencies handled operations of other speculators who were not bonded or registered by using fictitious names and accounts, and (5) that dealers, packer buyers and other buyers did not operate completely independent of each other as the law required.\(^2\)

The firms discharged the guilty employees or required them to discontinue all dealer activities. The Packers and Stockyards Administration brought actions against eighteen firms and individuals.\(^3\) The Fort Worth Stockyards Company issued a statement that they did not buy and sell livestock, and thus were not involved. They expressed relief that the government had charged only a small percentage of operators and that the firms had eliminated all unfair practices. "We will, of course, continue to cooperate with the department


\(^3\)M. J. Cook to E. S. Mayer, 3 November 1950, General File, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
and the market agency . . . to assure the patrons of the Fort Worth yards the fairest market conditions and safety," a spokesman for the market stated. Obviously, the bad publicity hurt the yards at a time when they needed to create good will.

Coordinating much of the promotional activity designed to create good will and increase market receipts became the major task of a new structure that originated in April 1950 called the Fort Worth Livestock Market Institute. The Fort Worth Stockyards Company and the commission companies on the market set up the Institute as an organization to build a greater understanding of livestock problems and as an attempt to boost economically the entire Southwestern livestock industry. It was patterned after similar structures in St. Paul and Sioux City. Those who formed it were Ted Gouldy, newspaperman, W. L. Pier, division manager of the stockyards, and J. C. (Buck) Weaver, of Cassidy Commission Company. Members of several other commission firms joined them as directors. Plans called for the stockyards company

---

4"Tribute Paid to Most Firms at Stockyards," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 13 January 1950 (morn.), "Livestock" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

5Charter No. 102374, Fort Worth Livestock Market Institute, filed 27 March 1950, Office of Secretary of State, Austin, Texas. Also W. L. Pier to W. E. Williams, 4 May 1950, Livestock Market Institute Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

to pay 50 percent of the cost of the Institute and the member commission firms to pay the other 50 percent. Virtually 100 percent membership of livestock commission firms, dealers, order buyers, and the company eventually resulted.\textsuperscript{7} The Institute spent only $5,079 in its first year,\textsuperscript{8} but by the end of the decade expended as much as $2,000 to $3,000 per month for advertising in newspapers and magazines, printed matter, radio coverage, dinners, equipment, management and secretarial costs, office supplies, postage, premiums and judging expenses, and wages.\textsuperscript{9} News releases to county papers over the territory adjacent to the Fort Worth market went out weekly, and radio and television farm directors in the region also received regular releases.\textsuperscript{10} Of eighty columns by Ted Gouldy the Institute distributed, sixty papers in the market area immediately picked them up and used them.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{7}Ted Gouldy, "Big Gains At Stockyards in '51," Fort Worth 27(January 1952):38.


\textsuperscript{10}"W. L. Pier Made President of New Marketing Institute," Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 20 April 1950, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{11}W. L. Pier to Roland B. Pendergast, 5 October 1950, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
or three years later Gouldy supplied a market summary called "Let's Talk Livestock" to over three hundred newspapers in the state.\(^{12}\)

Another organization created to foster interest in the local livestock industry was the Fort Worth Farm and Ranch Club, established in May 1950 by the Agriculture and Livestock Department of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. W. L. Pier, manager of the Fort Worth Stockyards, became vice president of the new organization.\(^{13}\) Members met for a luncheon once each month to hear a speaker or see a film on some phase of agriculture.\(^{14}\)

The first big public relations thrust of both organizations was a Texas Livestock Roundup on 2-3 November 1950 sponsored primarily by the Chamber of Commerce but co-hosted by the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, the stockyards interests, and WBAP-TV. Promoters initially planned the roundup for the coliseum at the stockyards and then changed the location to Will Rogers Auditorium in the West part of Fort Worth because of better parking facilities. Experts in all phases of the


\(^{14}\)"Farm and Ranch Club Formed," Fort Worth 25(June 1950) :21.
livestock industry appeared on the program which was open to any interested persons. More than one thousand ranchers and farmers attended what then became an annual event for at least three or four years.

Several advisors outside the Fort Worth Stockyards suggested that the market try to recreate the livestock exchange which existed near the beginning of the century until the state of Texas outlawed it in 1907. Manager Pier would have to get the state of Texas to rescind its injunction against an exchange which came in the case of The State of Texas v. The Fort Worth Livestock Exchange, et al. Therefore, Pier and his lawyer called on Texas Attorney General Price Daniel in Austin on 5 May 1950 to discuss his rescinding the 1907 injunction and allowing the exchange. They went over the 1907 injunction point by point and Pier told Daniel that it was obsolete anyway because of the Packers and Stockyards Act. In five areas the suit enjoined the Fort Worth Livestock Exchange from doing what the Packers and Stockyards Act required them to do. For example, the 1907 injunction forbade the exchange to set prices and rates, but


17Ashley Sellers to W. L. Pier, 26 April 1950, FWSY Co. Coll.
the Packers and Stockyards Act required it. Pier wrote that "the purpose of organizing the Exchange was to keep our own house clean and therefore make it unnecessary for the government to come in, as they have here recently, with various charges that have hurt the Yards and the commission men."\(^{18}\) Nothing came of their attempts to create a new exchange, for the Attorney General refused either to "approve nor disapprove" its organization.\(^{19}\)

Among other public relations tactics tried by the stockyards were their continued tours by 4-H or Future Farmers of America boys. When the youngsters brought in their cattle, the stockyards treated them royally. The commission firms and the Fort Worth Stockyards Company paid for their hotel rooms at the Westbrook Hotel, and Armour and Swift invited them to a luncheon and took them on a tour.\(^{20}\) Files of the 1950's are full of requests for such tours, some from as far away as Kansas.\(^{21}\) Twenty-eight such tours were held in one particular year.\(^{22}\) In addition, promotional field agent


\(^{19}\) Price Daniel to Julian E. Simon, 1 August 1950, FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^{20}\) W. L. Pier to Buford Browning, 19 February 1948, Agricultural Extension Service Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^{21}\) U. S. Crippen to W. L. Pier, 16 January 1956, FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^{22}\) It was 1951. Ted Gouldy, "Big Gains At Stockyards in '51," p. 39.
Walter Rice judged shows and the stockyards helped furnish the ribbons. 23

When a noontime radio program went back on the air in 1951 called "Roundup Time" which Ted Gouldy hosted, the network of high power stations that carried it extended from Shreveport, Louisiana to the Gulf Coast and to the Rio Grande Valley. Gouldy broadcast the fifteen minute program from the Roundup Studios in the Livestock Exchange Building. 24 The program continued on through the 1950's.

Part of the promotional program to create good will for the local market included two films called "Today's Chisholm Trail" and "This Little Pig Went to Market," which the American Stockyards Association produced. The Fort Worth Stockyards Company loaned out the films free to schools throughout the 1950's decade and even longer.

Despite optimistic publicity endeavors designed to bolster the market and indications that such tactics were working, one frustration after another seemed to plague the yards in the early years of the decade. During 1952 particularly, sheep, cattle, and swine diseases created problems.

23 Interview with Elmo Klingenberg, division president of Fort Worth Stockyards Company, 19 February 1981, Fort Worth, Texas.

24 "Roundup Time, Texo Hired Hands Are in Fort Worth Stock Yards Studios Now," Weekly Live Stock Reporter, 22 February 1951, p. 1. The program had lost its noon slot several years earlier, but market reports had been offered at various times.
Compulsory dipping of sheep at auction barns and other market concentration points of intra-state shipments of sheep other than for immediate slaughter became effective on 4 February, according to the Livestock Sanitary Commission of Texas. The campaign was to eradicate sheep scab, a highly infectious disease caused by a tiny parasite which had caused other states from time to time to threaten embargoes on Texas sheep.  

Then the Texas Livestock Sanitary Commission and the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture closed the hog and sheep divisions of the Fort Worth Stockyards on 2 October until such time as diagnostic tests could be completed on some hogs suspected of having vesicular exanthema, a swine disease that swept through the Midwest in previous months. The testing procedure took seventy-two hours, so the yards remained closed to all sheep and hog shipments during that time. However, the USDA and state officials soon declared the Fort Worth Stockyards to be "clean yards."


Labor problems perennially plagued the stockyards. In the 1950's many persons coupled these with charges that communists had infiltrated the unions, for the United Packinghouse Workers of America, of which the Livestock Handlers Union at the Fort Worth Stockyards was a subdivision, was born in the midst of distress and disillusion during the depression and post-depression years. The Livestock Handlers Union was affiliated with the CIO as was the United Packinghouse Workers, so both unions often acted simultaneously. In the 1950's, the communist issue which had long beset the United Packinghouse Workers, became more publicized. Left-wingers seemed to have more power in Chicago and New York than elsewhere, but they never completely controlled the UPWA.

As a reflection of the business stockyards attitude toward the hint of such activities in their industry, W. L. Pier helped form and became a director of the Texas Better Business Bureau, an organization dedicated to "help to reverse the trend of this country toward socialism." Pier also supported with a $25 contribution a right-wing anti-communist group which sponsored a radio program called

29 Ibid., p. 35.
"Americans, Speak Up" and newspaper articles by John T. Flynn entitled "Behind the Headlines."\(^{31}\) Possibly to stave off any labor unrest at the local stockyards, the company began a pension plan on 21 March 1951 for their employees.\(^{32}\)

Approximately twelve hundred members of the United Packinghouse Workers of America walked off their jobs at Armour in Fort Worth on 4 January 1952, and such activities always affected the flow of livestock at the stockyards, even though Swift did not strike. The UPWA strike affected the plants of the Armour Company in Omaha, Chicago, Denver, Atlanta, and Sioux City as well. The strike revealed dissatisfaction with the line the current wage negotiations were taking, but quickly ended.\(^{33}\)

A contract negotiated with the Livestock Handlers Union called for an additional holiday in 1952 besides July 4, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. The stockyards workers also got Labor Day, and the stockyards closed on that day in 1952 for the first time in its history.\(^{34}\)

\(^{31}\) Robert L. Lund to W. L. Pier, 26 April 1951, FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^{32}\) Annual Report, United Stockyards Corporation, Year Ended 31 October 1951, United Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also W. L. Joyce to H. E. Ratton, 10 October 1957, Pension Plan Folder, Dies Corr., ibid.

\(^{33}\) "1,200 Strike at Armour," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 5 January 1952, "Armour" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

\(^{34}\) "Stock Yards to Close Labor Day for 1st Time," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 28 August 1952 (eve.), "Livestock" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.
Then in 1954 the Livestock Handlers Local 59 of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, seceded from the UPWA by an overwhelming majority vote and became an independent union because of what members cited as "Communist domination" of the national organization. Lee Holley, secretary of the Local 59 in Fort Worth, spoke for the members. They had formed a new Stockyards Workers Association of America and were preparing a representation petition for the National Labor Relations Board "as are other locals in Kansas City, Omaha, St. Joseph, Mo. and Sioux City, Iowa which have withdrawn from the UPWA for the same reason." The last straw for the stockyards workers came when the UPWA refused at a nationwide convention in Sioux City in May to adopt an anti-communist resolution. In addition, the UPWA had refused to outlaw communists on the union staff and defeated two militantly anti-communists, including A. J. Pittman of Fort Worth. Pier continued to oppose strict union activity, for he sent a telegram in 1956 to the Attorney General of Texas, John Ben Shepperd, congratulating him on his efforts in behalf of the Texas right-to-work law.


A business slump came early in the decade, so Pier cut down on the size of stockyards ads and tried to make them friendlier and less crammed with statistics at the suggestion of an editor who ran some of their advertisements. The treasurer wrote magazine editors that "business has been terribly bad" to explain why the ad he was sending was smaller than the previous year. Also the company was spending a great deal of its advertising budget through the Livestock Market Institute. Even the West Texas Chamber of Commerce which the stockyards interests had induced the city of Fort Worth to create and encourage lost some monetary support. W. L. Pier told the president of the WTCC that he had to reduce his usual $200 contribution to $100 because of increased expenses and income problems. The company also stopped its former full-page ad in the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show premium list. As another means of reducing expenses, the company forced its employees to retire at age sixty-five.

---


39 W. L. Joyce to Sue Flanagan, 28 April 1952, FWSY Co. Coll.


41 W. L. Pier to W. R. Watt, 30 July 1958, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Folder, FWSY Co. Coll.

42 W. L. Joyce to H. E. Ratton, 10 October 1957.
A slump in business in the early 1950's for the Fort Worth Stockyards and packing interests did not prevent Armour and Swift from celebrating their fiftieth anniversaries in Fort Worth in 1952. One reason for the celebration was a big hoopla to stimulate business. 43 A public relations agency planning the big celebration charged a fee of $600 and suggested a $7,100 budget for doing all the publicity, inviting movie stars to a premier in Fort Worth, printing movie star buttons, and airing radio promotions. 44 They also suggested that merchants in the North Side area have merchandise drawings and that everyone wear Western clothes. They sponsored a beard growing contest and also placed loud speakers on Exchange Avenue playing old tunes. 45 Swift and Armour conducted open house tours of their plants. Armour bragged that its Fort Worth plant remained the fourth largest among thirty-four plants in the nation and employed twenty-five hundred workers in 1952. 46


44 Ibid., pp. 3, 7.


46 "27,000 Enter Armour Gate at Open House," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 5 May 1952 (eve.), "Armour" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.
Nature in the form of a drought and the federal government in the form of price controls caused erratic receipts at the terminal markets, including Fort Worth, in the early part of the 1950's decade. Manager Pier expressed his opinion about the government controls: "It would seem that most increases in government regulations result in more costs and less efficiency." Pier reflected the opinion of stockyards operators as well as many others in the livestock industry in his attitude toward federal intervention.

As of 26 January 1951 the government placed ceiling prices on meat and meat products at wholesale and retail levels. This indirectly acted as a control on prices paid for livestock. Predictably, under government price controls, the trading at the smaller country markets not posted by the Packers and Stockyards Administration expanded, resulting in a reduction of cattle and calf receipts at the larger public markets that were posted. The packers became more active in the country in order to get the meat they needed.

Everette L. Dobbs, manager of the local Armour plant, laid off workers because of the dwindling availability of cattle under the Office of Price Stabilization regulations.

47 W. L. Pier to Wingate Lucas, 29 June 1949, General Correspondence Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

He said that the average kill per hour before the regulations became effective had been sixty. In the first week of regulations the kill dropped to eighteen cattle per hour. He predicted that even that figure would be cut by half during the following week. 49 Swift faced a similar situation. Receipts at the stockyards remained low because the market price was higher than the OPS ceiling, and producers would not sell.

Congress issued a roll back order on 30 April 1951 which would go into effect on 1 August and 1 October. Cattlemen in Texas began presenting to Congress the cost of production figures on raising calves on the range and argued that the roll back order would force the feeder calves to sell below the cost of production.50

To try to sell before the price rollbacks became effective, many producers brought stock into the yards in September, 1951. Over one thousand trucks unloaded 10,233 cattle on the single day of 4 September.51 The threatened roll back and the drought brought in so many animals that fall


51 Note in Photographs File Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
that Pier had to send a telegram to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission to ask him to compel the return of stock cars to the railroad lines in the Southwest.\textsuperscript{52}

By the spring of 1952 heavy selling of cattle off drought-stricken ranges had cracked the market and sent prices shooting downward in a record slump. Cows for which men had paid up to $300 each would do well to bring $100, even with calves by their sides. Because no grass existed on their ranges, cattlemen had to borrow money to buy feed.\textsuperscript{53} But the government price support program on feed made its price outrageously high. Many petitioned Washington for price supports for beef cattle, because for some in the industry it became a little easier by 1952-53 to look to Washington for aid. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, the American National Cattlemen's Association, and most major organizations of beef stockmen opposed a support program, saying it would be impossible to administer and would mean the government would be running the cow business.\textsuperscript{54} Instead, they launched an "eat more beef" campaign

\textsuperscript{52}Telegram from W. L. Pier to W. M. Splawn, 8 October 1951, General Folder, FWSY Co. Coll.


\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., pp. 273-74.
designed to double consumption in ten years. By late October 1952 the industry won decontrol of the sheep and mutton industry in a fight that started at Fort Worth and enlisted the aid of United States Senator Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas and his assistant, Walter Jenkins.

Many smaller and less experienced cowmen wanted government support during the trying years of the drought, and as a result the Truman Administration proposed the "Brannan Plan" named for Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. In essence, the plan embraced price supports with universal subsidies called "incentive payments." The proposal called for government controls, production quotas, and marketing allocations. Bryant Edwards, president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, said the Brannan Plan was loaded with socialism. Edwards traveled to Washington to oppose the plan before the agriculture committees


of both House and Senate. He told Congressmen:

We can imagine the graphic language that would have been used by one of our trail driving ancestors to a proposal of a subsidy by the government, and we can imagine what would have happened to some 'economist' who would have had the temerity to tell an old cowman that the government or in particular the Secretary of Agriculture would tell him how many cattle he could raise or how many he could sell, or where and when he had to sell them—and the character of the cowman has not changed.57

When Dwight Eisenhower and his Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson took office in early 1953, the subsidy philosophy changed, and Eisenhower removed government regulations in February which limited the prices that could be paid for livestock and meats.58 The government granted loans on livestock and arranged for the sale of feed at reduced prices, but many producers still had to sell. Cattle and sheep receipts at Fort Worth tallied substantially higher than the previous year.59 By July Benson declared Texas, Oklahoma, and Colorado disaster areas. He increased the area


in 1954, and the drought continued into 1955.\textsuperscript{60} Even when the drought ended in 1957, farmers throughout the Southwest withheld their cattle from market in order to rebuild herds which were liquidated or greatly reduced. Therefore the earnings of the Fort Worth Stockyards suffered from it as late as 1958.\textsuperscript{61}

In lieu of the direct cattle price support program, the Eisenhower Administration attempted to support cattle prices indirectly through an expansion of its purchase of beef for foreign and domestic aid. Pier called the beef purchase program "the least painful thing that might be done in the present emergency."\textsuperscript{62} To aid sheepmen in 1954 Congress passed the National Wool Act as an incentive plan to encourage greater wool production with the hope that it would reduce a downward trend in sheep production.\textsuperscript{63}

While debate continued concerning government price supports and subsidies, the federal regulation of the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{60} John T. Schlebecker, \textit{Cattle Raising on the Plains 1900-1961} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), pp. 207-08.
  \item \textsuperscript{61} Annual Report, United Stockyards Corporation, Year Ended 31 October 1958, FWSY Co. Coll.
  \item \textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 31 October 1953, p. 5. Also W. L. Pier to A. Z. Baker, 20 October 1953, American Stockyards Association Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
  \item \textsuperscript{63} It was Title VII of Public Law 690, "An Agriculture Act to Provide for Greater Stability in Agriculture." U.S., Statutes at Large, vol. 68, pp. 910-13. Also see \textit{Annual
industry, of course, remained in effect as administered by the Packers and Stockyards Administration. In the beginning the Act applied only to stockyards of over twenty thousand square feet. The legislation seemed to be adequate in the 1920's and 1930's, for most livestock passed through stockyards of this size, and most traveled by rail. Changes in the marketing of livestock to country auctions and the operations of packers after World War II outmoded the Act. Larger terminal markets like Fort Worth naturally felt themselves at an unfair disadvantage in the competitive fight with the country markets; in fact, by 1955 the country outlets had a slight edge over terminal markets in number of sales, twenty-three million to twenty-one million. By 1957 fourteen hundred to fifteen hundred country livestock markets operated in interstate commerce not covered by the Act because they were less than twenty thousand square feet in size. To bring the Packers and Stockyards Act in line with the current practices, Congress amended it in 1958. Under the amended Act,
all stockyards engaged in placing livestock in interstate commerce were subject to regulation, regardless of size.\textsuperscript{65}

Publicity measures fostered by the stockyards company and other dealers on the Fort Worth market apparently stirred other businessmen in the North Side area to make their own attempts to turn things around, for in September 1955 a small group met at the Cattlemen's Steak House and drafted plans for a progress program for their area and selected the name North Fort Worth Business Association. Headquarters would be the North Side Coliseum. Their plans called for modern street lighting on North Main, hospital facilities for the area, an extension of Twelfth Street to University Drive and West Seventh, traffic outlets from downtown, additional

\textsuperscript{65}The amendment was H.R. 9020. U.S., Statutes at Large, vol. 72, pp. 1749-51. See also H. W. Hannah and N. G. P. Vrausz, "The Packers and Stockyards Act," American Livestock Journal 216(July 1961):16. The American Stockyards Association by 1958 supported the P & S Act and had no thought of repealing it, but they certainly favored the amendment to place all the country auctions under it so all markets could compete under the same conditions. Speech by A. Z. Baker, 23 May 1947 at Oklahoma City. Mimeographed copy in American Stockyards Association Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll., pp. 4-5. Pier and other stockyards managers opposed any amendment to the P & S Act that only applied at terminal markets. W. L. Pier to A. E. Brooks, 8 March 1956, General Corr., Pier Corr., ibid. For example, part of the P & S regulations said an auctioneer could not buy or sell, but they did this all the time on the smaller country auctions. Mimeographed transcript of a Special Hearing of Texas Livestock Auction Owners, Roosevelt Hotel, Waco, Texas, 6 January 1957, p. 24. Miscellaneous Folder, Pier Corr., ibid.
parking areas, and attempts to induce more industry into the area.66

They also soon conceived the idea to make the area into a Western style tourist attraction.67 They wanted it to be like the New Orleans French Quarter, San Antonio's Alamo district, or Virginia City. They asked the City of Fort Worth to provide $1,900,000 to construct the Western village.68 Voters in an 18 November 1958 bond election turned down $1,250,000 in bonds that would have provided a museum of Western art as a part of the attraction, and private funds for specialty shops failed to materialize, so the Western village had to remain a dream for awhile.69 As a compromise,


67John Ohendalski, "North Side Gets Downtown Aid in Move to Re-Create 'Old West,'" Fort Worth Press, 1 December 1957, p. 10 in "North Fort Worth" File at Fort Worth Public Library, Fort Worth.


69Voters turned it down 23,016 to 8,926. Fort Worth, Texas, City Council, Minutes, Vol. 0-1, 21 November 1958, p. 306. Also "North Fort Worth Sets Sights On Marine Creek Western Village," Fort Worth 35(April 1959):10; and "Plan Outlined for Village of Old West," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 19 September 1959, "North Side" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library. Dreams are sometimes long in coming true. About twenty-five years after these businessmen and local residents wanted their Western tourist attraction, it
then, merchants and businessmen spent their own money for new architectural fronts on the buildings made of wood shingles and boardwalks to give the area a Western look.  

The North Fort Worth Business Association sponsored a "Go Western Week" in 1956 as "a period dedicated to the re-capture of a bit of the spirit of the old West and North Fort Worth's place in the metropolitan area's business picture." The occasion was the activating of the new vapor-mercury street lights along Exchange Avenue which Fort Worth Mayor F. E. (Jack) Garrison and L. N. Wilemon, president of the North Fort Worth Business Association, turned on just after sundown. The people seemed to have so much fun during the festivities that the association decided to have a Western celebration every year. Therefore, the next spring became an actual fact in the early 1980's. Possibly reasons for failure in the 1950's included: (1) public money was needed and that concept was too new then; (2) the city moved Southwest and North Side was in the wrong place; and (3) although the mall concept for shopping was innovative, Seminary South opened about this time and it was better. Larry Neal, "Ups 'n' downs: taking Stock in the Yards," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 21 June 1981 (morn.) sect. a, p. 39.

The North Fort Worth Story (Fort Worth: North Fort Business Assn., n.d.), p. 29.


The North Fort Worth Story, p. 28. The Pioneer Days still continued as an annual event in September 1981.
the association sponsored a "Pioneer Days" celebration on 30-31 May and 1 June 1957 at the old North Side Coliseum. They brought back a rodeo to the coliseum for the first time in fifteen years. Western bands, square dancers, free variety acts, a carnival, and a giant parade accompanied the show.73

While area businessmen did their part to revitalize the stockyards district, the stockyards company continued its own efforts. To promote sales and interest, the Texas Hereford Association and the Fort Worth Livestock Market Institute jointly arranged a feeder calf show and sale featuring Herefords at the Fort Worth Stockyards on 30 June 1955. Judges would select the outstanding animals in various classes and award ribbons and prizes.74 Then the Texas Aberdeen-Angus Association joined with the stockyards to host their own feeder calf show and sale on 8 July 1955 with about two thousand calves expected for the show.75 The show netted nearly $100,000 for producers and encouraged them to host several other such shows with the stockyards that


season.\textsuperscript{76} In fact, the shows did so well that the two cattle associations and the Fort Worth Livestock Market Institute planned seven similar events the following year.\textsuperscript{77} Then in 1958 nine such special stocker and feeder sales were held, four of them with shows. Two were for sheep and seven for cattle. In connection with these shows the Livestock Market Institute tried prizes and drawings to get more traffic into their market.\textsuperscript{78} The Livestock Market Institute advertised the special sales in seventy-three newspapers and magazines, placed announcements on eighteen radio and television stations, and sent news releases to three hundred and fifty newspapers and magazines, and sixty-three radio and television stations.\textsuperscript{79} They got some of their ideas from other stockyards such as Sioux Falls and Sioux City.\textsuperscript{80}

Part of the stockyards company's promotional efforts involved market research to find out just what producers


\textsuperscript{78}Copy of a talk given by Ted Gouldy at a Marketing Clinic at Oklahoma A & M, "Special Events," enclosed with a letter from Ted Gouldy to Joe Whitemen, 23 February 1957, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{79}"2% Charge Goal for Institute Sale, Was 2.3," The Weekly Live Stock Reporter and Texas Poultry News, 26 March 1959, p. 1

\textsuperscript{80}John W. Bennett to W. L. Pier, 16 October 1959, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
thought was wrong with shipping to Fort Worth. In March 1955 several officials from the Fort Worth market traveled to College Station, Texas for a quarterly directors meeting of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association. They also wanted to meet with a group of Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College agriculture professors about market research.  

W. L. Pier, among the group, had known Professor John G. McNeely for a number of years and wanted to enlist his aid. Representatives of stockyards in Houston and San Antonio also attended the meeting. They urged the college professors to devote some time to the research of terminal markets. Each year Texas A. & M. had been conducting a course in marketing, and one or two representatives from the Fort Worth Stockyards usually attended.

As a result of Pier's request, Texas A. & M. sent a questionnaire to livestock producers and did a study of the Fort Worth market. Some questions asked were: "Were you treated courteously? How long did you have to wait? What is your main reason for selling at Fort Worth? What day of the week is most convenient for you to deliver livestock to market? Do you have any suggestions for improving services

---


83 W. L. Pier to A. Z. Baker, 16 November 1953, American Stockyards Association Folder, FWSY Co. Coll.
at the Fort Worth market?"\(^8^4\) Manager Pier and market reporter Ted Gouldy were not too sure that their request for A. & M. to study terminal markets meant so specific a study of Fort Worth because the publicity might prove embarrassing, but they decided to be gracious and go along. They certainly wished they could pick the commission companies and the producers for A. & M. to interview, however.\(^8^5\)

Unfortunately, McNeely took an extremely negative approach in an article to be published in *The National Live Stock Producer* about his research on the Fort Worth yards. It proved so derogatory, that the editor offered to let the Fort Worth Stockyards make rebuttal statements before publishing the article.\(^8^6\) McNeely's theme was that "People in the stockyards business are slow to change their ways."\(^8^7\) Because small consignments constituted the usual practice instead of railroad car loads as in the old days, these small livestock producers wanted good food in a restaurant at reasonable prices, plenty of parking space, and clean and

\(^8^4\)John G. McNeely to W. L. Pier, 30 November 1955 with enclosed questionnaire, Agricultural Extension Service Folder, FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^8^5\)Memo from Ted Gouldy to W. L. Pier, 17 May 1955, FWSY Co. Coll.

\(^8^6\)J. W. Sampier to W. L. Pier, 1 June 1956, FWSY Co. Coll.

comfortable lounging areas for both men and women. "All of these services are lacking to some extent at the Fort Worth Stockyards." He said that the prevailing system at the stockyards discouraged purchases by small buyers because commission men preferred to deal with packers and established dealers and even often refused to accept bids from outsiders. McNeely explained that the flow of livestock operated inefficiently because everything was laid out to receive livestock by rail from the east side of the yards, although nearly all cattle by 1955 came by trucks at the north end of the yards. The system took more labor to move fewer cattle around, he said.

Low volume during certain shifts and late in the week made it cost more to handle livestock during these times. One alternative would be to close the market during unprofitable periods, McNeely said. The answers to the questionnaires revealed to him that the stockyards and some commission companies needed advice in public relations. They preferred the farmer to stay away from the pens and alleys; however, at local country auctions the farmer could stay which led him to feel that smaller auctions appreciated his business more. McNeely suggested innovations such as identification

---

88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
90 Ibid., p. 2.
91 Ibid., p. 3.
badges for stockyards and commission company people and an invitation to buyers to have full privileges to bid on any and all livestock. He praised the loud speakers for paging that were being tried at stocker and feeder sales and suggested they should be used more extensively.

W. L. Pier asked market reporter Ted Gouldy to help him frame their rebuttal to McNeely's article. They explained that the company had changed pen sizes many times to accommodate smaller shipments. They objected to a sentence that said "The current system at Fort Worth deliberately discourages smaller buyers," calling it an emotional expression and accused McNeely of being biased against their market.92 Most farmers did not know how buying was done and the stock usually was sold before they made an effort to buy it. Pier and Gouldy insisted that commission men did not refuse to accept bids from outsiders. They explained that if the stockyards closed down or charged higher rates for a particular day of low traffic, that would violate both the advantage of being a twenty-four hour market as well as USDA rules. "Any suggestion that we would be more 'efficient' by rendering less service for higher rates is not apt to increase volume."93


93Ibid.
After the rebuttal, McNeely toned down his report somewhat. Pier accepted his revised version of the article and did not send the rebuttal remarks to the magazine editor. But in reaction to the criticism that the commission men did not want small shippers to buy, the stockyards and the commission firms put out a small booklet "It's Easy When You Know How to Buy At Fort Worth."95

Because of his position at Texas A. & M. and his study of markets, Professor McNeely testified before a Senate subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly in the Meat Industry in June 1956. The three points he made were: Armour and Swift were in a position to dominate the livestock pricing in Texas, individual buyers for Swift and Armour were in a position to exploit the advantages given to them by this dominant position, and the Packers and Stockyards Administration was not in a position to do anything about it. His information came mostly from his study of the Fort Worth market. He said that Armour and Swift buyers tended not to compete with each other, for one went down one alley and one another. The fact that each bought approximately 50 percent


95W. L. Pier to Jack Sampier, 9 July 1956, FWSY Co. Coll.
of the livestock each year "would be impossible to attain ... strictly on a chance basis."  

A longer published report of McNeely’s Fort Worth study came out in 1959 and resembled the shorter article he had published earlier. He based his study on the questionnaire responses. McNeely found that many respondents preferred Fort Worth as a packer market but not as a stocker market. He made some recommendations involving personnel training, adding more yard telephones, building overhead walkways, controlling dealers and speculators better, and increasing courtesy. The professor concluded his remarks by stating:

> Probably no other major industry lacks so completely any control over its sales force as does the stockyards industry. While the Fort Worth Stockyards has a great investment in facilities, 29 individual commission firms are actually responsible for bringing in and maintaining business on the market.  

Despite some early ruffled feelings over the Texas A. & M. market study, the association continued between the stockyards and the agricultural college. Together they planned a series of Texas Livestock Marketing Clinics for

---


97 John G. McNeely and Jarvis E. Miller, "Fort Worth Stockyards—Operating Procedures and Problems," Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, College Station, Texas, February 1959, pp. 18-19 in Tom B. Saunders, Jr. Collection, Texas Christian University Special Collections, Fort Worth.
terminal markets in Fort Worth. The one on 20–21 March 1959 was co-sponsored by the Port City Stockyards in Houston and the Union Stockyards in San Antonio. The clinic attracted one hundred people who were interested in helping the markets keep step with changing conditions. Many persons came from out of state, representing stockyards in Omaha, Sioux City, St. Joseph, and Kansas City. They admitted their mistakes and discussed how to avoid them. Most of the participants took an optimistic approach that central markets would meet the challenge.

Pier, in fact, kept close touch with all other terminal markets and exchanged monthly livestock receipt statements with them. Presidents or general managers of the different stockyards wrote each other often to ask what the other was doing about their common problems and to trade ideas. Thirty-nine member stockyards of the American Stockyards Association relied on A. Z. Baker, its president, to keep them informed and to investigate attacks on their group.

---


99 Fifty of the one hundred participants were from the Fort Worth market. W. L. Pier to John Bennett, 27 March 1959, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also "Two-Day Livestock Marketing Clinic Held in Fort Worth," The Cattleman 45 (April 1959): 104.

Fort Worth hosted the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Stockyards Association on 4-6 April 1956. Toward the latter part of the decade some of the major terminal markets began to close, such as the South San Francisco and Los Angeles Union Stockyards. At Fort Worth, commission firms slowly decreased to twenty-seven by January 1958.

Weekly reports during the decade showed periodic losses. Observers noted that if it had not been for the checks received from Armour and Swift for direct yardage payments, the stockyards might not have made it. Fortunately for the stockyards, the original 1902 agreement had stated that so long as the stockyards continued to operate adjacent to the packing plants all animals to be slaughtered on the packing plant property would pass through the stockyards and pay the customary yardage and other charges thereon. This arrangement was made in exchange for Armour and Swift getting the land on which to build their packing plants, one-third of the Fort Worth Stockyards stock, and $300,000 in bonds. What it meant was that the stockyards got a fee on all cattle going through Armour and Swift whether they passed through the stockyards or not.


102The agreement was repeated in Fort Worth Stockyards Company Corporate Record, unnumbered vol. 1917-1934, p. 233.
In May, 1952 the Fort Worth Stockyards had executed a supplemental agreement with Armour which reconfirmed that they were to pay full yardage on livestock consigned direct to its Fort Worth plant and Armour admitted that the original agreements dated 25 January 1902 remained in full force and effect. The packers in 1902 had not realized how drastically marketing would change either. In January 1957 the Armour president Everett Dobbs had asked Pier if the stockyards could reduce the charges because his own superiors had told him to cut costs. In addition to his negative response, Pier replied that poor receipts meant that the stockyards company might have to increase charges. Pier told Dobbs that packers caused the poor showing on terminal markets by their buying in the country at auctions. Then on 14 May 1958 the parent company of the Fort Worth Stockyards, United Stockyards, filed a suit in 67th District Court in Tarrant County demanding that Armour and Company live up to terms of the fifty-six year old contract, for it had not paid since 15 March. United


104 W. L. Pier to David Hunt, 24 January 1957, United Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

Stockyards dismissed the suit in November when Armour agreed to pay.\textsuperscript{106}

Swift too became unhappy with the agreement that required payment to the stockyards for cattle that did not go through the yards. Hogs and sheep generally went through the stockyards, for Swift had no way to accept them directly, but cattle went directly to Swift. Swift began complaining in December 1959 of having to pay the same charge on the cattle as if they had gone through the yards.\textsuperscript{107}

The stockyards company dealt with another big packer toward the end of the decade. It unsuccessfully tried to get Morrell and Company to reopen a plant that they had closed on the North Side and even broached the idea of United operating a feed yard near it.\textsuperscript{108} Plans did not work out.

W. L. Pier resigned as president and general manager of the Fort Worth Stockyards effective 31 December 1959 and resigned as vice president and director of United Stockyards at the same time. United Stockyards, which owned twelve

\textsuperscript{106} United Stockyards v. Armour and Company. See also "Stock Yards Suit Against Armour Is Dismissed," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 10 November 1958, "Armour" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

\textsuperscript{107} John M. Lewis to Harry J. Walsh, 18 December 1959, Miscellaneous, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{108} John M. Lewis to John W. Bennett, 19 November 1959, Miscellaneous, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Morrell had become the nation's fourth largest meat packer by 1959 but had only maintained a small operation in Fort Worth.
fairly large terminal markets (with Fort Worth about the second largest) experienced some changes of its own. In order to diversify into an industry that was not subject to direct governmental regulations, the Corporation on 30 April 1956 acquired substantial controlling interests in the Federal Steel Products Corporation and the Zenith Steel Casting Company, both of which were engaged in the production of steel castings in Houston, Texas.109

United's coast to coast stockyards operations represented the largest single unit in the livestock marketing field in the world.110 By 19 March 1959, however, a large real estate conglomerate named Canal-Randolph had acquired 73 percent of United's Stock through stock purchases and thus had authority to operate United's properties.111 David Hunt, president of United since 1941 and a director since 1939, fought the takeover, but was in ill health and died 11 April 1959.112 Heading Canal-Randolph, and consequently United

---


beginning in 1959, was Hanns Ditisheim of Chicago, who came to the United States in the 1930's after a successful banking career in Switzerland. He named his company from an intersection in Chicago where he turned a forty-year-old warehouse into a modern office building. Ditisheim remarked while on a visit to Fort Worth that "Those who are unwilling to put forth this effort to revitalize must necessarily become casualties of progress." Many persons in the local livestock industry wondered in 1959 if the Fort Worth Stockyards would become such a casualty, although promotional efforts exerted by those on the market certainly helped stave off that possibility.

One last change in methods in an effort to compete successfully with the country auctions came late during this promotion-filled decade. Other large stockyards across the nation conducted auction sales along with the private treaty buying that had always been the practice at terminal markets, so the Fort Worth Stockyards decided to provide an auction sale. The first one was on 5 March 1959 in an old


114 "Stock Yards Boost For City Predicted," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 18 June 1959, Clipping in FWSY Co. Coll.

115 W. L. Pier to F. Wallace Rothrock, 26 March 1959, Other Yards Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
livestock exhibit building behind the coliseum left over from the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show days.\textsuperscript{116} All shippers of any kind of livestock to Fort Worth from 13 April through 7 May were entered in a drawing by their commission firm,\textsuperscript{117} and two "Whirlwind Feeders" were given away at the 7 May cattle auction. United Stockyard and Canal-Randolph tried to buy back the cattle barn and the coliseum from the city of Fort Worth to use for the auction sales, but they gave the idea up and leased the exhibit building until the end of the year when they constructed their own auction barn just behind the northeast corner of the exchange building.\textsuperscript{118}

Other public relations tactics used by the stockyards included a "Doane Agricultural Report" which the company paid to have mailed to vocational agriculture teachers and extension service personnel for several years all over the state, two hundred twenty-five of them. Numerous letters in files testify to the favorable response to this service


\textsuperscript{117} "Shown here is one of the Whirlwind Feeders," The Weekly Live Stock Reporter and Texas Poultry News, 16 April 1959, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{118} Copy of Lease Agreement Between City of Fort Worth and Fort Worth Live Stock Market Institute, 3 April 1959, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
which the stockyards made sure everyone knew came at their expense. Also, as a good will gesture, Ditisheim of Canal-Randolph suggested sending a present such as a pen set or something similar to bank executives, commission men, newspaper editors, managers of local restaurants, order buyers, and anyone else who might be associated with the market. Also during the decade the stockyards sent out two men practically full time to visit the local auctions and to hustle business from the country to the Fort Worth Stockyards. These representatives were Walter Rice and Glenn Shields. Sometimes yard foreman Leon Odom went out too.

Despite labor problems, a drought, federal controls, as well as the growing threat of the decentralization of livestock marketing into smaller country auctions, the Fort Worth Stockyards fought a successful fight during the 1950's decade. Although at times receipts proved erratic owing mainly to the government controls or the drought, the market, while receiving less cattle certainly than the war decade, did not actually decline appreciably from the beginning to the end of the ten-year period. The market accepted somewhat over

---

119 Doane Agriculture Service Folder, FWSY Co. Coll.

120 John W. Bennett to W. L. Pier, 12 August 1959, United Stockyards File, FWSY Co. Coll.
two million animals the last year of the decade just as it had at the beginning.\textsuperscript{121}

CHAPTER XII

RETRENCHMENT AND DECLINE

Leon Ralls, one of the commission men on the Fort Worth yards, remembered being amused when the first scattered auctions sprang up in small towns surrounding Fort Worth for even thinking they could challenge the big terminal market. Most of the people on Exchange Avenue laughed too.¹ During the 1960's no one laughed anymore, for country auctions by then threatened the very existence of the central markets, including Fort Worth.

Many misjudged the causes of the situation and did not immediately see it as a trend sweeping the entire industry. Small producers complained of bad treatment on the Fort Worth yards, erratic prices, and high service charges, while the stockyards officials thought that by publicity, friendlier service, and promotional gimmicks they could revitalize their market. Decentralization of terminal markets into smaller country auctions nearer the producing areas became inevitable and could not have been halted singlehandedly by the Fort Worth Stockyards Company.

A review of the reasons for the decentralization seems appropriate because it so drastically changed livestock marketing and altered the dominant position of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company in Fort Worth and the Southwest. The direct marketing that began slowly in the 1920's had actually become a trend by the 1930's with as many as an estimated 1,317 local auctions in existence. World War II with its need for quick movement of large volumes of animals, many by rail, used existing market organizations, but the war only delayed the inevitable by a few years. Following the war, producers supported the country auction markets for numerous reasons.

1. Local country auctions were not posted under the Packers and Stockyards Act, so promoters did not have to worry about regulations. Only eight had been posted in Texas as of June 1950.3

2. People began demanding better cuts of meat, for their affluent post-war lifestyle permitted this luxury. The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture called it eating "higher up on the hog."4

---


4Address by Earl L. Butz before the Annual Convention of the American Feed Manufacturers Association, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, 2 May 1957, Mimeographed Copy in Department
3. Buyers for supermarkets did not know cattle as well as the buyers on the terminal markets, but they required choice cattle for their customers. The only way they could be assured of choice meat was to buy direct from feeders who guaranteed corn-fed or grain-fed beef.⁵

4. Packers sometimes owned their own ranches or feedlots where they fed corn or grain. They could not obtain these choice animals from the cattle available at terminal markets, for most were grass fed.⁶

5. Packers placed buyers at all the little country auctions for it proved cheaper for them to buy direct and kill locally in new plants nearer the livestock producing areas.⁷

6. Obsolescence hit the packing houses in the 1950's as ceramic tile and stainless steel of one-story structures replaced whitewash and wood of six-story plants.⁸


⁶Interview with Grover Rogers, former Swift and Company employee, Fort Worth, Texas, 21 August 1979.

⁷Tape of Conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Tom Saunders and Ted Gouldy, 24 June 1971, Tape 1. (Tom Saunders was present for part of the conversation and Bob Bramlett was there for part.)

7. The development and use of motor trucks, all weather roads, telephones, and radio also stimulated direct marketing. Just as the development of central livestock terminals between the Civil War and World War I had been the result of the transportation and communication patterns of that period, so was the demise of the central market.⁹

8. Feeders contracted ahead of time for a fair market sale of their animals rather than gamble for a large profit or risk a disastrous loss depending upon the fluctuating price at the terminal market when their animals were ready to sell.¹⁰

9. A farmer found it more convenient to sell at a local auction rather than risk damage and shrinkage to travel to the more distant larger market. Also, if the prevailing price was not to his liking, he could with little trouble take his livestock home and try again another day.¹¹

10. Farmers felt that they obtained comparative returns and avoided paying high feed charges and commissions, as well as bypassing the crowded conditions, delays, and other


problems often associated with the larger and more distant central market.  

The larger markets such as Fort Worth countered nearly all of the arguments producers cited for using the smaller local auctions, but by the 1960's did not get many listeners.  

1. Direct buying lowered prices to producers in the long run as the history of hog prices revealed. From 1900 to 1922 cattle and hog prices were about the same, with hog prices usually higher. After packers began direct hog purchases, which they did to a large extent in the 1930's, the hog prices dropped lower than cattle and stayed there except for a price rise in the late 1970's.  

2. All safety regulations of the state and federal government remained in effect and were enforced at the terminal market. Because commission firms posted large bonds, the farmer or rancher was protected against "dishonest and unscrupulous people."

---


3. Farmers might think it more convenient to sell at local auctions, but that convenience became costly because prices would not be set by a large volume of competitive bidding as on the larger markets.¹⁵

4. The central market determined prices, provided specialized banking and insurance service, and provided highly trained specialists to aid the uninformed producer.¹⁶

5. Larger markets had the power and influence to petition that the government make necessary grading changes or similar requests. Smaller auctions simply would not have that much influence.¹⁷

6. Market information and prices for producers were more readily available at a few terminal markets than at so many small scattered ones.¹⁸

7. Off-grades of animals sold better and for higher prices at the terminal markets where a volume of other, similar animals existed.¹⁹


¹⁶Duddy and Revzan, Marketing and Institutional Approach, pp. 345, 347.

¹⁷Tape of Conversation between Ben Green, Dutch Voelkel, Ted Gouldy, and Bob Bramlett, Tape 6.


¹⁹DeGraff, Beef Production and Distribution, p. 152. See also Ted Gouldy, "Greater Southwest Livestock Sales," in Tom B. Saunders, Jr. Collection, Texas Christian University Special Collections, Fort Worth, Texas.
Despite the arguments of the larger markets, decentralization continued and the Big Four packers, Armour, Swift, Wilson, and Cudahy, lost their dominant position in the meat packing field.\textsuperscript{20} One of their former properties, the Fort Worth Stockyards Company, faced many problems of its own that grew out of the decentralization trend. The West coast demand for both cattle and sheep increased, diverting more of these animals to that area and thus causing the local market to suffer greater losses than it would have otherwise.\textsuperscript{21} Also, some persons brought charges against commission men that they discriminated against smaller packers in favor of larger packers and against all packers in favor of dealers and order buyers.\textsuperscript{22} Many small scale livestock producers who ran a few head on their land to supplement an income gained elsewhere complained most loudly that commission men discriminated against them and cheated them. Many of these part time farmers remained firmly convinced that the Fort Worth Stockyards declined in receipts because commission men cheated

\textsuperscript{20}In 1916 the four firms handled 53.9 percent of the commercial cattle slaughter and this dropped to 30.8 percent in 1955. The same four firms handled 51.2 percent of the hogs killed in 1916, but this declined to 36.4 percent in 1955. DeGraff, Beef Production and Distribution, p. 162.

\textsuperscript{21}H. B. Hening to W. L. Pier, 31 March 1952, Advertising Correspondence Folder 1951-1952, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{22}J. M. Lewis to John W. Bennett, 26 July 1962, Sub-Progress Report Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
these small producers when the agents handled their animals. Such word-of-mouth complaints spread and added to the decline of the market although any wrongdoing constituted a minor percentage of livestock transactions. Producers blamed the stockyards for any bad practice by commission men on its yards, but the company really had no control over them. The company also tried on numerous occasions to get commission men to go to special livestock seminars out-of-town but usually could not.\(^{23}\)

The Weekly Livestock Reporter once had been owned by the stockyards and traditionally supported the market almost exclusively. In the 1960's it engaged in its own battle for survival and succeeded by expanding its coverage to include the activities of the small country auctions that threatened the Fort Worth market. One auction at Brownwood, Texas drew big buyers after its promoters took out a full back page ad in the Reporter.\(^{24}\) Further problems for Fort Worth came because the Texas Railroad Commission rules prevented farmers from hauling other producers' livestock without a permit, and no more permits seemed to be available. A lot of farmers paid heavy fines for hauling such livestock to Fort Worth, but they could move to the local auctions without

\(^{23}\)W. L. Pier to David F. Hunt, 9 February 1956, Tariffs Folder, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

difficulty. Stockyard rates continually remained a problem. When the company needed more revenue, it considered asking the Packers and Stockyards Administration to let it raise rates, but the rates remained lower at the country auctions than the terminal markets. An increase, according to W. L. Pier, would be "like waving a red flag and result in giving the auctions more ammunition." Some customers complained that all the scales at the yards were not open for use and they had to wait. The company had closed down and curtailed some services as a result of reduced receipts because of the country auctions. One agricultural analyst summed up the major problems of the Fort Worth market as an uneven flow of livestock, a decline in salable receipts, seasonability of receipts, lack of television coverage of the market, and unfavorable customer attitudes.

The Livestock Market Institute served its co-sponsors, the stockyards and commission firms well during the entire


26W. L. Pier to David F. Hunt, 9 February 1956, FWSY Co. Coll.


decade of the 1950's, but activities came to a sudden end in May 1960. Reasons seemed to be a clash of personalities, a difference in philosophies, and a feeling that it had served its purpose. Ted Gouldy, newspaperman, market reporter, and radio program host, had served the Institute part time for eight years. In 1958, with a budget of $50,000 he assumed a full-time position as director. Stockyards manager at that time, W. L. Pier, wrote, "We feel that we are on the right track to get a job done that is badly needed." The stockyards still planned "aggressive attempt to reclaim its position as a public livestock market."^29

John M. Lewis had arrived from South Dakota as assistant manager of the Fort Worth Stockyards only three weeks earlier and immediately became a vice president of the Institute.

Two months later Lewis wrote:

. . . our Market Institute has been a very weak organization. A recent re-organization of this group has engendered some enthusiasm and so far the organization is supporting a budgeted program nearly twice the size of any previous program. However, business on this market has not improved to the same degree that it has on other markets and there is a great likelihood that the contributions will fall off unless we can find new gimmics to keep the enthusiasm alive.^30

---


^30 John M. Lewis to John W. Bennett, 15 July 1958, Other Yards Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
Ted Gouldy believed that the Livestock Market Institute proved effective and succeeded with what it intended to do—stir up interest in the local market. Some institutes remained on other markets after the one at Fort Worth closed. Lewis, Gouldy believed, felt that the Market Institute was stating policy that the stockyards should be doing. Gouldy explained that the commission men would not let the stockyards speak for them, but would let the institute because they were a part of it. Gouldy resigned as manager of the institute on 27 April 1959 citing "press of other business," but explained later that Lewis as the stockyards representative did not always do what he agreed to do and apparently was trying to take control. Gouldy ended his taped market reports for Western radio stations at the same time.

The institute lasted another year but disbanded its activities as of 1 May 1960 after the stockyards company and several of the larger commission firms withdrew. Publicity

---

31 Interview with Ted Gouldy, Fort Worth, Texas, 29 October 1979.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., 24 July 1979.
34 Bob Stephens to W. L. Pier, 24 April 1959, Fort Worth Livestock Market Institute File, Pier Coll., FWSY Co. Coll.
35 "Ft. Worth Livestock Market Institute Will Disband on May 1, Was Market 'Voice,'" The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 7 April 1960, p. 7. The non-profit organization did not officially end until 1 September 1965 when the institute forfeited its right to conduct affairs in the state by failing
had not been as extensive in the last year. Elmo Klingenberg, who later succeeded Lewis as division manager of the stockyards, explained that once Ted Gouldy gave up the job as manager of the institute, the large group of commission firms and the stockyards company could not decide on one person to run it. He believed that Lewis had been dissatisfied that the stockyards paid half the cost of the institute but had only one vote at policy meetings along with the large group of commission men. In May 1960 when the institute disbanded, the feeling seemed mutual among many commission men and the stockyards that it had served its purpose. The stockyards then took the lead in advertising and the commission companies continued to pay half the cost.  

The institute appeared successful in what it set out to do. Despite some cries of woe, the market remained in reasonably good shape throughout the 1950's decade. The

36Interview with Elmo Klingenberg, Fort Worth, Texas, 4 August 1981. John M. Lewis is deceased and thus could not be interviewed concerning his feelings about the institute.  

37An examination of livestock receipts during the decade might be a way to determine how effective the institute was, keeping in mind that probably nothing could really have turned the trend around toward decentralization. In 1950 2,649,298 animals arrived at the Fort Worth yards, while at mid-decade in 1955 the total was even higher at 2,829,692 (probably because of the drought), and in 1959 had dropped
1960's would tell a different story, however, even though beef consumption nationwide reached an all-time high and promotional efforts continued among the several organizations and activities created the previous decade.

John M. Lewis, who had come to Fort Worth in May 1958 as assistant general manager, replaced W. L. Pier when the latter resigned on 31 December 1959. Lewis had been president and general manager of the Sioux Falls Stockyards Company in South Dakota.

Lewis was not as well received on the yards as Pier had been, and many resented him as a "Yankee," probably not remembering that Pier originally had been from South Dakota too. Apparently Pier had become "Texanized" in their minds during his years in Fort Worth before assuming control of the stockyards. Lewis made some fairly quick changes which definitely were needed, but some persons resented them. He

---


reduced fifty-five acres of railroad-car size cattle pens to twenty-five acres and replaced the stockyard working horses and mules with motorcycles or scooters. Conservative Texas livestock producers complained of a "sissyfied" atmosphere and began taking their cattle elsewhere, for they preferred old cowhands on horses handling their stock instead of "teenaged shirtless longhaired kids" on motor scooters.\(^{40}\)

Some critics around the stockyards explained that Lewis simply was different and had his own ideas and did not fit in because he was from the North.\(^{41}\) Consequently, Lewis did not get the local cooperation that he might have. He was only trying to make changes suggested by United and other large stockyards that many felt would help the terminal markets keep pace. He immediately set out to reorganize cattle buying and trading procedures, implementing some of the suggestions that the A. & M. professors made, but old-timers on the yards resisted change, calling the motor

\(^{40}\) Edith Wharton Taylor, *Money on the Hoof--Sometimes* (Fort Collins, Colo.: Old Army Press, 1974), p. 104. Also Bob Trimble, "That Traditional Bovine Title May Be Slipping--And Here's Why," *The Fort Worth Press*, 29 August 1961, p. 7. The motorcycles were more economical than horses, for they could operate twenty-four hours a day. The driver could turn the switch and forget the vehicle until the next day. Also they turned sharply and their noise even helped herd cattle. Paul W. Horn, "Ponies With Wheels," *The Cattleman* 63 (June 1976): 66-68. Also interview with Al Todd, livestock producer, Fort Worth, 5 August 1981.

\(^{41}\) Interview with Frank Kirli, Fort Worth, Texas, 14 August 1979.
scooters or motorcycles the "last straw." Before Lewis even took control, officials had been looking at a possible reduction of the cattle division north to Twenty-eighth Street and examining deeds to consider possible sale or other use of the land.

Ted Gouldy, owner of the Weekly Livestock Reporter, and constant market publicist, owned stock in United Stockyards, the parent company, and thus believed he had a right to suggest an idea that might help the Fort Worth market. He believed that the terminal markets should go with the trend toward decentralization as he was doing with his newspaper instead of fighting against it. He suggested that the Fort Worth Stockyards set up branches at places like Ennis, Abilene, and San Angelo, and locate commission men, office staff, and buyers who could move around, visiting different markets each day of the week. He believed that this policy shift would result in the Fort Worth Stockyards controlling the markets instead of letting the small independent auctions have free rein. He also tried to interest the local businessmen and packers in moving out of the central business

---

42 The North Fort Worth Story (Fort Worth: North Fort Worth Business Association, n.d.), p. 16. Also interview with Charlie McCafferty, former president, North Fort Worth Historical Society, Fort Worth, Texas, 12 August 1981.

district, to build efficient one-story buildings at the edge of town. Unfortunately, United Stockyards and the packers did not pick up on his suggestions. Gouldy reminded anyone who would listen that when a trend starts, you either go with it or you die. The central markets did not go with the trend. United Stockyards should have decentralized as the packers did during World War II, and they could have beat out all the little "outlaw auctions," Gouldy said.  

Instead, the stockyards company continued its promotional activities, reinstituting a daily radio broadcast which aired fairly regularly during the first half of the decade. A "good percentage" of the 250 members of the Farm and Ranch Club continued to meet regularly. Pioneer Days continued annually, and promoters even staged a re-enactment of the Chisholm Trail drives in 1967. In addition, the stocker and feeder sales in cooperation with the Texas Hereford Association and the Texas Aberdeen Angus Association attracted good crowds with generally seven of

44Interview with Ted Gouldy, Fort Worth, Texas, 29 October 1979.


each category scattered throughout the spring, summer, and fall. These sales generally brought in approximately five thousand head each and sometimes six to seven thousand. The Charolais-Cross Feeder Calf sale even brought that breed into the stocker-feeder ranks on 25 September 1965 when 837 were offered. Some buyers came from out-of-state for these sales.

Promotional gimmicks for these shows became more elaborate and sometimes included an all-expense paid weekend in Fort Worth for some lucky rancher and his family. Sharing the cost of the award were the Fort Worth Stockyards Company, the North Fort Worth Business Association, and the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. Another prize, a Philco Home Entertainment Center, included a combination color television, AM-FM radio, and hi-fidelity record player. Another time, a livestock producer who had sold on the Fort Worth market won a free steel gate.

---


50 "V.I.R. (Very Important Rancher) and Family To Have Fun in Fort Worth in August! Winner to Be Shipper to August 9 Sale," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 20 July 1967, p. 2.

Even though promotional efforts continued in the 1960's, so did retrenchment of the market. As of October 1959 the stockyards employed 123 yard men for their 54 acres of cattle pens and 20 acres of sheep and hog pens. By June 1961 Lewis had finished the demolition of 30 acres of cattle pens, cutting down the working area of the yards by 40 percent and eliminating four scales from the operation. Consequently, by the fall of that year the number of yard men had been lowered to 107. A year later he had eliminated three more positions. Because employees had received two raises in a year's time, labor costs kept rising, but receipts at the yards had dropped by approximately 170,000 animals. As a result, Lewis reduced yardmen down to 84 by June 1962. He explained that any further reduction to save money "would not permit necessary operation of present facilities" for they were spread too thin already.

When the air conditioned auction ring opened on 3 June 1960 to host the cattle auctions, it offered theatre-type seats, a ladies lounge, and a snack bar. Twenty-two seats, a ladies lounge, and a snack bar. Twenty-two


54 "Fort Worth Stockyards Improving Facilities," The Cattleman 47 (June 1960): 86.
commission firms still operated at the market.\textsuperscript{55} By 1961 only 42.3 percent of all federally inspected animals slaughtered nationwide were purchased at terminal markets, and only 29.2 percent of all hogs.\textsuperscript{56}

The year 1962 seemed an unusual year, for not only did the stockyards get national coverage on the "Today" television show and celebrate an anniversary of sorts, one of the big packers closed its doors and cut receipts to the market even more. When John W. Bennett, president of United Stockyards, made a visit to Fort Worth in January, 1962, he assured local people that the rumors that the Fort Worth market would close were false and called the auctions there "among the largest in the nation."\textsuperscript{57}

Nevertheless, officials believed it might be a good idea to do some market research, similar to the study made by Professor John G. McNeely of Texas A. & M. some seven years

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55}"Fort Worth Stockyards Will Halve Cattle, Up Sheep Pens," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 14 January 1960, p. 6.
\item \textsuperscript{56}"Selected Papers on Marketing," Fifty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Meat Institute, Chicago, Illinois, 22-25 September 1963, p. 29. J. Russell Ives, director of the American Meat Institute's department of markets, cited these figures in a speech. His source was the Agricultural Market Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.
\item \textsuperscript{57}"Stockyards President Visits Fort Worth, Market Future Bright," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 18 January 1962, p. 14.
\end{itemize}
earlier. Consequently, in a survey which a public relations firm conducted in February 1962, members of the firm personally interviewed 392 people, 302 of them persons who had not used the Fort Worth Stockyards in six months, and 90 who had used it more recently. The firm learned that people who did not ship to Fort Worth cited distance, disadvantages to small operators with a few head, and transportation costs as their reasons. The people preferred an auction to a commission firm and suggested that the stockyards disseminate more information, solicit producers' business better, and do magazine and radio advertising. Livestock raisers apparently considered services and facilities of minor importance in selecting a way to sell their livestock, however, for the operations of the Fort Worth yards were generally believed to be in good order with only a smattering of criticism. The overall conclusion of the study as to why people no longer shipped to Fort Worth: "The market had gone to the seller; he no longer has to go to the market." The local auctions attracted them more. Producers believed they could


59 Ibid., p. xi.

60 Ibid., p. ix.

61 Ibid., p. vii.
get the largest net return by selling either at local
auctions, directly to dealers, or to packers.62

On the June day when officials of the National Broad-
casting Company's "Today" Show filmed on the Fort Worth
market, the stockyards company offered a $100 savings bond
to the shipper with the largest consignment and also to the
shipper coming the greatest distance. The company planned
free drawings for dozens of other prizes ranging from saddles
to billfolds and boots. People wore pioneer costumes to a
chuckwagon breakfast at the Livestock Exchange Building to
host the guests.63

By and large the most important event, though a dis-
illusioning one, of the year 1962 was the closing of the
Armour packing plant. Rumors had been circulating for nearly
four years that both major packers might shut down their
operations, but part of this pessimism came from the drought
that made receipts erratic in the 1950's.64 However, Armour
discontinued the slaughtering of hogs on 11 July 1959 at
Fort Worth and ceased operations entirely at six of her

62Ibid.

63"NBC's 'Today' Show to Feature Texas Cattle at Special
Calf Show At Fort Worth Mart June 22," The Weekly Livestock

64Bud Shrake, "Despite Setbacks, Future Rosy at Fort
Worth Stock Yards," Fort Worth Press, 10 January 1958, Clip-
ping in Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.
other thirty-two plants that summer. United president John W. Bennett, asked Pier to talk to the Armour officials to try to get them to reconsider. He suggested that another plant had been successful when the labor union agreed to more productivity if the plant would not cancel the slaughter. His pleas failed to change Armour's plans. Then in 1962 came the announcement that Armour would cease cattle slaughter as of 1 June, but sheep might continue. All activities halted as of 26 July, however.

Local newspaper writers assured Fort Worth citizens that the stockyards would not close, for most of the animals bought and sold were stockers and feeders, and the packers were not major buyers anymore. Armour cited its outdated plant, labor costs, and high administrative expenses as its major reasons. They could not compete with independent packers with non-union plants who offered lower wages and few fringe benefits to their workers. Lewis reported that


66 Letter from John W. Bennett to W. L. Pier, 7 August 1959, United Stockyards Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.


68 Ibid.
the closing of the Armour plant "can be expected to account for a loss of perhaps 100,000 head of cattle and as much as 300,000 head of sheep in the ensuing year, plus some possible contingent loss of salable receipts." 69

After Armour closed, followers of the local market wondered if the Swift plant would cease operations as well. However, the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers, Local No. 6, the Swift Union, voted on 15 December 1962 to take a wage cut of approximately twenty cents an hour and yielded some fringe benefits in order to allow Swift to be able to compete better in the local market. 70

The Armour union, the AFL-CIO United Packinghouse Workers, Local No. 54, opposed the vote. Swift had informed its employees that labor costs might cause a possible shutdown, but Armour workers did not accept that same explanation from their employer. Armour officials would not guarantee the union that the plant would remain open three to five years if they voted for a pay cut. Their contract already called for a nine cent raise, so workers voted to continue the contract. 71

---


70 "Swift Employees Here Okay Pay Cut; Plant Won't Close," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 17 December 1962 (eve.), "Swift" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

71 Telephone interview with Eddie Humphrey, Armour employee and co-chairman of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Local 540, and formerly a member of United
But the concession by the independent union's members saved jobs for the fourteen hundred employees of the Fort Worth Swift plant and averted closing of their slaughtering facilities at Fort Worth. Some local citizens believed that the Armour plant could also have remained open if their union had granted similar concessions.\(^72\)

Following the closing of the Armour plant, many of the businessmen of Fort Worth and many local citizens gave up on the stockyards district and turned their interests to oil, banking, and aircraft, planning to make Fort Worth a big business center like Dallas.\(^73\) Evidence continued to surface that Fort Worth was forgetting its cattle roots, for in a "Guide to Historic Sites in Fort Worth and Tarrant County" published by the Tarrant County Historical Society in 1963,

---

Packinghouse Workers Union, Local 54, Fort Worth, Texas, 1 January 1982. Humphrey was a member of the union committee in 1962 that discussed the proposed wage cut with Armour officials.

\(^72\)"Swift Workers Take Wage Cut, Save Fort Worth Plant, Jobs," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 20 December 1962, p. 7. Ironically, when an Armour plant in Hereford, Texas was threatened with closing early in 1981 a reason was that its national union forced the plant to pay $9.79 an hour while local competitors (Iowa Meat Processors and Missouri Beef at Amarillo, forty-five miles away) earned $7.09 to $7.87. From 1962-1980 Armour closed twenty-five beef operations throughout the country, being forced out by the two companies who in 1980 slaughtered 30 percent of all cattle killed in the United States. Kara Rogge, "Armour plant a problem for Hereford," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 11 April 1981, (morn.), sect. b, p. 2.

\(^73\)Interview with Ted Gouldy.
no mention at all was made of the stockyards and packing plants. The only cattle reference was the Chisholm Trail that a century earlier had gone through the city. Also a Chamber of Commerce bulletin published five years earlier citing attributes of Fort Worth made no mention of the stockyards whatsoever. Numerous persons in the livestock industry believed that the Chamber of Commerce leaders wanted to "write off" the North Side which was becoming dilapidated and crime ridden. Chamber of Commerce leaders wanted to shake the "Cowtown" image for a more modern one. In fact, some North Side residents remember seeing bumper stickers in Fort Worth proclaiming "Nowtown, not Cowtown."

To let the public know that the market did not close when Armour did and to generate some business, fifteen commission firms joined together to promote some special days to celebrate the sixtieth anniversary of the market from

74 W. J. Overman, A Guide to Historic Sites in Fort Worth and Tarrant County (Fort Worth: The Tarrant County Historical Society, 1963). The real Chisholm Trail did not go through Fort Worth, but the cattle trail that did connected with it in Indian Territory. Also "Fort Worth" Chamber of Commerce booklet published in 1958, in Clippings File, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.


76 Interview with Charlie McCafferty, Fort Worth, Texas, 10 November 1979.
13 August to 26 October 1962. They kept forgetting that
the Fort Worth Stockyards Company began in 1893 instead of
1902 when the packers came. On 26 October they held a draw-
ing for a fully-equipped, air conditioned, Chevrolet pickup
truck. The truck remained on display inside the exchange
building during the promotion.77

So despite the loss of one of the Big Four meat packers,
the Fort Worth Stockyards continued as an active market,
mostly because of its special stocker and feeder sales and
its shift to auctions, but it had lost out in volume of
business to the country auctions. A news story proclaiming
the market leaders as of 1963 cited Norfolk, Nebraska, Dodge
City, Kansas, and two Texas auctions in Amarillo and San
Angelo as providing top dollar volume of cattle, hogs, sheep,
and goats.78 In 1965 an article cited Fort Worth as eight-
teenth of fifty-three terminal markets in the nation overall,
but fourth in sheep, seventh in calves, and seventeenth in
cattle.79

77"Public Market Days' Set Aug. 13-October 26 At Fort
Worth, Truck Grand Prize," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 16

78"Two Texas Auctions Among Nation's Market Leaders,"

79Roy Scudday, "Fort Worth Stockyards," Fort Worth, 42
(May 1966):27.
John Lewis, Fort Worth Stockyards Company manager, wanted to reduce commission firms mainly because the stockyards did not generate enough business for all the firms on the market. His position became that on the death or retirement of the owner, that company was no longer in existence. "Any successor would be a new registration, and we will not accept new registrants."\textsuperscript{80} That position constituted another of the things that did not make Lewis too popular on the yards. He had reduced the number of commission firms to sixteen in 1968 and to fourteen a year later. The stockyards company even bought one of the older commission firms, John Clay and Company, and operated it for most of the decade.\textsuperscript{81}

The Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce did not totally abandon the livestock industry, although many stockyards people believed that the city had done so. In 1968 the Chamber came out with "A new plan to recapture the image of Fort Worth, Texas as the livestock center of the Southwest" which it announced in mid-September. The plan called for offering a package of services and financial assistance to any group or individual breeder who wanted facilities for shows and sales of livestock in Fort Worth. The facilities

\textsuperscript{80}J. M. Lewis to John W. Bennett, 26 July 1962, United Stockyards File, Dies Corr., FWSY Co. Coll.

\textsuperscript{81}Interview with office staff, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Fort Worth, Texas, 30 July 1981.
The Chamber of Commerce offered, however, were the barns with judging and sales arenas owned by the city on Amon Carter Square at the Will Rogers Complex on the west side of Fort Worth. The city leased these facilities for one month each year to the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show.82 The programs may have helped Fort Worth's cattle image, but they obviously hurt the Fort Worth Stockyards Company business by attracting away some buyers who would have participated in the stockyards' own stocker and feeder sales.

A nationwide promotion to help the livestock industry took place in June 1968 when the Competitive Livestock Markets Council, composed of representatives of the American Stockyards Association, the Certified Livestock Markets Association, the National Livestock Exchange, and the River Markets Group, declared a "Competitive Livestock Market Month." This promotion became an industry-wide effort to acquaint all elements of the livestock and meat industry with the services available and to show how their

---

82 City of Fort Worth, Contract No. 1947, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Lease - Municipal Buildings West, 14 January 1948. The first twenty year lease which expired in 1967 has been renewed to 1987. The cost is $17,500 for the one month each year. Also "Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce Livestock Promotion Planned," The Cattleman 55(December 1968):64; and "Fort Worth Offers Livestock Sales Facilities At Reduced Rates, Many Free Services In New Program Sponsored by Chamber of Commerce," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 24 October 1968, p. 6.
organizations could help the meat business. The Council repeated the promotion the following June as well.

Market receipts did decline in the 1960's from the previous decade, primarily because of the closing of the Armour plant and the further acceleration of auction markets closer to the source of supply. Efficiency changes upset many oldtime customers and caused resentment. At the beginning of the decade salable receipts of cattle, calves, hogs, and sheep reached 1,378,509; by 1965 the figures had dropped to 580,256, and by 1969 to 355,990. Citing salable receipt figures may appear misleading, however, for in 1965 total receipts reached 1,113,058 and 1969, 1,045,158, but the receipts still had dropped by one million head from the yearly totals of the 1950's.

Another reason for the decline in the local market was that the United States began importing beef from Australia,


85"Salable Receipts at Fort Worth 1939-1979," United States Market News Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth Office, Livestock Exchange Building. For figures for the entire decade and for all the years in which records were kept, see Appendix II.

86"Comparison of Receipts and Disposition of Livestock," Fort Worth Stockyards Company. Copy of monthly report in author's possession for years 1964-1970. Salable receipts differed from total receipts, for some animals simply passed through the stockyards in transit to sale elsewhere.
New Zealand, and Ireland. Cattlemen complained to President Lyndon B. Johnson about their plight in 1964. The Johnson Administration insisted that the imported beef would be used only in school lunch programs and for the needy, but cattlemen believed that this action represented unnecessary government meddling with beef supplies. The problem of imported meat continued throughout the decade. Farmers also complained about the government program concerning feed grains, oil seeds, and the acreage set-aside system. Feeders blamed the feed grain program for high costs of cattle and lamb finishing by placing feed items at artificially high levels. Any program such as the foreign imports or feed supports which hurt cattlemen also hurt receipts and sales at the Fort Worth Stockyards.

By and large, however, the new phenomenon of the 1960's became the expansion of feedlots, particularly in the Texas Panhandle, which accelerated the decentralization process that had made great gains already. In 1956 an estimated 63 feedlots existed in Texas with capacities of over 1,000 head. 88 In 1964 this figure had grown to 207. 89


89 Feedlots are not regulated by the government, so the USDA has no reason to keep accurate records each year. They
Feedlot Directory in 1968 cited 185 entries, representing member feedlots at that time, but only a year later the number had increased to 280.\footnote{90}

One Amarillo banker described the feedlot business as a $6 billion investment in feedlots, packing plants, farms, and other businesses allied with the feeding of cattle.\footnote{91} The abundance of grain plus cooler temperatures in a high and dry area located equally between lucrative East and West coast markets set a favorable scene for the production of beef on the plains of Texas. The \textit{Texas Business Review} estimated that 160,000 cattle were fed in 1955 in Texas, but by January 1969 feedlots held approximately 1,452,000 cattle in the Texas Panhandle.\footnote{92}

The feedlot system made possible more stable supplies of finished livestock allowing the meat processing operation


\footnote{91}James E. Vance, "Lots and Lots of Cattle," \textit{Fort Worth} 46(February 1970):25.

to be streamlined. Smaller, speedier plants located near the major livestock producing areas had a distinct advantage over the older, slower, and larger plants. Getting livestock in the right numbers had always been a problem for meat packers, making their days either feast or famine in supplies. This problem of erratic receipts explained their low profit margins. A decade or two earlier the meat packers depended largely on individual farmers, and often relative small operators for their livestock needs; but by the late 1960's larger percentages of their kill came as a steady flow from large operations.93

What really caused the decline, then, of the Fort Worth market—and other large terminal markets like those owned by United—was decentralization, first toward local country auctions in small towns and then to the large feedlot operations in the heart of the cattle producing areas. Despite the company's massive publicity efforts which seemed to work in the 1950's (possibly only because the decentralization process had not been completed) and which continued on into the 1960's, the stockyards officials at Fort Worth and the other terminal markets could not reverse the trend. Livestock marketing in the United States changed dramatically in the two decades following World War II.

93Ted Gouldy, "New Moves by Diversified Firms to Gain Control of Packers Reported," The Weekly Livestock Reporter, 10 October 1968, p. 4.
Whether the Fort Worth market would have declined quite as rapidly as it did in the 1960's had not a "Yankee" division manager been making drastic efficiency changes which oldtimers resented, will remain a question in the minds of many local observers. At any rate, just "holding on" became the primary task of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company by the end of the decade.
CHAPTER XIII

RENOVATION: LESS CATTLE, MORE PEOPLE

"You mean, they still sell cattle at the stockyards? I thought it closed years ago when the packing plants shut down." Such comments became common in Fort Worth during the 1970's even in areas of the city reasonably near the stockyards district. Just because North Side residents could not smell the distinct cattle "aroma" to which they had become accustomed, they thought that no more cattle, hogs, or sheep ever arrived. Actually, three hundred thousand animals arriving over a period of a year just did not smell as strongly as three million, or even two million.

The man who dealt with the cattle that did arrive who listened to comments of the stockyards' demise was Elmo A. "Mo" Klingenberg who replaced John M. Lewis as division president on 30 July 1971 upon the latter's retirement. Klingenberg grew up on an Illinois farm, studied livestock marketing and animal husbandry at the University of Illinois in the early 1940's,¹ and became associated with United Stockyards in his home state after graduation. David Hunt

¹W. L. Pier to R. C. Ashby, University of Illinois, 23 May 1946, Personal Folder, Pier Correspondence, Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Hereafter cited as FWSY Co. Coll.
of United Stockyards directed Klingenberg to Fort Worth and told him to work there a couple of years. Because immediately after World War II Klingenberg could not find a house to rent, he asked if he could stay longer to make it worth his while to buy a house. A quarter of a century later he remained in Fort Worth.

Klingenberg started at the bottom on 1 February 1946, worked his way up as day yard master, superintendent, vice president, and, upon Lewis's retirement, president. To show that a close loyalty still existed between the stockyards company and the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, Klingenberg also became a director of the latter organization soon after becoming division president of the Fort Worth Stockyards.

"Mo" Klingenberg seemed the strong, silent type of whom Westerners usually approve, dressed the part in his boots and cowboy hat, and certainly had resided in Fort Worth long enough to shed any "Yankee" image, so he did not face the same kind of problems as his predecessor. The altered market

---


3 W. L. Pier to A. Z. Baker, 16 November 1953, American Stockyards Association Folder, Pier Coll., FWSY Co. Coll.

situation he inherited, however, differed drastically from the one he encountered when he had arrived in Fort Worth twenty-five years previously, and so this constituted his real challenge. Things had progressed a little too far for any hope of reversal; he simply had to try to hang on to what he had.

Klingenberg's task was not made any easier by the shutdown of the local Swift and Company plant on 1 May 1971 just two months before he assumed the presidency. The closing at least had been anticipated. Swift announced as early as 1968 its plans to close its all-purpose packing plants and had already ceased operations in Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, St. Paul, and Omaha. In announcing the Fort Worth plant's demise, Swift officials explained that the nearest big livestock growing areas existed in the feedlots of Lubbock, Amarillo, Abilene, and Muleshoe, Texas.5

Union workers at Swift in Fort Worth voted 557 to 244 on 19 April 1969 in favor of another pay cut to keep the plant open until at least April of 1971, and Swift promised to keep the plant operating until that time to provide jobs for a total of 1,130 hourly workers who were members of Local No. 6 of the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse and Dairy

Workers. The workers would get no more cost of living wage increases during the life of their contract which extended to 1 September 1970. Many of the company's employees had been with them thirty-five years or more and would be unable to transfer to other Swift plants.

Then in October 1970 Swift made the "long anticipated announcement" that they would shut down the following spring. Officials cited as factors in their decision their obsolete plant, changing patterns in livestock production and marketing, and the growth of independent packing operations that diversified the meat business.

Obviously, an immediate problem for the Fort Worth Stockyards became the loss of revenue from Swift for the direct livestock shipments of each animal slaughtered under the terms of the 1902 contract. As for other market receipts, several independent buyers had dominated the cattle slaughter market for years, so stockyards officials expected that aspect to be little affected. The independents possessed speedier and more efficient plants and hired cheaper labor than Swift could employ because of its union. Consequently, as

---

7 Ibid., p. 12
9 Ibid.
long as three years after the Swift closing, as many as two hundred thousand animals still were slaughtered each year in the Fort Worth-Dallas area. The demise of Armour and Swift, however, left unemployment and stagnant businesses in the city's North Side, for most of the former employees of the two plants lived in the area.

Unfortunately, fires destroyed the abandoned buildings of both Armour and Swift. The old Armour plant caught fire at 11 p.m. on 11 May 1971 and soon more than one hundred firemen and between thirty and fifty pieces of fire equipment fought the blaze. Heavy wooden floors in the plant had accumulated a great amount of grease through the years, and that caused dense smoke over the area. The floors also smouldered for a long time afterward. The building was a total loss.

Two fires plagued the abandoned Swift building. A brief fire on 11 January 1974 lasted only three hours and involved the fourth and fifth floors of the plant.

---


Apparently a cutting torch used by workmen demolishing the building started it. Thirty-one firemen and eight pieces of equipment answered the call.\footnote{13}{"Torch Is Blamed For Blaze," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 12 January 1974, "Swift File," Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.}

The more disastrous Swift fire started on 30 May 1975 and burned all night. Fire officials again believed that a demolition team's cutting torch started it. The fire burned for two or three weeks because it extended to the basement and tunnel, and no way existed for firefighters to get down there and extinguish it. Oil and grease also had saturated the thick floors.\footnote{14}{Ken Hammond, "Firemen Battle 3-Alarm Swift Co. Blaze All Night," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 31 May 1975, "Swift File," Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library. Again nearly one hundred firemen and twenty pieces of fire fighting equipment answered the call. A portion of this building remained standing as of 1982. The almost total demise of Armour and Swift in Fort Worth might make one wonder what happened to them nationally. In June 1971 the Supreme Court by a vote of four to three approved Greyhound's takeover of Armour and Company which was the nation's second largest meat packer. The government had tried to prevent the sale by calling on the old 1920 Packers' Consent Decree. "Greyhound Warned Against Stock Deal," ibid., 25 November 1969, "Armour File." Also "Greyhound Armour Buy OK'd by Supreme Court," ibid., 2 June 1971. Esmark is the large holding company of which Swift is one of four major areas. (Playtex girdles is another.) Of the original Big Four, Ling-Temco-Vought owns Wilson, and General Host Corporation, which manages Yellowstone National Park, owns Cudahy. Iowa Beef Processors, Inc., in 1982 the nation's largest meat packer, first belonged to Pacific-Holding Corporation, then Occidental Petroleum.}

The decline in receipts at the Fort Worth Stockyards continued during the 1970's. Salable receipts in 1970 totaled 309,852, dropped to 308,173 in 1975 and slumped to...
149,158 by 1979.\textsuperscript{15} By 1980 they increased slightly to 167,428.

At the beginning of the decade, drought conditions hurt the industry, although the dry ranges caused increased marketing in 1971.\textsuperscript{16} That year shippers used the railroad for the last time to haul cattle into or out of the yards. By January 1975 the stockyards decided to spread sales out rather than try to sell all the cattle that arrived on Monday on that one day. The market had been receiving about half their week's receipts by noon Monday, so they spread it out by assigning a number of drafts of cattle which each of the nine commission firms at the local market could sell on each of the four days of sales, Monday through Thursday.\textsuperscript{17} By 1978 only six commission firms remained in business, and the stock pens, which once covered one hundred ten acres, had been reduced to twelve.\textsuperscript{18} Then Farmer-Kutch Commission

\textsuperscript{15}United States Department of Agriculture, Livestock Marketing Service, "Salable Receipts at Fort Worth, 1939-1979," (handwritten records) Fort Worth Livestock Exchange Building, Fort Worth, Texas.


\textsuperscript{18}Worth Wren, Jr., "North Side Area now marketplace instead of slaughter point," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 21 May 1978, "Stockyards" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.
Company became inactive and formally closed out its business on 27 July 1981.

Klingenberg continued many of the same promotional tactics that had proven successful in the past. As of 1971 the special Hereford-Angus feeder calf shows and sales had been going on for eighteen years, and the stockyards planned eleven of the special shows that year. In previous years only seven had been held. To queries of how the market fared in 1972, Klingenberg explained that the increased feeder and breeder shows had helped. He said he was taking a "positive approach on improving and expanding our services at Fort Worth." Surprisingly, he reported that the hog receipts actually had grown after Armour and Swift closed because other buyers increased purchases, and some new buyers appeared.

A change, however, occurred in 1973 concerning the special monthly stocker and feeder shows which the stockyards and the Texas Angus Association and the Texas Hereford Association sponsored jointly. As an economic measure the stockyards and commission companies decided to host the shows themselves rather than pay the fifty cents per animal sold to the two associations for doing the advertising and

providing the ribbons and trophies, for the stockyards people believed the two organizations were not doing as much advertising as previously. Both associations then ceased their co-sponsorship of the sales because they saw no advantage to their organizations to continue the arrangement. Spokesmen of both groups explained that they no longer maintained any association with the Fort Worth Stockyards. "Purebred breeders never sell our cattle at a stockyards anymore, anyway," explained the secretary-manager of the Texas Hereford Association. "We sell at a ranch auction or by special agreement." The stockyards company and the commission companies did their own advertising and continued the special sales with much the same format of ribbons and trophies. "We saw no appreciable difference in the number of animals at the sales," Klingenberg said.

---

20 Interview with Gwen White, Texas Angus Association, Fort Worth, Texas, 2 July 1980. Also interview with Jack Chastain, Texas Hereford Association, Fort Worth, Texas, 19 August 1980. The Texas Angus Association moved its offices out of the Livestock Exchange Building in June 1980 to their own building on the Airport Freeway.

21 Interview with Jack Chastain. The headquarters of the Texas Hereford Association have been located in Fort Worth since the 1940's because the city remained the hub of livestock activity and so many Hereford producers lived nearby. The organization began in San Antonio in 1899 and is the oldest single breed state association in continuous operation in the world. It has approximately 550 members.

22 Interview with Elmo A. Klingenberg, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Fort Worth, 6 August 1981.
On 27 January 1973 the company held its first annual Performance Tested Bull Sale and Chianina Seed Stock Sale at their auction arena with the help of the Aledo Custom Breeders organization.23 Also the Fort Worth Registered Horse sales began on the second Saturday of each month as of 14 September 1974.24 By 1975 the company advertisements proclaimed that "In the last year the Fort Worth Stockyards has moved from a sellers market to a buyers' market attracting buyers with national outlets."25 The "Top Dollar" feeder and breeder sales and shows indeed continued the last Thursday of each month from May to November and by 1982 were in their twenty-ninth year.

Federal regulation always remained a concern in the livestock industry. The only regulation that really affected stockyards during the decade was the 1976 amendment to the Packers and Stockyards Act which made bonding mandatory for commission men at country auction markets and required for the first time that packers who purchased over $500,000 worth of livestock in a year post bonds. Also a farmer or rancher

could obtain a lien or trust against a packer's assets in case the packer failed to pay for the livestock.26

The mid-June 1973 price freeze by the Nixon Administration disrupted the livestock industry which as a result affected the Fort Worth market too. John M. Trotman, president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, said that live cattle prices dropped nearly 30 percent from highs on 17 August 1973. He said it was the largest such decline since 1950 at the beginning of the Korean War. As an explanation Trotman cited seasonality, the price freeze, and then a surplus when the market price dropped lower than the freeze price.27

William J. Kuhfuss, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the organization's fifty-sixth annual meeting in New Orleans on 6 January 1975 expressed concern over recommendations of Congressional leaders for bringing back ceilings on food prices. "Government price ceilings at any level of the food pipeline put a lid on returns to farmers. Livestock producers still find themselves in a loss position due to the effects of the 1973 price controls," Kuhfuss said. Hog and poultry producers had begun a cutback

26 Interview with Mike Pacatte, Packers and Stockyards Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Fort Worth, Texas, 27 July 1977.

in production as the result of depressed prices in the face of high production costs. Cattle feeding operations have been cut severely."\textsuperscript{28} Kuhfuss said that the Farm Bureau Federation was the largest general farm organization in the nation, with 2.3 million member families, and it opposed farm subsidy programs. He continued, "Farmers and ranchers have a right to seek a fair return in the market place and a right not to be dependent on the federal treasury for handouts to supplement family farm income."\textsuperscript{29}

Naturally, all livestock producers did not agree politically. Some feeders sued chain stores and packers, charging that they set prices. Others had no complaints with those who merchandised their products and claimed that the suits damaged the entire industry. Obviously, anything that hurt the industry, affected receipts on the Fort Worth Stockyards as a marketing center for that industry.

Labor unrest also caused problems at the stockyards during the decade. Although the company had enjoyed over thirty years of uninterrupted contracts with its employees, this record was broken on 1 November 1978 when stockyards workers went on strike. Twenty-seven livestock handlers and yard repairmen participated. They wanted a 25 percent raise the


\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., p. 14.
first year of a three-year contract.\textsuperscript{30} United Stockyards sent employees in from other areas to help keep the Fort Worth yards open, and Mrs. Klingenberg even helped out briefly in the yard's weighing duties. The strike ended after about two weeks. The date for a special monthly stocker-feeder sale approached, which became at least one reason for both sides to try harder to reach an agreement. Workers returned to work Monday before the big sale on Thursday.\textsuperscript{31}

Despite decentralization, United Stockyards still believed in the future of central, or terminal-type, livestock markets, for they purchased the stockyards at Omaha.\textsuperscript{32} By 1978 United's eleven public stockyards handled about 30 percent of all livestock marketed through stockyards facilities.\textsuperscript{33} That figure dropped somewhat in the ensuing two or three years, but United's larger stockyards still retained

\textsuperscript{30}"Stockyards strike stalemate goes on," \textit{Fort Worth Star-Telegram}, 4 November 1978, "Stockyards" File, \textit{Fort Worth Star-Telegram} Reference Library. This was the first strike against the stockyards company since 1946.


\textsuperscript{33}Frankie Paulkner, "Fort Worth Stockyards' rejuvenation said combination of imagination, conservatism," \textit{Dallas/Fort Worth Business}, 27 November 1978, p. 5.
an impact on the pricing structure nationally and were quoted frequently, especially Omaha. 34

Further indications that United and its holding company Canal-Randolph believed in their markets was a renovation project begun at the Fort Worth Stockyards in the latter part of the decade. In May 1977 Klingenberg announced a $500,000 renovation program to include moving livestock unloading docks from Exchange Avenue to a new site on the north side of the stockyards, remodeling pens and building new ones, constructing an overhead walkway from the new unloading area to the auction barn and Livestock Exchange Building, installing a new sanitary and storm drainage system, and providing a new parking area for livestock trucks. The project would take six months to complete. 35 In addition, the Stockyards Development Corporation, a subsidiary of Canal-Randolph, announced on 12 December 1977 a $750,000 program to restore the historic Fort Worth Livestock Exchange Building to retain the original architectural style of the forty-five thousand foot structure

34 Interview with Elmo Klingenberg, division president, Fort Worth Stockyards, Fort Worth, Texas, 14 January 1982. The eleven stockyards owned by United in early 1982 included Fargo, N. Dak., Indianapolis, Milwaukee, Omaha, Portland, Sioux Falls, St. Joseph, St. Paul, Stockton, Sioux City, Iowa, and Fort Worth.

and to provide twenty-nine thousand square feet of leaseable office space.36

The commitment of funds from the stockyards ownership came after $2 million in public monies were spent in improvements along Marine Creek and Exchange Avenue as the city of Fort Worth made plans to renovate and restore the stockyards district.37 The stockyards company delayed its own project until drainage and other environmental requirements had been met. Their pen remodeling project basically represented a transition from livestock shipments by rail to modern-day truck transportation. They changed big pens large enough to receive railroad carlots of cattle and calves to pens adequately sized to receive truck shipments from one animal to a semi-trailer load.38 When completed, more than four-hundred new and remodeled livestock pens lay centrally located in an area north of Exchange Avenue. The daily capacity for cattle was between four and five thousand head and up to two

36"Fort Worth Exchange Begins $750,000 Renovation," The Cattleman 64(February 1978):139.

37The renovation project undertaken at the stockyards in the late 1970's by the city of Fort Worth will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 14 along with the federal grants and matching city funds allocated for the program.

38James E. Vance, "Stockyards announces plans for renovation," Fort Worth Star-Telegram (morn.), 11 May 1977, sect. d, p. 7. The last cattle to arrive by rail had been 1971. The changes being made were the same suggestions Professor McNeely of Texas A. & M. had said were needed in 1956.
thousand head of hogs and sheep.39 When the renovation had been completed, the stockyards company sent out news releases to small weekly newspapers all over West Texas, and President Elmo Klingenberg sent a letter to patrons explaining the changes.40 As further evidence of the modernization, in 1979 the company employed women to work in the yards.41

The situation that existed at the stockyards late in 1981 only continued the problems of the seventies. Many Fort Worth residents, even those from the North Side, believed that the stockyards no longer operated as an active market. They assumed that all the renovation had been done because the market had closed and the Livestock Exchange Building was being leased out for office space. They figured that the cars in the parking spaces each day belonged to office workers or tourists. New rumors circulated almost weekly through the exchange building, and stockyards employees would be asked periodically even by commission companies, "Is the stockyards closing down?" With only five commission companies in business in the late summer of 1981, few persons remained to hustle livestock business for the companies or for the stockyards.

39"North Side cattle auctions have a bawl in new quarters," The Observer, 30 April 1978, sect. a, p. 10.

40Letter from Elmo Klingenberg to Stockyards patrons, 6 April 1978, Copy in possession of author.

41Interview with office staff, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Fort Worth, Texas, 19 February 1981. Women had been in the office for a long time but not out in the yards.
For five commission companies to share the cost of 50 percent of any advertising (with the stockyards paying the other 50 percent) each company bore a larger share than when split with twenty-five or thirty commission companies in the old days. Thus the stockyards found it difficult to persuade the companies to cooperate in advertising their market. Sales dropped considerably. The special stocker and feeder sales of the last Thursday of the month generally brought in four thousand animals during the summer months of 1980, but in July 1981—which should have been one of the best months—only twenty-six hundred animals were marketed.

The company began looking at numerous directions to go and checking out various options. With division president Elmo Klingenberg scheduled to retire in the spring of 1982, some change would be necessary. Late in the summer of 1981, Klingenberg allowed Gary Allen of Foley-Allen Commission Company to announce the major change in operations which Allen and his associates had worked out with the Fort Worth Stockyards Company and United Stockyards. The five commission companies remaining on the market agreed to dissolve and create one company. This new company officially registered as the Niles City Cattle Company, Inc. dba Fort Worth Stockyards. This new company which would operate under the old familiar name planned to lease the auction barn, pens, and other yard facilities from United Stockyards, official owner
of the old Fort Worth Stockyards Company. Allen promised streamlined operations, more efficiency, lower rates, and more competitive sales. United agreed to install a new pneumatic tube system to send sales tickets to the office and back to save customers' time, to build a new trailer chute, and to enlarge the pens and watering facilities.\footnote{Public Announcement by Gary Allen, Auction Barn, Fort Worth Stockyards, Fort Worth, Texas, 19 August 1981.}

Allen called the new venture the "most positive thing that has happened in the last twenty-five years" and hoped to turn the trend toward decentralization around. He said that buyers within a 150 mile radius of Fort Worth often had to go to fifteen of the smaller auction arenas in one day to obtain enough livestock to fill their orders. By lowering tariffs up to 40 percent for larger truckloads of livestock, Allen planned to induce more producers to ship to Fort Worth.\footnote{Ibid. The five commission companies still in existence when they dissolved to join with Allen in the new venture were Foley-Allen, Carson, John Clay, Farm and Ranch, and Leon Ralls. Gary Allen had been full time on the yards since 1958 but had been on the yards off and on since age ten with his father and grandfather who began Foley-Allen Commission Company in the 1940's.}

When the "new" Fort Worth Stockyards began operations 1 November 1981, several significant things occurred. After eighty-eight years, a terminal market ceased at Fort Worth, for a terminal market must have more than one commission
company to which to assign cattle, and only one company remained. Also, for the first time in the eighty-eight year history of the company, the market would be managed by local livestock personnel, the men who had composed the last five commission companies to exist on the market. Previous management always had been out-of-state. Perhaps just as important, even though the market had changed management on a lease basis rather than ownership, provisions had been made for the market to continue under the name of the Fort Worth Stockyards.

After Gary Allen and his new company took over the management, mail deliveries became confused between the two companies operating under the same name within the exchange building, for the older company still owned the building and facilities and maintained its office to oversee these interests. Consequently, in January, 1982 the older company changed its office sign and stationery from Fort Worth Stockyards Company, a division of United Stockyards, to United Stockyards, Fort Worth Division, to avoid the confusion.

44 Interview with Dan VanAckeren, United State Department of Agriculture, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Fort Worth, Texas, 16 December 1981. This definition of a "terminal" market is used by the USDA's Packers and Stockyards Administration. The term terminal market originated from one of two practices—the fact that in the old days the large central market was the end of the process because packing houses were located there, or railroad facilities also existed near the stockyards.
Gary Allen in January 1982 remained "well pleased" with the business and income for the first two months, although the winter season constituted the slower period for the market. His only disappointment was that he had not cut labor costs as much as he thought he could. As a result, he considered shortening the seven days a week, twenty-four receiving service for livestock to four days.45

So in 1982 a company calling itself the Fort Worth Stockyards continued to operate in updated and renovated facilities on the city's close-in North Side. Since 1893 the company had undergone three changes of ownership and kept the same name; one more management change would not matter.46 While tourists began to arrive in larger and larger numbers wanting to see a live cow or two, only 150,000 animals passed through the market yearly. Since these animals disembarked from trucks at the north docks several hundred yards behind the exchange building and were sold by noon or earlier each day, it was no wonder that few people in the area ever heard a bawling cow anymore or smelled the distinctive odor that

45 Interview with Gary Allen, president of "new" Fort Worth Stockyards, Fort Worth, Texas, 20 January 1982.

46 The Fort Worth Stockyards Company was reorganized in 1902 to allow two-thirds ownership to go to Armour and Swift. In 1944 United Stockyards bought up all Fort Worth Stockyards Company stock and officially dissolved the corporation, making it only a division of United Stockyards. Then in 1959 a real estate development firm, Canal-Randolph,
once clearly identified the site as a stockyards. People became more visible than livestock on Exchange Avenue by the 1980's.

became owner of United Stockyards and thus also of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company.
A CITY'S HERITAGE

The impact the Fort Worth Stockyards Company and its related livestock industries made on metropolitan Fort Worth and the surrounding area is clear and undeniable; they made a city: Cowtown! DeWitt McKinley, a former mayor, recently stated that "The roots of Fort Worth are on the North Side of that river and I think we would be foolish to neglect or forget the heritage that we have." Although some cultural leaders have remained uncomfortable and ashamed of the cattle image, they soon became overshadowed by those who wanted to celebrate the city's livestock past. Officials placed a Texas Historical Commission plaque on the site of the Livestock Exchange Building in May 1967. A Stockyards Restoration Project became one of the first Bicentennial Projects listed by the Fort Worth Bicentennial Committee and the Texas


Bicentennial Commission. Then on 29 June 1976 the National Register of Historic Places added the stockyards area to its prestigious list.

Relatively little history had been recorded about the North Side area of Fort Worth until a renewal of interest came in the mid-1970's. The lack of historical appreciation probably resulted because most of the blue-collar workers living there had no time or inclination for cultural pursuits. In addition, out-of-state big business interests owned the major industry in the area and remained aloof to preserving local history. Thus most of the city's recorded history reflected the downtown area rather than the stockyards district, even though the latter possibly was more significant. Much interest in preserving the history and heritage of the stockyards began in 1975, however, when Charlie McCafferty decided to form the North Fort Worth Historical Society, mainly when he saw the old city hall of Niles City on Decatur Avenue being demolished to make way for a parking lot. He called the North Side "the heart and the muscle of Fort Worth"

4Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 19 January 1975, "North Side" Folder, Fort Worth Public Library.


6Interview with Paul Campbell, Reference Librarian, Local History, Fort Worth Public Library, Fort Worth, Texas, 28 July 1980.
because the larger city would not have reached its metropolitan size had it not been for the livestock interests of the stockyards district. McCafferty became the first president of the North Fort Worth Historical Society and the group began working to get historical markers for various buildings and locations and cooperating with other organizations to promote the area. In 1978 the Society received a $1,000 grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation to aid its efforts.

A massive redevelopment effort that finally took place in the stockyards district in the late 1970's could not have been done through the actions of the Historical Society or North Side residents alone; they needed the help of the city of Fort Worth to do it. Although the North Fort Worth Business Association had been urging redevelopment for years and had set as their goal "a struggle for rebirth and a halt to decay," it is difficult to determine just when the city of Fort Worth finally became convinced of the need. City officials divided the city of Fort Worth into geographical areas for planning purposes in the 1960's and in 1971 completed the

---


9 Mary Abrego, "A Struggle For Rebirth and a Halt to Decay," Northwest Passage, 7 April 1976, p. 5.
Northeast Sector Plan, encompassing the stockyards area. At that time they recommended that the stockyards be redeveloped to aid the economy:

The core area contains the highest concentration of features which may be restored and redeveloped as a tourist and commercial center. . . . The area's key features are the buildings and industries which have most significantly influenced the Fort Worth economy.\textsuperscript{10}

The North Fort Worth Business Association renewed its efforts, and, in addition, Fort Worth in the 1970's began falling behind Dallas because Fort Worth's rival city down the Trinity could draw more conventions, so Fort Worth had to try to compete. When Fort Worth finally decided to try to redevelop the area to reverse and halt the tide of unemployment and decay, it represented the first really concentrated redevelopment effort undertaken by the city.\textsuperscript{11}

By 1972 the City Planning Department recommended that the effort include industrial parks, residential development, and a public park with emphasis on the historical and cultural significance of the area. They labeled about four hundred acres as the Stockyards Intensive Study Area and made a target effort. The area contained one hundred fifty businesses,


\textsuperscript{11}Interview with Jim Wilson, Economic Development Coordinator for the City of Fort Worth, 1977-1980, Fort Worth, Texas, 6 January 1982.
many of them agri-businesses including the Fort Worth Stockyards Company. Then in April 1972 the Fort Worth City Council appointed a sixteen member Stockyards Area Restoration Committee to supervise the private and public redevelopment of the area. Jack Shannon of Shannon's Funeral Home on North Main chaired the committee. Included were other leading members of the North Fort Worth Business Association. This Stockyards Area Restoration Committee (SARC) in 1973 raised money for an economic feasibility study which revealed the practicality of a redevelopment effort, calling it a "viable venture." A Stockyards Area Redevelopment Office opened 19 July 1974 in ceremonies at the Livestock Exchange Building and Wilford "Butch" Saxton became senior planner on the stockyards project. More than $400,000 in federal renovation

12A map of the area was included in a Letter from Wilmer D. Mizell, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, U.S. Department of Commerce, to Mayor R. M. Stovall, City of Fort Worth, 24 April 1975. Copy in Jim Wilson's Office, City Hall. The area encompassed Meacham Field on the north, Samuels Avenue on the east, Downtown on the south, and a jagged line on the west as far as Rosen.

13Fort Worth, Texas, City Council, Minutes, 3 April 1972, p. 2.

funds from the Economic Development Administration for a Public Works Impact Program were available at that time. Congressman Jim Wright, who later helped obtain additional federal funds, spoke at the ceremonies. The projects at that time consisted of restoring the Marine Creek area, building a park, constructing three miles of bike trails, and renovating the city-owned North Side Coliseum. By 1975 the Economic Development Administration designated the area as a Special Impact Area which allowed for additional federal funding for an overall economic development. The Stockyards Restoration Project at that time officially became a Bicentennial Project for the city.

The Fort Worth Economic Development Policy Board agreed unanimously on 7 June 1977 to recommend the stockyards area receive $2 million in U.S. Economic Development Administration public works funds which the City Council later also approved. The stockyards area, with a 19 percent unemployment rate, topped a list of seven sections of Fort Worth which had high unemployment and could benefit from federally


16Mike Munroe, "Northside Rebirth," Fort Worth 52 (January 1976):22-23

17Fort Worth, Texas, City Council, Minutes, 16 June 1977, pp. 490-91.
financed construction work. The stockyards headed the list because street and sidewalk improvements there coincided with a long-time goal of many persons seeking to rejuvenate a historical city and because it would most benefit the neighborhood. Soon fifteen hundred feet of East Exchange Avenue had a brick surface, which had been the original covering, instead of the asphalt which had been a more recent one. The project also reconstructed sidewalks of several streets in the area and placed decorative antique lighting as well as street furniture and landscaping. Marine Creek from Exchange Avenue to Twenty-third Street also received landscaping.

By early 1978 some $4.4 million of public funds, mostly from the Economic Development Administration had induced nearly $7 million in private investment and created at least 660 new jobs in the area. North Siders even gave a big party in the Horse and Mule Barns on 20 October 1978 to thank

---

18 John Makeig, "Stockyards top fund bid," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 8 June 1977 (morn.), sect. a, p. 13. Mrs. Edward W. Sampson, Jr., who headed the Bicentennial Committee, also served as chairperson of the Fort Worth Economic Development Policy Board.

19 "Fort Worth Stockyard Area Redevelopment Project, Summary of Public Expenditures for the Period July 1974 through September 1978. This chart from the Economic Development Coordinator's office cites a total of $4,409,500 federal expenditures or 90.7 percent of the total and $445,775, or 9.2 percent city, and $5,625 or .1 percent private capital spent on stockyards redevelopment during the years cited."
Congressman Jim Wright for his help. That year the city hired a public relations firm to promote the redevelopment activities. They adopted the Longhorn steer as the logo for the area in all its publicity and advertising. Funds amounting to $4,900 from a National Endowment of the Arts Grant and matching funds from the Fort Worth Junior League, with some additional administrative money supplied by the League, allowed a one-year adaptive re-use study in 1978. Texas Heritage, Inc., the North Fort Worth Historical Society, and the Fort Worth Chapter of the American Institute of Architects also cooperated. They made an inventory of all historically and architecturally significant structures and sites.

---

20 The low-income residential area was predominantly Mexican-American and traditionally Democratic politically. They turned out in large numbers to thank House Majority Leader Jim Wright who seemed to enjoy making a public appearance on horseback just two weeks before election day. City officials agreed that because of Jim Wright's influence Fort Worth received "millions of dollars of funds and grants." Interview with Jim Wilson. The city obtained in all nine construction grants and four planning and staffing grants.

21 "Stockyards Officials Say Unity Necessary," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 12 July 1978 (eve.), sec. b, p. 1. The new steer logo for the stockyards was drawn by Dallas artists which seems ironic since the two cities have been rivals for over a century. Larry Roquemore, "Stockyards Logo job 'bum steer' Ad men say," ibid., 10 July 1978 (morn.), "Stockyards" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.

22 North Fort Worth Architectural/Historical Survey and Adaptive Reuse Studies (Fort Worth: Motheral Printing Co., 1980), pages not numbered. The study recommended that a railroad museum be promoted for the area to take advantage of the lines of track.
of the North Side. Architect Stan Baker chaired the study and Ann Smith worked full time for a year as Project Coordinator. The project produced a collection of realistic adaptive re-use plans of the North Side buildings shown to have historical, architectural, and/or cultural importance. The study suggested restoring the original character of the two block long East Exchange Avenue.

During the spring of 1981 when much of the restoration project using federal and city funds had been completed, over two hundred area residents, businessmen, historical society members, and others gathered to celebrate at a barbecue luncheon in the White Elephant Saloon, and Congressman Jim Wright again spoke. He believed that what had happened in the restoration project on the North Side "depicted the federal government in its very best role." The government had been the catalyst that sparked more improvements that still preserved the area in its historic purity. He predicted a great future for the place where the "Old West will come into its own again."  


25 Speech by Congressman Jim Wright at the White Elephant Saloon, Fort Worth, Texas, 12 January 1981. Notes of speech in author's possession.
The Stockyards Redevelopment Project renewed the entire city's interest in the stockyards area and in the city's Western roots, so in 1977 the Chamber of Commerce sponsored for the first time a Chisholm Trail Roundup. Scattered all over town, events included a Western writers' workshop at Texas Christian University, a roundup ride for several miles from south of town on horseback, and several activities at the Tarrant County Convention Center. The "Chisholm Trail Days" became an anticipated annual event the second weekend in June and moved to the stockyards area where in 1980 it coincided with Flag Day on 14 June. The North Fort Worth Historical Society raised flags on the cupola of the exchange building, at the horse and mule barns entrance, and on all the individual barns in mule alley for the first time in forty years.26

Pioneer Days also continued and gained impetus as more and more Fort Worth residents set aside the last weekend in September each year for the annual festivities which had begun in 1957. Each year it included a Pioneer Days Queen contest, art exhibits, booths of crafts, gift items, ethnic food concessions, a chili cook-off, and beginning in 1978 a "Stockyards Stampede," a 4.5 mile run which became an annual event. All contestants in the Stampede received T-Shirts,  

and proceeds went to the American Cancer Society. Other usual Pioneer Days activities included shootouts, wagon rides, a carnival, Western bands and singers, historic bus tours, and a major parade with riding clubs, bands, floats, and queen contestants. The North Fort Worth Business Association rarely made any money from Pioneer Days, and usually donated about $20,000 to stage it.

Further evidence of an attempt to preserve the city's Western heritage in the stockyards area came in October 1975 when Steve Murrin became manager of the North Side Coliseum, the building the Fort Worth Stockyards Company constructed in 1908 for the stock show. Murrin signed a contract with the City of Fort Worth to lease the structure, created Cowtown Coliseum Consortium, Inc., and restored the rodeo to the North Side on 9-11 October 1975.

---


Murrin's company in 1982 was called Cowtown, Inc.
worked on the yards from 1903 to 1918 for a cattle buyer and later raised cattle. The rodeo, which started its seventh season in the fall of 1981, scheduled a ten-week season opening with the annual Pioneer Days celebration in September each year and another ten-week season from March to May. In March 1979 the Cowtown Rodeo, Inc. became a member of the professional Rodeo Cowboys Association with authority to hold permit rodeos, instead of continuing its amateur status as it had been previously, thereby giving it much more prestige.

With Chisholm Trail Days in mid-June each year, Pioneer Days late in September, and twenty weeks of rodeo each year, the eyes of the city were certain to be focused on the stockyards district more than it had been in recent years.

A continuing attraction which provided enjoyment to tourists and others was the art gallery located in the west wing of the first floor of the Livestock Exchange Building. When a group of local art organizations calling themselves the Committee for an Artists Center sought a place to have an art gallery, they settled on the stockyards area. As of

---

33 "Cowtown Rodeo gains professional status," The Exchange, Quarterly Publication of North Fort Worth Business Association, Spring 1979, p. 1.
1982 the gallery remained in the exchange building, but plans called for the artists to move to the horse and mule barns when those buildings would be soon converted into shops, studios, restaurants, and a shopping mall. Consequently, the artists named themselves the Mule Alley Art Center in anticipation of this move across Exchange Avenue to the mule barns.34

The city government and the federal government cooperated on the renovation of the stockyards district. The North Fort Worth Historical Society sponsored or co-sponsored special events and applied for historical markers, including one honoring the Tom B. Saunders family in Saunders Park on Marine Creek dedicated on 7 June 1981.35 The North Fort Worth Business Association had been promoting the area officially for twenty-six years. Consequently, the success of the stockyards area in its attempt to revitalize itself as a business community dedicated to preserve the Western heritage (if not the actual livestock activity and market receipts)

34Lee Bruner and Mike Kern, "An Analysis of Mule Alley Art Center In the Fort Worth Stockyards Redevelopment Program," (Research Paper, University of Texas at Arlington, 1979), pp. 1-5.

35His family operated the commission company he started until the 1970's. The city of Fort Worth named the newly-landscaped Marine Creek area Saunders Park to honor this prominent ranching family. The North Fort Worth Historical Society hosted the dedication ceremony for both the historical marker and the park the same day. "Tom B. Saunders Family," Essay accompanying Historical Marker application, Tarrant County Historical Commission Files.
depended in the 1980's solely upon the willingness of private businessmen to invest and get involved. The area provided an excellent business community, for it lay within five minutes of downtown Fort Worth. The area promised a potential for industrial growth because little residential expansion existed, a great deal of industry already was concentrated there, and zoning favored industry.

Local supporters anticipated that the major source of private funds would be Canal-Randolph, the New York and London based real estate development corporation. This firm owned United Stockyards, the parent company of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company, and the land along Exchange Avenue where the horse and mule barns and the decaying sheep and hog pens stood. By late 1981, residents anticipated the construction of a big Mule Alley shopping mall, but Canal-Randolph remained publicly non-committed. Artists in the exchange building hoped to move into studios there when the firm completed the project. Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce President Bill Shelton believed that smaller investors who might enter business in the area were holding off and waiting to see what Canal-Randolph would do. "The North Side area must have a


37Interview with Bill Shelton, Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, Fort Worth, Texas, 29 July 1980.
broader base of support than what it has right now," Shelton remarked. 38 When people cite the $7 million in private investment that has been spent in the area, they are including the new building of the North Fort Worth Bank and some improvements at Texas Electric Service Company, which would have come about anyway, so the $7 million is an "inflated figure," he said. 39

Wayne Snyder, president of the Stockyards Development Corporation, a wholly-owned subsidiary of United Stockyards and also of Canal-Randolph company, would make no statement of Canal-Randolph's plans in August 1981, but cited the money the corporation had spent renovating the exchange building and consolidating livestock pens to utilize its land better and free some of it for other uses. He left room for optimism that the huge corporation did indeed intend to develop the area. 40 Thus the "big money" that Chamber of Commerce President Shelton said was needed still just might come in the form of a $10 million or so investment by Canal-Randolph which would include turning the old horse and mule barns of 225,000 square feet into a large shopping mall and possibly

38Ibid.

39Ibid. Brick used to construct the new North Fort Worth Bank building came from the old Swift packing plant.

40Interview with Wayne Snyder, Stockyards Development Corporation, Fort Worth, Texas, 10 August 1981.
the old hog and sheep pens just east of the mule barns into a farmers' market.41

Small businesses which have been in the area twenty or thirty years, such as Ryon's Saddle and Ranch Supplies or M. L. Leddy and Sons Boots, reported an increase in business volume as early as 1976.42 In that year a restaurant chain known as the Old Spaghetti Warehouse spent $3 million to renovate and decorate the old Swift and Company office building and opened a restaurant on 1 June 1976.43 Ellis Aldridge's hat shop on East Exchange Avenue became a popular spot for tourists because one side of his shop once was Lilly's Red Door Saloon. Decorative ceilings and murals still could be seen.44 Mrs. Wanda Brown owned a custom chaps store in the area and sold these items all over the world.45 Joe Dulle managed the White Elephant Saloon, the Lone Star Chili Parlor and Beer Garden, and the Stockyards Drug Store, all of which saw greatly increased business by the summer of 1981.

41Jon McConal, "Stockyards' best days may be yet to come," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 12 August 1978 (morn.), sect. c, p. 1.
45Ibid.
The latest Western-style enterprise to open in the stockyards district in 1981 was Billy Bob's Texas, with 127,000 square feet, billed to be the largest night club in the world, surpassing Gilley's in Houston by a few hundred feet. The night spot, which opened in April, accommodated between five and six thousand customers and brought in well-known country-western singers on most weekends. The club featured live bulls and professional bull riders. The owners renovated a building that the city of Fort Worth built as a horse barn for the stock show over forty years previously.46

Another industry that promoters assumed would bring in money to the area was tourism, for the district possessed three excellent selling points: it was old, authentic, and Western.47 Merchants in the area began trying to sell the idea to local Fort Worth-Dallas residents, conventioneers in both cities, and tourists from wherever, that one should spend an entire day in the area, shopping, sightseeing,

46 Perry Stewart, "The bulls are real at Billy Bob's 'Texas,'" Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Clipping file at Stockyards Redevelopment Office, date clipped off. (1981). After Billy Bob's opened, false rumors spread that the wealthy promoters of the night spot had purchased all the land behind it that was presently in stock pens and that the Fort Worth Stockyards Company had closed.

47 Luther Jackson, "Mall-type shopping center proposed for Stockyards area," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 23 November 1978 (morn.), "Stockyards" File, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Reference Library.
eating, and if it was Saturday and in season, going to the rodeo. So, although the short five-block long Exchange Avenue, including East and West Exchange, once existed as the place to separate the cowboy from his money, by the 1980's it had become the place to induce tourists to spend theirs.

Tourists really started coming by about 1978, and by the summer of 1981 approximately three thousand visitors per month began signing the guest book provided by the North Fort Worth Historical Society in the Visitor Information Center located in the East wing of Cowtown Coliseum. Thus the stockyards area had by the 1980's changed from a major cattle center to a major tourist attraction because of the real history still preserved there and the importance of the market in its boom years.

Catering to tourists partially, and also for the purpose of providing needed protection, beginning in 1978 a Fort Worth police officer patrolled the area on

---


50 Sheila Taylor, "Taking stock of Cowtown's heritage," The Dallas Morning News, 17 October 1979, sect. c, p. 3.

51 "The Heart of Cowtown," Tape-Slide program produced in 1980 by Gary Havard and Don Ryon for the North Fort Worth Historical Society. Starting in the spring of 1981 the historical society showed the twenty minute slide presentation from 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. each Saturday and Sunday. Tape in possession of Gary Havard who shows it for the society.
horseback. Officer J. D. Powers did the honors at first, but by 1981 Leonard Schilling rode his own horses up and down Exchange Avenue, posed for pictures, chatted with visitors, and loved the job. Publicity about the mounted patrol officer even reached England. In fact, the stockyards gets numerous visitors from the British Isles and other foreign countries.

Probably the most prominent visitor the stockyards district hosted after its renovation and revitalization was President Jimmy Carter during his campaign for re-election in 1980 when he spoke to several thousand persons from the steps of the Livestock Exchange Building about a week before the November election. Steve Murrin commented, "Ten years ago you wouldn't bring a house guest to the Stockyards, much less the President."

---


53 Bill Binford, Mayor of Farmers Branch to Carolyn Snyder, 10 November 1980, Clipping File, Stockyards Redevelopment Office. On one day in mid-August 1981 tourists signed the guest book from Britain, Australia, Belgium, Germany, and at least a dozen states. The lady from London was upset, however, because it was afternoon and she did not see any cattle in the pens! Personal observation of author who worked as a volunteer in the Visitor Information Center that day.

54 John Paul Newport, Jr., "FW is sprucing up for President," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, 31 October 1980, pp. 1-2. Carter's visit apparently represented the first time a president had visited the stockyards since ex-president Teddy Roosevelt's appearance in 1911.
The City of Fort Worth became interested in a quality Western museum for the stockyards area, which also would attract tourists. When the director of the Cowboy Hall of Fame in Oklahoma City gave his city council some demands to clean up the area around his museum or he would move, the City of Fort Worth became very interested in relocating the Hall of Fame to the stockyards area. Mayor Woodie Woods sent a telegram to the officials of the museum saying that Fort Worth people wanted to discuss it with them when the Hall of Fame delegation came to Fort Worth for the Stock Show. Chamber of Commerce President Shelton believes that a quality museum of a Western heritage nature would be appropriate and would not conflict with the Hall of Fame in Oklahoma even if it remains there. Such a project would need financing from the private sector, however.

By the 1980's, the city finally began showing an appreciation of its cultural background. Citizens began to realize what many industrial leaders already knew that for over fifty years it represented the heart of the city's economy. Mayor Woodie Woods called the stockyards

55Doug Clarke, "FW man trying to lasso Cowboy Hall of Fame," Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Clipping File, Stockyards Redevelopment Office.


57Interview with Bill Shelton.

area "one of the best assets we have" to attract tourists who want a Western atmosphere.\textsuperscript{59}

Those who have studied the growth of Fort Worth since its beginning in 1849 as a military outpost on the bluff overlooking two forks of the Trinity River cite several stages of development in the growth of the city: military outpost, county seat of Tarrant County, oasis on the cattle trail, coming of the railroad, development as a livestock processing center, development of West Texas oil field, military installation during World War I, and aircraft manufacture and diversified industry.\textsuperscript{60} One writer, however, narrowed the city's growth to four dates which stood out in Fort Worth's first one hundred years: the coming of the Texas and Pacific Railroad on 19 July 1876, the cornerstone of Armour's and Swift's plants on 13 March 1902, the discovery of oil at Ranger on 27 October 1917, and the breaking of ground for Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corporation on 18 April 1941.\textsuperscript{61} In any list of milestones livestock-related items will dominate the first half, and by that time Fort

\textsuperscript{59}Telephone interview with Woodie Woods, former mayor, 19 January 1982. Woods served seven years as councilman and was elected two terms as mayor. He resigned in November 1981.

\textsuperscript{60}Robert H. Talbert, Cowtown-Metropolis Case Study of a City's Growth and Structure (Fort Worth: Leo Potishman Foundation, 1956), pp. 22-23.

\textsuperscript{61}"50 Years Ago Fort Worth Began Flirting With Meat Packers," \textit{Fort Worth} 26(March 1951):32. See also "Fort Worth," \textit{The Cattleman} 33(March 1947):145-46.
Worth had become an important city. An early city promoter stated, "All agree that the factor next in importance to the railroads in conferring prosperity and substantial greatness on Fort Worth has been the creation of a live-stock market through the instrumentality of stock yards and packing houses."62

The livestock industry was the greatest single industry of the nation during the last years of the nineteenth century and until World War I,63 so Fort Worth built its base along with the nation's most important industry, which in the twelve years preceding World War I poured $550 million into the city's economy. During the war a million dollars a week entered the pockets of producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, horses, and mules at the Fort Worth Stockyards.64 Throughout the 1920's and 1930's livestock and meat processing remained "the largest industry of Fort Worth."65


Even late in the 1940's an advertisement for Texas Electric Service Company showed a picture of the "canyon" between the tall buildings of Seventh Street in downtown Fort Worth and said "Cattle Helped Build This Canyon."\(^{66}\) The advertisement continued with information that the West Texas livestock industry, along with oil and farm products, was "the foundation of Fort Worth's business and industrial prosperity."\(^{67}\) Annual payrolls for the Fort Worth Stockyards, the packing houses, livestock commission firms, and traders and dealers in the 1940's amounted to $18 million annually, which did not even include other allied industries.\(^{68}\) Even in the 1950's the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce called "Cattle, grain, and oil" the city's principal corpuscles."\(^{69}\) Writers still claimed by the 1960's that the "Livestock Industry of the Southwest, through its various ramifications contributes more wealth to the economy of the area than any other," citing transportation, feeds, grains, equipment, entertainment, and supplies, and in fact "every phase of

---

\(^{66}\) "Cattle Helped Build This Canyon," Texas Electric Service Company Advertisement, _Fort Worth_ 21(October 1947):6.

\(^{67}\) Ibid.


\(^{69}\) "This is Fort Worth, Texas," _Fort Worth_ 26(November 1951):7.
business from finance to government. ... It would be
difficult to single out any business that is not touched by
the livestock industry and profits therefrom. 70 So even in
a period of the stockyard company's own decline, the city
and the industries that grew from the impetus of the stock-
yards and meat packing continued strongly. Through the
years Fort Worth developed other industries, but according
to Linda Gilliam a business writer, "cattle carried it from
1900 through World War II." 71 As late as 1981 one found
written agreement with the belief that "The cattle industry
is credited with providing the foundation for Fort Worth." 72

So livestock processing and marketing provided THE one
big industry for Fort Worth for at least half its existence,
and the ramifications of that industry still help bring pros-
perity to the city.

In relation to livestock markets nationwide, the Fort
Worth Stockyards ranked favorably as well. It remained the
largest marketing center in the entire Southwest for at least
sixty years of its existence and the largest south of Kansas

70 "A Salute to the Livestock Industry," The Weekly Live

71 Linda Gilliam, "Northside stockyard area weathers hard
times; hopes run high as renovation efforts continue," Dal-

72 "Entertainment--Stock Show," Fort Worth Star-Telegram
Special Section "Star-Telegram Country," 2 August 1981,
sect. j, p. 54.
Soon after its establishment as a packing center, Fort Worth began to challenge the mighty Chicago, and some thought Cowtown might even surpass the Windy City. At some periods Fort Worth tallied second only to Chicago in cattle and calf receipts. To attract hogs, Fort Worth remained as the highest paying hog market in the country for a number of years. By World War I Fort Worth developed into the largest horse and mule market in the United States, which meant the largest in the world, as Fort Worth sold animals to foreign governments for their cavalry. During some months of 1914 more than $100,000 per day changed hands at the Stockyards. The horse and mule market continued to hold up well even into the 1920's. Although receipts of various categories of livestock varied from year to year, Fort Worth generally ranked fifth or sixth in cattle and calves, and often the total receipts of the market made

73T. C. Richardson, "Fort Worth Where the West Begins," Hollands, 54 (February 1935): 29.

74"Fort Worth Now Second To Chicago in Calves Receipts," The Texas Stockman-Journal, 1 January 1908, p. 3.

75"Horse Trade Now Brings In More Than $100,000 Daily," Fort Worth Daily Live Stock Reporter, 5 November 1914, p. 1.

it third or fourth overall, particularly throughout the 1930's. Then by World War II Fort Worth developed as the largest sheep market in the nation and world and remained so during most of the 1940's decade. Quite clearly, then, the Fort Worth Stockyards and meat processing provided the major industry of Fort Worth during at least its first half century, threatened the big market centers of the nation, and ranked high as a market nationally.

Results of this achievement also are of interest. The one most obvious is that it made Fort Worth forever into "Cowtown." Both the trail drivers who came through Fort Worth as a supply stop on their way to markets in Kansas and then the men with vision who brought the railroads, stockyards, and packing plants contributed the title to the frontier community, but the people became determined to keep their Western heritage. Fort Worth later became an industrial giant but retained its image as a Westerner who walked away somewhat from the stockyards district wearing


a cowboy hat and boots. A newspaperman put it well, "We were born 'Cow Town' and as 'Cow Town' we will become immortal."79

One measure of the importance of the livestock market fostered by the Fort Worth Stockyards concerned the other livestock-related industries and organizations that materialized because of it. These include numerous milling firms, many for livestock and poultry feeds, which made Fort Worth quickly the milling center of the Southwest, and it remained the nation's second largest grain center into the 1970's.80 Two of Fort Worth's oldest banking institutions, the First National and the Fort Worth National, originated around the cattle business.81 In the 1970's a new phase of the livestock impact on Fort Worth came from the metropolitan banks going after the financing of the booming feedlot production of beef.82 Several laboratories in Fort Worth experimented

79 "Cowtown," The Cattleman 14 (January 1928):13-14. A Fort Worth boy dating an Oklahoma girl in the 1940's asked her to write him a letter and simply switch "Cowtown" for Fort Worth after putting his name and street address. In that day before zip codes, he got his letter with no delay. Interview with Irene Francis, Fort Worth, Texas, 21 August 1979.


82 James E. Vance and Frank Reeves, "Cattle Industry Triggers $150 million in Earnings," Fort Worth Star-Telegram,
with serums to prevent animal disease, and thus made the city a leader in research and development of animal pharmaceuticals.\(^3\) Other allied industries included boot and saddle makers, manufacturing facilities for cattle trailers, Western apparel shops, and livestock fencing and watering equipment.

Organizations the stockyards either created or fostered at its market included the annual Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show. It has been impossible to put a dollar figure on the economic impact of the show to Fort Worth, but the Chamber of Commerce has estimated more than $100 million spent by visitors during the twelve-day show.\(^4\) The show has been recognized as one of the four major shows of America and is according to Delbert Bailey, the show's publicist, "without a doubt Fort Worth's biggest annual event," with a record


\(^4\)Interview with Delbert Bailey, Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show Publicity Director, Fort Worth, Texas, 11 August 1981.
gate attendance in 1981 of 630,000. It features the largest quarter horse gathering at any livestock show, and is one of the top three rodeos in the nation. The show boasts of being the world's first indoor rodeo, the oldest continuously held annual livestock show in the nation, and its one hundred acres, thirty-nine of which are under roof, comprise the largest municipally-owned facility of its kind in the United States.

Numerous livestock organizations located their headquarters in Fort Worth in the early days because of their close connection with the local market. These organizations include the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, the Texas Hereford Association, the Texas Angus Association, the American Paint Horse Association, and numerous others. The Weekly Livestock Reporter, the largest livestock newspaper in the Southwest, began as the subsidized publication of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company. The 4-H and Future Farmers of America movement in the state benefitted greatly from the pig clubs C. C. French organized from 1909 to 1914.

In addition, the West Texas Chamber of Commerce exists as an organization because the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce

---

85 Ibid. Also "Fort Worth's Ace Stock Show Brings Millions to City," Fort Worth 35 (January 1959): 10.
86 Interview with Delbert Bailey.
started it, largely to develop West Texas towns and communities as a market for Fort Worth and its livestock industry.\(^{88}\) The stockyards also influenced highway construction into Fort Worth to aid the transportation of cattle to their market.\(^{89}\) In the early days the company encouraged new railroad lines into coming to Fort Worth. In addition, the stockyards engineer organized the Tarrant County Water Control District Number 1 primarily to prevent so many disastrous floods in the stockyards area as well as to provide water reservoirs for a growing city.

Despite all the important things the stockyards fostered, it should be remembered that what it did not become may have been important as well. Fort Worth never became the number one market in the country, surpassing Chicago, even though the packers who owned two-thirds of it intended for it to do so when they constructed their most modern plants in the

---

\(^{88}\) R. Wright Armstrong, Amon G. Carter, Jr., J. B. Thomas, and W. L. Pier to Sherman Beasley, 10 June 1952, West Texas Chamber of Commerce Folder, Pier Corr. Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. See also "WTCC May Execute Policy About Face," Clipping in ibid. about 19-20 October 1950 Convention. Also interview with Bill Shelton. The W.T.C.C. was the first regional chamber in the world. "WTCC May Execute Policy About Face."

\(^{89}\) W. L. Pier to J. A. Gooch, 4 February 1959, Chamber of Commerce Folder, Pier Corr., FWSY Co. Coll. Also W. L. Joyce to D. C. Greer, State Highway Engineer, 18 January 1959, Highways Folder, ibid. Also W. L. Pier to Otto Frederick, 21 October 1948, General Corr. Folder, ibid.
heart of the livestock producing area. The reason quite
definitely became the lack of sufficient numbers of hog re-
cceipts at the market to induce other packers to build plants
in Fort Worth. In the early days many promoters predicted
that Fort Worth would become number one, but it did not,
mainly because Texans preferred cattle to hogs. Editor Ray
McKinley explained, "It is generally accepted that packing
houses should kill five head of hogs for every head of cat-
tle." This growth would come to Fort Worth "when the farmers
have been educated thoroughly." Unfortunately, sufficient
farmers never became convinced along those lines. By being
too much "Cowtown" with cattle, Texans limited their own
potential when they refused to accept hogs, the product that
would have made Fort Worth a great packing center in its
early years. After all, the name "Cowtown" is more glamorous
than "Hogtown": Since Fort Worth is allegedly where the West
begins, it also is where the South ends. The Southern culture
apparently still prevailed in East Texas to the extent that
Texans wanted to be gentlemen farmers. They could plant
cotton, and there remained certain parts of the year after


91McKinley, "North Fort Worth Will Be Nation's Meat Market," p. 3.
the crops were in that life eased up a bit. To raise hogs meant one would have to work consistently every day. These Southerners in East Texas did not want to do it. West Texas livestock producers became too tied to cattle for hogs to have any appeal.

Texas would have been the best livestock market in the country, and Texans would have been richer had they raised more hogs. Texas is so wealthy in natural resources, however, that many of her citizens made it anyway with oil, but only after Texans relinquished at least two chances to do it with meat packing—first in the 1870's when they trailed herds to Kansas instead of packing them in Texas, and from 1902 to the 1930's when they would not raise enough hogs for their market.

Federal regulations also had an effect on the Fort Worth market and other large centers as well. The packers' avoidance of buying on terminal markets, i.e., direct buying, and the producers selling to the packers because it was more convenient, remained a major factor in the market decline. Federal legislation contributed greatly to this circumstance. The government through the Packers and Stockyards Act forced the packers to sell their stockyards, railroads, banks, newspapers, and other businesses, although the packers simply created other companies in which they owned the majority of the stock as holders of these interests, for example General Stockyards and United Stockyards. The Fort Worth Stockyards
Company created the Livestock Handling Company to get around new federal regulations, and United bought out the Fort Worth Stockyards because of a provision of a tax law which would make taxes cheaper. Principally because it made stockyards less efficient, in the long run federal regulations ultimately weakened the big stockyards, limited competition among the Big Four meat packers, and allowed unregulated country auctions to flourish. The Fort Worth Stockyards, being a part of the regulated big business, naturally suffered. Changing times demanded new methods of operation, but tradition-bound corporate entities failed to meet the challenge!

Fort Worth's attitude toward big business, in particular toward the Big Two of the meat industry, in the early years consisted solely of praise because of what they did for Fort Worth when the packers brought in their plants and provided the large local market. During later years, however, the attitude of many livestock producers toward the stockyards company changed to antagonism because it remained a part of a big corporation owned by out-of-state investors. This local attitude consequently damaged the market.

Apparently a booming tourist industry in the stockyards district will continue to grow while the livestock market struggles against further decline. Thus citizens of Fort Worth, businessmen of the area, and quite possibly even Canal-Randolph will be happy. The only sad ones are those
oldtimers or traditionalists who will watch the "new" Fort Worth Stockyards, home managed in its leased facilities that still belong to the original company, and hope that it continues to survive.

The original company officials fought untiringly with publicity, stocker and feeder sales, and other promotional tactics, but possibly they fought the wrong fight and should have gone with the trend toward decentralization and organized branches of the company at the local auctions.

Boston money organized the Fort Worth Stockyards Company in 1893, and Chicago money expanded the market in 1902 when the packers came, but one must not forget that the market nevertheless became uniquely Texan. That too may have contributed to its decline; Texans sometimes are too ruggedly individualistic and independent for their own good.\(^{92}\) The commission companies often behaved that way. They complained about the Fort Worth Stockyards Company as the big business absentee owner that it was and retained their own independence in their businesses. Realistically, however, the commission companies needed to cooperate more than they did with the company and defend criticisms of it, especially in the 1970's and early 1980's, because they both sought an identical

\(^{92}\)This writer, being a Texan, would not really have wanted or expected fellow Texans to behave any differently than their own nature which nature she shares!
goal--more business for their market. The commission agents, however, resented the way the stockyards continued to behave as the "top dog" even after the company ceased being number one in the Southwest because of the country auctions. Farmers and ranchers also acted too ruggedly individualistic and tied to tradition, and as a result limited themselves and their own market in the long run. In the early days they would not raise hogs instead of cattle. Then in the 1950's and 1960's they ceased to sell at the terminal market where volume could set higher competitive prices with the federal government as the referee between them and the packers.

Being Southwesterners, in part both Southern and Western, the livestock producers who became the customers of the Fort Worth Stockyards influenced it greatly just as its existence altered much more than just Fort Worth's history and destiny. The Fort Worth Stockyards Company may have been owned and managed by outside interests during its first eighty-eight years of existence, but what shaped a big part of its unique development were its customers who behaved like stubborn Texans and proud Westerners. That is the real story of the company and the livestock legacy it bequeaths to the city of Fort Worth--Western--and Western means cattle, not hogs!

93 Interview with Charlie McCafferty, Fort Worth, Texas, 12 August 1981.
APPENDIX I

To understand a typical day at the Fort Worth Stockyards in its heyday with twenty thousand assorted livestock milling about in pens, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association inspectors in their Stetsons checking for stolen animals, Packers and Stockyards Administration officials enforcing regulations, producers turning their livestock over to their favorite commission firm who then by private treaty dealt with packer representatives, other order buyers, and speculators, one needed to know certain terminology. Some words seemed to be more slang than accepted dictionary usage, but most terms cited below represented expressions common during the 1940's and the decades prior to that.

account of sale—a form completed by the commission company that indicated all the transactions in connection with the sale of a consignment of livestock. It showed all deductions, charges, and other information used in figuring net proceeds to the shipper.

baby beef—steers fifteen months old or under that had been under forced feeding from birth, weighing 950 pounds and under.

beef bulls—mature bulls of one of the three beef breeds that usually weighed above 1200 pounds and carried a fair amount of flesh. Good and choice kinds were mostly the heavier bulls scaling above 1300 pounds. Commercial bulls lacked conformation, smoothness, and finish.

beeeves—actually, plural term for beef, generally used to mean cattle.

belts—Hampshire hogs
bloom—spoken of as having bloom or lost their bloom; said of lambs showing milk fat or just losing it.

bob veal—flesh of an unborn calf from slaughtered cow: prematurely born or very young calf; unmarketable.

bologna bulls—generally dairy breeds or old bulls of beef breeds that were not too fat, but carried some flesh. Suitable for sausage meat only. Weighty lean kinds above 1500 pounds were usually the most desirable and the highest sellers, while lighter bulls and those lacking breeding were graded lower. Common and inferior kinds lacked weight, flesh, and conformation.

bow-wow—a small stunted aged steer with no quality, unsuited either for beef or feeder purposes; utilized sometimes as canners or cutters; same as "tripe" or "canner yearlings."

broken mouthed—aged ewes or sheep that had lost some of their teeth.

broker firm—a clearing house for traders and speculators that handled business connected with clearance for the trader. It put up loans and furnished the necessary bookkeeping services for a stockyards speculator not connected with a particular firm. Generally a broker charged a flat rate per head for the services of his office.

brushers—goats used for clearing brush land.

burry—sheep whose fleeces carried the burrs of various weeds; usually sold lower because of damage to wool.

bust—a hog that was ruptured.

butcher barrows and gilts—barrows or gilts of any weight which were sold for slaughter.

butcher bulls—well-bred young bulls usually of one of the three beef breeds weighing generally from 900-1100 pounds; usually showed some effects of grain feeding and carried good smooth finish. Sold in a wide range of prices, depending upon weight, condition, and current demand.

butcher cattle—one that was intended for immediate slaughter or that was more suitable for slaughter than for any other purpose. Butcher cattle grades were prime, choice, good, commercial, and utility.
cake fed—stock which were pastured and given a supplementary feeding of compressed protein cubes made from high protein meals such as cottonseed, peanut, or soybean meal.

canner cows—old, thin cows from which the meat was "boned out" for sausage and canned food products; also called strippers by packers.

cash, v.—to sell; to exchange for money.

catch sales—sales made above the present market.

central market—also called terminal market, one that was open on an equal basis to everyone who desired to buy or sell livestock. It was federally regulated and supervised under the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 and the stockyards company provided facilities and services, but did not buy or sell livestock for its own account or as the agent of others. At the central market the livestock selling function, for the most part, was performed by independent market agencies known as commission companies.

chicken eater—a hog that was thin.

chopper—aged ewes in medium flesh, not good enough to grade as fat.

classes of cattle—the market class for any kind of livestock was determined by its sex or sex condition. The classes for cattle were steer, heifer, cow, bull, and stag.

clipped—shorn; descriptive of sheep or lambs after the wool had been removed.

coasters—Texas cattle raised in counties bordering on or near the coast of the Gulf of Mexico.

cold-blood—an animal that did not take on flesh easily.

Collies—Colorado cattle.

comebacks—lambs returned to market from which they had previously been shipped for feeding and fattening.

commission company—a market agency which represented the shipper in the sale of livestock and who also bought livestock on order for its customers. The commission firm did not take title to the livestock and its only revenue was the commission it received for the sale and/or the purchase of livestock.
condemned—an animal that government inspectors had pronounced unfit for food; to be slaughtered and sent to the fertilizer tanks.

do-co-op—shipment with two or more owners with distinguishing marks.

counterfeit—cattle of good color giving impression of good breeding that they did not possess. Example, Hereford markings, but lacking Hereford conformation and quality.

cow market—could be a general term in reference to all kinds and grades of cattle, or it could refer specifically to cows.

crampy—hog that walked to scales slow and stiff in joints and muscles.

crip—an animal that had been hurt or crippled.

cutbacks—lambs that had been cut out of a bunch when buyer got a percentage cut; the ones which did not come up to contract.

cutter cows—aged beef or dairy-bred cows in thin flesh. The loins, ribs, and other better cuts could be sold as fresh meat in retail stores, while the other parts of the carcass were boned out for sausage or canned meat; one grade better than canners.

deacon—a young calf, a veal; a calf too young for food.

dealer or trader—meant any person not a market agency, engaged in the business of buying and/or selling in commerce livestock at a stockyards either on his own account or as the employee or agent of another. The dealer took title to the livestock he bought and his only revenue came from an increase in price and/or weight of his livestock.

direct buying—meant that packers or their representatives purchased directly from livestock producers either out in the country or at special receiving areas near their slaughtering operation, rather than through a central or terminal market.

dockage—shrinkage, a specified weight reduced from stags and pregnant sows. On sows the dock was forty pounds, on stags, seventy pounds.

dogey—small common-bred cattle native to the Southern states, sometimes called "yellowhammers" on the St. Louis market.
dogs—very poor inferior animals, canners.
dopey—hog that was droopy, dumpy, or possibly sick.
downer—an animal that for any reason could not keep on its feet; crippled.

drift—loss in driving or shipping stock; shrinkage.

feeders—animals intended for intensive feeding in preparation for slaughter or those that were more suitable for that purpose than for any other; also animals on feed. Stocker and feeder grades were fancy, choice, good, medium, common, and inferior (cull).

feedlot operation—a practice that had existed previously but expanded rapidly in the 1960's whereby businessmen concentrated cattle in large pens holding thousands of cattle and fed them grain until ready to sell them for slaughter.

freemartin—heifer born twin with a bull, imperfectly sexed and barren as a rule.

governments—animals thrown out by government inspectors. They might or might not be finally condemned as unfit for food.

grades of cattle—the final subdivision in a classification for marketing any kind of livestock and indicated the relative degree of excellence of an animal or group of animals. The number of grades varied with the different kinds, classes, ages, and weights of livestock and with the purposes for which they were to be used.

grades of hogs—hogs were not graded as closely as cattle but the following grade terms did apply: choice, good, and fair or medium.

grass-bellied or pot-gutted—from the fact that a "dogie" when deprived of milk became big-bellied from eating grass.

grassy—cattle fed on range or pasture alone.

grossy—finished calves or baby beeves that had produced too much growth so as to give them a steer appearance.

gummers—old ewes which had lost their teeth; a class better than broken-mouths, always carried more flesh.

gummies—old sheep whose teeth are partly gone or worn out.
handy weight—barrows or gilts which fell into the weight range that was being demanded by buyers, usually around 190-240 pounds, or beef cattle averaging around 1100 to 1300 pounds.

hard feeder—an animal that could not be fattened properly.

hat racks—Nellies, old thin cows.

heiferette—a large heifer or a young cow that was barren or for some reason had not had a calf and was smooth and straight, was carrying a rather high degree of finish and showed little if any udder development. Occasionally cows that had produced a calf but had dried up well and showed very little udder development were called heiferettes.

heretics—calves that were too big for veal and not big enough for beef; inbred cattle between the veal and yearling age, weighing generally 150 to 300 pounds.

holdovers—stock not sold on the day of arrival, leftovers, stale receipts, the opposite of fresh receipts.

horsey—an animal plain in quality, coarse and larger than the types of animals demanding top price, usually under finished.

hot house lambs—very early spring lambs marketed in advance of the general run of spring lambs.

in-between kinds—stock that did not easily fit into any one class. For example, cattle that were too fleshy for feeders and hardly good enough for beef. If corn fed they might be described as "warmed-up" or "near-beef."

infusion—that which is introduced, added, or mixed. For example, there might be an infusion of Shorthorn blood in ranch steers.

integration—the packer practice in recent decades of getting into the feedlot business to assure himself of a continuing supply of animals at the grade and weight he needed to please his supermarket customers.

jackpot—mixed cattle, usually of common quality.

killer—a packer; anyone who slaughtered meat animals.

killing cattle—cattle in the condition to be profitably slaughtered.
kosher—clean, lawful, as kosher meat for animals slaughtered according to Hebrew or Talmud law. Kosher buyers were those who bought for the kosher trade or kosher cattle, those bought for the kosher trade.

lead goats—goats trained to lead sheep which because of their habit of bunching up and running in circles could hardly be driven through an alley without such a leader. Also called "Judas goat" when he led them to slaughter.

livestock exchange—an association of commission companies organized to promote uniformity in the customs and usage at a market; to inculcate and enforce correct and high moral principles in the transaction of business; to inspire a confidence in the methods and integrity of its members; to provide facilities for the orderly and prompt conduct of business; to facilitate the speedy and equitable adjustment of disputes, and, generally, to promote the welfare of the market.

long-fed cattle—cattle that had been on corn or other concentrated feed a sufficient time to make finished beef, six to nine months or longer.

market agency—any person engaged in the business of buying and/or selling in commerce livestock at a stockyard on a commission basis or furnishing stockyard services.

mast hogs—hogs fattened on acorns and nuts, principally in the South.

mongrels—scrubs; animals with unknown or poor ancestors.

Montanas—cattle raised in Montana.

near packer—an animal very near a packer, but still a right good kind only slightly rough. Generally sold 25 to 50 cents per hundredweight better than packers.

Nellies—canners, because they were so thin they were only good for canned meat.

nurse cows—milch cows that furnished additional supplies of milk for feeding calves not their own to give better flesh and finish.

old-crop lambs—last years' lambs that were ready to shed baby teeth. They were between new-crop lambs and yearlings. The classification was for butchering and feeder purposes.
order buyer—a market agency whose function was to buy livestock on an agency basis for a principal. The order buying firm did not take title to the livestock and its only source of revenue was the order buying tariff. Commission companies also provided order buying service for their customers.

outs—inferior grades, usually short on weight as well as quality and might be crippled by disease or injury.

packer buyer—a buyer who represented a slaughtering firm such as Armour or Swift. He bought with an eye for the dressed carcass and the quality of meat the animal would produce. He could estimate the percentage yield of the carcass and give the weight of the animal to within ten pounds after dress.

packers—sows that because of age, weight, or quality were not suitable for use as fresh meat and therefore were made into pickled, canned, or processed meats.

Packers and Stockyards Administration—the agency created in 1921 by the Packers and Stockyards Act. Its representatives enforced fair practices at stockyards and the agency approved any increase in service charges or tariffs. In 1958 small country auctions came under the jurisdiction of the Packers and Stockyards Administration for the first time.

package or packet—a consignment of from one head to less than a carload.

Panhandles—cattle raised or matured in the Panhandle section of Texas.

paunchy—too big a stomach from fill, etc.

peewees—small stunted pigs or lambs.

pelter—ewe or sheep so old as to be of no value other than for its pelt.

pen holder—an animal left in a pen to hold it and keep other cattle from being turned into it.

pigs—usually applied to animals weighing under 140 pounds.

plant—livestock placed by a yard trader for resale.

price basing point—If a market had sufficient volume, it was a price basing point. If it did not, then whatever happened on that market was only of local significance.
private treaty—referred to the method of buying and selling on central or terminal markets through use of commission companies or order buyers rather than by auction.

public auction—a sale of livestock to the highest bidder after livestock was shown in the auction ring. At some auctions buyers had to be registered and bonded before they could bid. The country auction phenomenon multiplied in Texas in the late 1940's and 1950's.

pumpkin seeds—small inferior class of calves with no quality, unfit for veal or feeding.

quarantine division—section of the yards set apart for stock that for some reason had to be segregated, often for tick dipping.

rail splitters—hogs that were built on a long frame with long noses and impossible to fatten.

rannie—common Southern calves of poor quality.

reactors—cattle that react to a tuberculin test.

running—going to market, especially in rather large quantities.

sappy—lambs freshly taken from the ewes and carrying milk fat; generally marketed at about four months of age.

scalawags—shells, stock that was thin and emaciated.

scale ticket—filled out by the weighmaster, it showed the weight of the animal or animals, the price, the name of the seller and the buyer and the name of the commission company handling the sale. It was from the scale ticket that the remittance to the shipper was figured. Title changes from the seller to the buyer the moment that the weight is stamped on the scale ticket.

scratch top—one particular load that happened to sell higher than anything else.

seedy belly sow—old and rough sows that had been used as brood sows.

shambles—slaughter house, a meat packing plant.

shee stuff—cows and heifers.
shells—poor and thin stock.

shelly—a cow brute that was very thin and would weigh less than she looked.

shrinkage—weight an animal might lose between the time it left the pasture and finally was sold because of lack of water or sufficient feedings, etc.

skin—very thin and common hog.

skip—a light, trashy, common pig or lamb.

slow hog that was poor on foot, probably had been crippled and recovered.

slunk—a prematurely-born animal, unmarketable; bob-veal.

soft and oily—meaning the flesh was soft and fat; oily layers of fat on hogs which were fed peanuts, cotton hulls, etc.

sold "subject"—meant that an animal might be sold at a certain price, subject to a post mortem inspection or sold subject to the inspection with the value to be determined after slaughter. If the animal was found to be unfit for human consumption, the shipper received only salvage or tankage price for it.

spayed heifer—a heifer unsexed by removal of ovaries; has scar in front of left hip.

springer—a cow due to freshen.

stale—stock that had been held over on the yards for several days or a week; often applied to stocker and feeder cattle.

standardized cattle—cattle raised by a breeder who had a reputation for producing uniform quality cattle.

stag—a male that had been used for breeding purposes before castration; generally heavy and rough, showing the appearance of masculinity in the head and shoulders; subject to 70 pounds dock because the fore shoulders are so hard.

stock bull—a bull that had been used for breeding purposes.

stock calf—a calf with blocky form of body usually with at least one ancestor belonging to one of the beef breeds and purchased at about weaning time in the fall to be matured into a fat yearling six or twelve months later.
stockyards company—any company which was engaged in the business of operating a stockyards and which furnished facilities for marketing, feeding, watering, holding, delivery, shipment, weighing, and handling livestock. The stockyards company did not participate in either the buying or selling of livestock and its only source of revenue was the small yardage charge that was collected on each animal coming through the market.

strippers—canners. The meat must be stripped off the bone.

suspects—hogs which were suspected by government antemortem inspector as having some disease, as cholera, pneumonia, etc., and probably would not pass inspection. This causes the buyer to take these animals subject to government inspection.

tail-end—that which was left after the more desirable individuals had been sorted out of a drove; the poorer animals.

tariff—schedule naming charges for marketing of livestock and for buying and selling livestock, services to be rendered and definitions of pertinent terms. This schedule had to be approved by and on file with the Secretary of Agriculture.

T-B's—cattle that had been found to be reactors by the tuberculin test.

terminal market—central market; called "terminal" because it represented the last stage in the marketing of livestock if slaughtering plants existed at that market; also often railroad terminals existed at the market.

thin—an animal very poor in flesh, regardless of weight.

through stock—stock received and counted in the day's run but not offered for sale, being consigned to other points.

throw outs—animals of any kind thrown or sorted out of a bunch of stock because of some defect.

tops—the best or the pick of the herd or block; opposite to culls or tailings.

truck waybill—document furnished by the stockyards company and filled out by the shipper or his representative which showed ownership of the animals, brands, or marks of identification; commission company to which animals were consigned; date and time of arrival at market; trucker's name and other pertinent information concerning the livestock. The waybill served primarily as a receipt for the shipper and as a
positive means of identifying the livestock. It was made in triplicate with one copy going to the shipper, one copy going with the animals to the commission firm, and the other copy staying with the stockyards company for a permanent record.

two-way cattle—cattle that might go either to the slaughter because they had enough flesh on them or back to the farm for further finishing. They usually were wheat pasture or grass fat cattle.

ups and downs—any kind of stock in a bunch that some were large and some were small.

warmed up—thin cattle that had been on corn feed just long enough to show feed effects, but not long enough to be desirable beef.

washed up—descriptive of feed such as new grass or other freshly grown vegetation that had a clearing effect upon the digestive tract but did not make good hard flesh; applied to animals fed on such feed; soft; green.

weigh-back—an animal sold and weighed up with other stock but cut out and weighed back to the seller, because of some imperfection or injury.

wet cows—cows being suckled; cows that did raise a calf during the current season.

wooden—cattle that would not fatten.

yearlings—cattle or sheep beyond the calf or lamb stage and under the two-year-old class.

yellowhammer—dogey.

Yorker—a hog weighing 160 to 190 pounds, very smooth and choice; a type very popular with New York City butchers.¹

¹"General Market Terms and Definitions," Miscellaneous Folder, Pier Correspondence, Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas. Also "Stock Yards Slang," The Cattleman 16 (December 1929):41, and ibid., (April 1930):42. See also Edith Wharton Taylor, Money on the Hoof—Sometimes (Fort Collins: Old Army Press, 1974), pp. 113-15.
# APPENDIX II

## Total Livestock Receipts at Fort Worth Stockyards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Calves</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Horses &amp; Mules</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>29,411</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>86,480</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>121,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>375,779</td>
<td>70,999</td>
<td>150,527</td>
<td>125,322</td>
<td>10,094</td>
<td>732,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>549,772</td>
<td>93,022</td>
<td>280,840</td>
<td>103,650</td>
<td>17,895</td>
<td>1,045,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>663,660</td>
<td>148,427</td>
<td>462,766</td>
<td>125,270</td>
<td>18,033</td>
<td>1,418,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>603,615</td>
<td>234,269</td>
<td>550,661</td>
<td>97,514</td>
<td>21,303</td>
<td>1,507,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>707,631</td>
<td>314,442</td>
<td>486,679</td>
<td>112,853</td>
<td>18,507</td>
<td>1,640,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>839,774</td>
<td>229,591</td>
<td>702,844</td>
<td>120,489</td>
<td>12,435</td>
<td>1,905,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>883,353</td>
<td>314,022</td>
<td>868,333</td>
<td>188,006</td>
<td>20,732</td>
<td>2,274,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>784,987</td>
<td>285,545</td>
<td>541,190</td>
<td>162,980</td>
<td>34,445</td>
<td>1,809,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>690,840</td>
<td>192,713</td>
<td>556,201</td>
<td>186,535</td>
<td>37,361</td>
<td>1,663,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>775,321</td>
<td>263,958</td>
<td>387,579</td>
<td>283,914</td>
<td>49,025</td>
<td>1,759,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>965,525</td>
<td>219,629</td>
<td>403,761</td>
<td>327,527</td>
<td>56,724</td>
<td>1,973,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>990,763</td>
<td>185,536</td>
<td>515,003</td>
<td>407,796</td>
<td>47,712</td>
<td>2,146,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>794,505</td>
<td>149,926</td>
<td>463,879</td>
<td>363,003</td>
<td>53,640</td>
<td>1,824,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>905,345</td>
<td>175,177</td>
<td>966,024</td>
<td>430,911</td>
<td>79,209</td>
<td>2,558,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1,646,110</td>
<td>313,427</td>
<td>1,062,021</td>
<td>405,810</td>
<td>115,233</td>
<td>3,542,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1,384,594</td>
<td>280,515</td>
<td>762,486</td>
<td>334,596</td>
<td>78,881</td>
<td>2,841,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1,031,343</td>
<td>235,292</td>
<td>588,004</td>
<td>453,292</td>
<td>60,363</td>
<td>2,368,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>875,476</td>
<td>258,847</td>
<td>412,637</td>
<td>393,927</td>
<td>45,362</td>
<td>1,986,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>572,496</td>
<td>410,903</td>
<td>382,348</td>
<td>357,094</td>
<td>13,086</td>
<td>1,735,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>759,927</td>
<td>324,274</td>
<td>510,362</td>
<td>324,870</td>
<td>28,610</td>
<td>1,948,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Calves</td>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Horses &amp; Mules</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>946,553</td>
<td>311,376</td>
<td>485,895</td>
<td>385,780</td>
<td>58,437</td>
<td>2,188,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1,048,966</td>
<td>342,559</td>
<td>392,414</td>
<td>372,515</td>
<td>46,071</td>
<td>2,202,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1,059,983</td>
<td>309,815</td>
<td>312,019</td>
<td>314,234</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>2,030,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>943,774</td>
<td>240,871</td>
<td>217,139</td>
<td>445,208</td>
<td>27,343</td>
<td>1,874,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>956,135</td>
<td>330,305</td>
<td>338,055</td>
<td>444,541</td>
<td>42,555</td>
<td>2,111,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>885,902</td>
<td>325,217</td>
<td>431,635</td>
<td>457,788</td>
<td>43,429</td>
<td>2,143,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>761,798</td>
<td>327,334</td>
<td>401,740</td>
<td>539,687</td>
<td>42,304</td>
<td>2,072,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>637,513</td>
<td>331,443</td>
<td>279,331</td>
<td>432,082</td>
<td>27,047</td>
<td>1,707,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>597,586</td>
<td>243,368</td>
<td>216,347</td>
<td>1,173,326</td>
<td>13,052</td>
<td>2,243,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>444,061</td>
<td>209,097</td>
<td>255,202</td>
<td>1,197,570</td>
<td>16,730</td>
<td>2,122,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>416,975</td>
<td>223,070</td>
<td>497,873</td>
<td>778,806</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>756,619</td>
<td>381,017</td>
<td>403,716</td>
<td>596,616</td>
<td>30,240</td>
<td>2,168,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>749,227</td>
<td>368,661</td>
<td>290,505</td>
<td>646,664</td>
<td>47,485</td>
<td>2,102,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>657,650</td>
<td>373,865</td>
<td>372,004</td>
<td>609,733</td>
<td>51,867</td>
<td>2,065,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>908,677</td>
<td>491,890</td>
<td>350,637</td>
<td>1,280,807</td>
<td>44,010</td>
<td>3,076,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>763,774</td>
<td>448,785</td>
<td>278,614</td>
<td>1,378,268</td>
<td>33,460</td>
<td>2,902,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>620,062</td>
<td>422,041</td>
<td>355,111</td>
<td>938,729</td>
<td>30,570</td>
<td>2,366,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>523,748</td>
<td>377,034</td>
<td>446,960</td>
<td>1,085,610</td>
<td>27,510</td>
<td>2,160,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>590,784</td>
<td>372,358</td>
<td>519,967</td>
<td>906,379</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>2,411,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>829,832</td>
<td>404,659</td>
<td>647,818</td>
<td>1,367,123</td>
<td>21,783</td>
<td>3,271,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>879,685</td>
<td>377,050</td>
<td>1,001,484</td>
<td>2,098,479</td>
<td>26,649</td>
<td>4,383,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1,046,116</td>
<td>482,068</td>
<td>1,092,086</td>
<td>2,657,226</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,277,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,078,633</td>
<td>565,825</td>
<td>492,119</td>
<td>2,714,414</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,850,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>923,344</td>
<td>505,548</td>
<td>580,930</td>
<td>2,337,668</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,347,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1,083,412</td>
<td>474,153</td>
<td>728,189</td>
<td>1,770,614</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,056,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>868,892</td>
<td>337,036</td>
<td>812,742</td>
<td>1,593,146</td>
<td>16,407</td>
<td>3,628,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>634,245</td>
<td>251,072</td>
<td>638,518</td>
<td>952,090</td>
<td>12,855</td>
<td>2,488,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>584,633</td>
<td>279,556</td>
<td>717,106</td>
<td>1,068,003</td>
<td>8,916</td>
<td>2,658,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Calves</td>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Horses &amp; Mules</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>638,583</td>
<td>350,823</td>
<td>800,245</td>
<td>869,399</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>2,666,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>766,927</td>
<td>297,578</td>
<td>796,951</td>
<td>920,006</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>2,785,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1,013,390</td>
<td>313,092</td>
<td>543,317</td>
<td>960,290</td>
<td>2,602</td>
<td>2,832,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>894,631</td>
<td>275,166</td>
<td>507,942</td>
<td>1,083,198</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>2,762,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>818,077</td>
<td>222,605</td>
<td>651,817</td>
<td>1,137,193</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>2,830,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>912,272</td>
<td>244,210</td>
<td>678,599</td>
<td>1,169,859</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>3,005,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>610,908</td>
<td>187,370</td>
<td>567,107</td>
<td>919,515</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>2,285,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>424,873</td>
<td>166,529</td>
<td>225,633</td>
<td>943,006</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,760,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>458,963</td>
<td>160,711</td>
<td>430,552</td>
<td>1,074,897</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>2,126,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>482,947</td>
<td>103,109</td>
<td>128,147</td>
<td>664,306</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,378,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>413,620</td>
<td>67,695</td>
<td>97,714</td>
<td>715,783</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,294,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>329,262</td>
<td>68,179</td>
<td>82,684</td>
<td>734,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,214,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>294,354</td>
<td>84,680</td>
<td>73,543</td>
<td>432,134</td>
<td></td>
<td>884,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>315,759</td>
<td>105,698</td>
<td>253,173</td>
<td>624,539</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,299,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>281,648</td>
<td>104,875</td>
<td>230,216</td>
<td>496,319</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,113,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>236,309</td>
<td>112,419</td>
<td>211,597</td>
<td>429,402</td>
<td></td>
<td>989,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>209,950</td>
<td>121,606</td>
<td>283,511</td>
<td>557,481</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,172,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>195,343</td>
<td>120,934</td>
<td>388,774</td>
<td>447,522</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,152,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>169,791</td>
<td>122,035</td>
<td>360,650</td>
<td>392,682</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,045,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>140,660</td>
<td>109,809</td>
<td>301,828</td>
<td>354,048</td>
<td></td>
<td>906,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>121,145</td>
<td>102,054</td>
<td>180,251</td>
<td>143,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>547,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>122,457</td>
<td>96,497</td>
<td>74,428</td>
<td>17,378</td>
<td></td>
<td>310,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>129,510</td>
<td>83,798</td>
<td>64,642</td>
<td>11,647</td>
<td></td>
<td>289,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>130,464</td>
<td>81,995</td>
<td>80,421</td>
<td>10,177</td>
<td></td>
<td>303,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>189,810</td>
<td>90,045</td>
<td>84,381</td>
<td>7,106</td>
<td></td>
<td>371,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>123,018</td>
<td>80,795</td>
<td>76,674</td>
<td>5,373</td>
<td></td>
<td>285,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>138,821</td>
<td>72,666</td>
<td>94,379</td>
<td>4,208</td>
<td></td>
<td>310,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>137,458</td>
<td>63,718</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>2,636</td>
<td></td>
<td>289,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Calves</td>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>Horses &amp; Mules</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>89,958</td>
<td>38,717</td>
<td>64,695</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>194,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>53,667</td>
<td>46,681</td>
<td>81,267</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>183,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>65,659</td>
<td>14,458</td>
<td>54,165</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>134,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1These figures for 1896 are for six months from December 1895 to 1 June 1896. "Fort Worth Market," Texas Stock and Farm Journal, 5 June 1896, p. 7. No other statistics are available for these years 1897-1902.

2Figures for 1903-1943 came from Annual Reports, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Fort Worth Stockyards Company Collection, North Texas State University Archives, Denton, Texas.

3Even with Fort Worth breaking all records in 1944 with over five million total receipts, the market still ranked only sixth in the nation. The first five were Chicago, 10,701,059; Omaha, 7,689,358; St. Paul, 6,829,309; Kansas City, 6,119,258; and St. Louis, 6,026,457. Advertising-Clippings, W. L. Pier Correspondence, FWSY Co. Coll. Horse and Mule figures are missing for 1944-47.


5Figures for 1960-63 are Salable Receipts rather than Total Receipts. When the Stockyards Company moved its office to the second floor of the Livestock Exchange Building in 1978 its records of those years were destroyed. The Market News Service of the United States Department of Agriculture reports salable receipts only. They began this practice in 1940. Prior to that their reports are total receipts.

APPENDIX III

Readers unfamiliar with how terminal markets operated might not understand livestock sales before the advent of auction barns. Selling through commission companies by what was called a "private treaty" characterized sales at the larger markets including, until late 1981, Fort Worth. A description of this private treaty process as well as a brief summary of the large-scale slaughtering operation in the nearby packing plants thus seems necessary.

When cattle were unloaded from a producer's truck at the stockyards unloading dock, an employee of the Fort Worth Stockyards Company called a "key" man received them and locked them in catch pens. Gate men from each of the thirty to forty commission companies would meet these trailers or trucks and fill out a weigh bill of cattle consigned to their companies. A gate man for a particular commission company took the cattle from the stockyards catch pens and drove them to the assigned pens of his company, signing with the key man for the animals. The gate man would mark the animals to keep different owners' animals separate, using a wax marker to place an "X" or a circle or other figure. He would put this same mark on the weigh bill.

At the commission company pens, the yard man for that company took over responsibility for the animals and placed
them in separate pens according to owners. On a card he made a note of ownership. Each commission company usually retained two or three cattle salesmen, some specializing only in calves, others steers, or cows and bulls. The salesman would take buyers around to the pens of his company, showing the animals his company was responsible for selling, until he obtained a bid that he thought was fair market value. He might show the animals to four or five buyers before he became satisfied with the price. When he had accepted a price, he notified the yard man of his company to go weigh the animals that were sold. Surprisingly, the salesman did all of this by memory and became so adept at his profession that he made few if any mistakes. From memory he wrote down all the animals sold, whom to, and for how much.

During the busiest years the Fort Worth Stockyards Company operated seven scales for weighing animals, and generally assigned commission companies to certain scales. The yard man of the commission company would line the sold animals up in the alley to be weighed, open the gate, put the animal or group of animals on the scales and call out the owner's name, purchaser, and at what price. The weighmaster would write this information on the scale ticket, weigh the animal or animals, and stamp the weight on the ticket. If several were weighed at one time, it was called a draft.
Once the animals stepped off the scales on the opposite side from where they had stepped on, the responsibility of the commission company ended and the animal became the property of the new owner. Responsibility for holding that animal until it left the yards shifted at that point to the Fort Worth Stockyards Company.

The commission company's work had not yet ended, however, for the head yard man would go pick up several weigh tickets from the weighmaster and take them back to the various salesmen from his company who had sold the animals on those tickets. The salesman checked over the tickets, and initialed them. Then a runner would carry the tickets to the office of the commission company, usually located in the Livestock Exchange Building. The office staff could not do anything until approved by the salesman. Therefore, if an anxious farmer picked up his own ticket for his animals at the scales and rushed it to the office himself, it still had to be taken to the salesman for approval.

The office staff of the commission company figured the amount of money due to the seller of the animal or animals and made up a bill to give the buyer. The money always was collected by 11 a.m. the following day. The process did not ever operate on credit and still does not in the 1980's. The commission company collected all fees and paid the stockyards company for yardage and handling. The late evening or night of the sale, the office staff wrote a check to the
stockyards company so that it would receive payment the following morning after the sale.

The farmer, rancher, or livestock producer who turned his animals over to commission companies for the process just described, referred to as selling by private treaty, really took no part in the sale unless he was so knowledgeable and traded animals so constantly that he knew all the buyers. In that case he might tell a buyer that he had some good animals in such and such a pen for sale that the buyer probably would want. The salesman for the commission company, however, retained control of the sale, although the commission company (and the stockyards company) only acted as agents for the seller and the buyer. They never owned the livestock. The seller retained ownership during these activities and could stop the process at any time prior to the moment when the animals stepped off the weigh scales.

Once the animals stepped off the scales and officially became the property of the new owner, the stockyards company received them in catch pens and the animals remained there until some representative of the buyer came to the key man hired by the stockyards and signed for the animals. This representative then drove the animals to his own pens, if he had any, sorted them out, and prepared to deliver them to the new owner. During the heyday of stockyards activity, some persons did nothing all day but go to the seven weigh scales
over and over and receive cattle for his employer and take them to his pens.

If cattle arrived at the stockyards by rail rather than motor truck or trailer, stockyards employees received them. In 1940 a Livestock Handling Company came into existence to receive these cattle. The handlers held the unique position of working for the stockyards company and for the railroad at the same time, and many of them thus qualified for railroad pensions. These handlers made out a weigh bill, put the cattle in catch pens, and then commission company agents received them. From that point the process of sale continued as previously described.1

The Slaughtering Process

Employees of Armour and Company, Swift and Company, or any of the several smaller independent packing concerns had the job of receiving the livestock purchased by these firms from the catch pens after they had been weighed. The workers separated cows from calves, steers, and bulls, and ran the animals up the chute to the sixth floor of the packing plant.2

In the earlier days someone with a sledgehammer would knock

---

1 Interview with Gary Allen, Fort Worth Stockyards, Fort Worth, Texas, 22 February 1982. Also Interview with Leon Ralls, Fort Worth Stockyards Company, Fort Worth, Texas, 29 March 1982.

2 The process of slaughter at Swift and Company in Fort Worth is being described. Swift's plant had six floors.
the animal in the head to kill or stun it. In later years, workers used an electric gun and shot the animal between the eyes which stunned it and knocked it down.

The animal rolled out of a chute onto the floor where the hind legs were attached together and the animals were put on a chain where they could hang from their hind legs and slide forward. Another employee stuck the animal in the throat to bleed it. When the chain moved the animal to the next position, workers skinned it, cut the head and hocks away, and threw these appendages into chutes which carried them to various areas to be processed. Meanwhile, workers split open the carcass of the animal, removed the entrails, and dropped the entrails to the fifth floor by chutes where they landed in an area to be washed. Workers saved the liver, lungs, stomach, and similar parts. The carcass of the animal, still on the sixth floor, moved along the chain to a cooler where it remained until the following day. A grader from the U.S. Department of Agriculture came in and graded the cattle. Grass fed cows generally received one of three grades: utility, canners, or cutters. Grades of grain fed steers, calves, and heifers became U.S. commercial, U.S. good, U.S. standard, U.S. choice, and U.S. prime. After the government grader stamped the grade on the carcass, company employees came along and stamped that grade all over the back of the carcass and down both hind quarters and forequarters. Then the carcass moved to the cutting room to be separated into
identifiable parts such as hind quarters, loins, fore quarters, ribs, and brisket. At that point many orders could be filled. Workers wrapped the portions of the animal desired in a thin cloth with sometimes a cellophane wrapping over it, depending upon how far the order had to travel.

Often, however, portions of the animal moved by chutes to other areas of the building where from the chute the meat fell onto a conveyor from which workers took the meat and boned out ribeyes, chucks, and other pieces. Much of the fifth floor of the slaughtering plant was thus utilized to bone out meat. As many as 125 boners worked on this process. Often workers cleaned and separated the offals on the fourth floor. They salted down hides on the third floor and then sent them to the second floor to be cured for thirty days. Workers on the first floor later shook these hides out and shipped them to buyers.

Offices of foremen were located on each floor where the person in charge accepted orders for the type of meat processed on that floor. The office often remained the only place to get warm, and government graders and others visited there whenever possible.

The process just described dealt mostly with cattle, but portions of the top floor of both Armour and Swift also slaughtered hogs and lambs, sending the body parts down to lower floors for further processing. Swift also made tough
bull meat into chili, cooked and canned tender veal into baby food, packaged bacon and sausage, and refined lard.

Probably the most cattle ever slaughtered at Swift and Company in one day consisted of the 1,080 cattle during one of the World War II rush periods, when workers completely processed this number to the extent even of boning out the canners and cutters they received.  

---

3 Interview with former Swift employee Grover Rogers, Fort Worth, Texas, 26 February 1982.
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