

A BLACKLANDS MORALITY PLAY

CENTRAL TEXAS FARMERS DURING THE AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION
1880-1930

By

Watson Caufield Arnold

Bachelor of Arts, 1966
Tulane University
New Orleans, La.

Doctor of Medicine, 1970
University of Texas
Southwestern Medical School
Dallas, Texas

Masters of Arts, History, 2000
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
AddRan College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Texas Christian University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
May, 2006

Copyright by
Watson Caufield Arnold
2005

PREFACE

This dissertation has been part of a long and arduous process beginning in 1995 and now finished ten years later. My professors, family, colleagues at work, and friends have had incredible patience and endurance to follow me through this ordeal. I began to take history courses for pleasure, enjoying the seminars, reading books, and discussing them with bright young graduate students. I am still having fun.

Of course, I must thank my primary professor Dr. Ben Procter. He probably did not realize what a task he took on by accepting me as one of his graduate students. But, neither did I. After my first day at one of his writing seminars where the discussion had centered on topic sentences, Mother Hubbard's, and passive voice, the other graduate students looked at my face, took pity on me, and explained what Dr. Procter was talking about. Mark Barringer and Mark Beasley made a permanent friend that day and they have continued to help me since. Mary Kelly and Bart Pointer joined them later. I owe all of them a great debt of gratitude.

I came by the records that formed the basis for my research by accident. The weekend after the seminar, I drove home and, as the managing partner of our family ranch, met with my father and his cousin, Cavitt Caufield. I wanted to reorient the cattle pastures around a central barn like we had been taught in ranch management. But Cavitt told me that the fences would wash if put in

certain places “like they did in ‘88.” I remarked that I did not remember any flooding in 1988. He looked at me and said, “No—1888. Granddaddy told me all about it.” I later asked him how he knew all that stuff he was telling me. He said it was in the ranch records. I inquired what ranch records, and he told me about the ones in the old house. Well, my great uncle Monty, who managed the ranches before my father, had an office on the sleeping porch at the old house. He smoked and chewed cigars. My great-grandmother and his wife, my great aunt Eula, exiled him to this remote area. I remember his sitting at an old roll top desk in an old leather chair, which still smells like Uncle Monty’s cigars. Also on the porch were several old lopsided wooded file cabinets. Inside I found the ranch records from the 1850s and records from Boligee, Alabama, beginning about 1820. The mother lode! I now had my dissertation.

As I progressed in the research, Cavitt Caufield continued to give me support and advice. He gave me access to papers he had at his house from his uncle Josephus Cavitt and his father George Caufield. Cavitt had saved several file boxes of their business records. He later took me out to see some distant cousin in Coryell County—the Footes--and they had kept the records of their ranch from the 1870s in small ledger book and had kept hundreds of letters in army ammunition boxes.

Because the paper was fragile, I xeroxed all the information and carefully returned it to the owners. These are the primary sources upon which this dissertation is based. In addition, Cavitt, my father, and Sonny Foote spent many hours talking to me about the ‘old days’. I recorded many of our

conversations. Those are three very nice men who helped me a great deal. I cannot thank them enough.

Other relatives brought me additional records. I xeroxed their records and added them to my growing boxes. Roberta Powell, Frankie Glaze, and Dr. Speegle, all decedents of William Young, gave me additional records and encouraged me--and I am appreciative of their efforts.

Finally, I need to thank my family. My wife has been extremely patient and supportive. When I told my two sons that I was going to get a doctorate in history they gave me with that "you gotta be kidding" look teenagers give you when you do something really embarrassing. But after a while they accepted that their Dad was a bit odd and let it go. But, now after college (it has been a long time), they actually seem to enjoy reading my writings. I guess things do change over time.

Watson Arnold

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	
INTRODUCTION	1-7
THE CAUFIELDS	16-38
THE CAVITTS	39-131
THE YOUNGS	132-154
THE FOOTES	154-215
CONCLUSION	216-204
APPENDICES	205-223
BIBLIOGRAPHY	224-237
ENDNOTES	238-258
VITA	
ABSTRACT	

INTRODUCTION

Prosperous ranchers and farmers constituted the middle-class of agrarian America during the latter part of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries, but this situation changed. Over a fifty-year period from 1880 to 1930, the agricultural portion of the American economy underwent dramatic alterations. Prior to this time period, the majority of Americans lived on farms, made their livings from the soil, and often prospered. By the end of this period, the farming population had shrunk to a minority of Americans and most farmers lived on the edge of poverty.

While many historical works have concentrated on the wealthy and famous or, more recently, on women or on the poor and oppressed, few works have detailed the lives of Middle America—the vast middle-class of prosperous Americans who formed the backbone of the country and the economy. Most lived on farms and owned their own land, but many were doctors, lawyers, small planters, and merchants. This literate and cultured portion of society kept records, especially letters that detailed their lives. This work investigates these Middle Americans—how they lived, the issues they embraced, how they spent their money, how they planned and invested, and what happened to them during the transition from an agricultural to an urban society.

Agrarian rural America included both the farmers and the small villages where they socialized, purchased manufactured goods, and sold their crops.

These small, closely interconnected economic units suffered as the rural population declined and aged. The churches lost members, the merchants lost customers, and the influence of local politicians and conservative village elders waned. Once called the flower of American life, the small towns faded as the population decreased.

Many forces drove these vast changes—urbanization, improved transportation, the rise of manufacturing, the mechanization of farming, and the decline in the relative value of agricultural goods. As the cost of farm labor increased because workers could make more in urban manufacturing jobs, successful farmers cut costs by investing in improved agricultural equipment. Those who failed to buy tractors and other farm implements saw their relative economic status decline. The advent of railroads allowed farm goods to be shipped directly and quickly to urban markets and lowered prices at the farms. The fate of these once self-sufficient farmers was one of gradual decline in their standard of living as the prices for agricultural goods declined and the costs of producing crops and of purchasing manufacturing goods rose. This study illustrates the impact of the “agricultural revolution” on farming and ranching and four families during the generation spanning the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

This work is not designed as a family history but rather delineates the economic challenges that several families faced during the transition of the United States from an agricultural-based to an industrial-based economy. Because these families often worked together as an economic unit, the individual

members are described so that the reader can follow their actions. Some description of personalities also clarifies why they made certain choices.

The agricultural revolution that occurred between 1880 and 1930 changed the life of the rural middle class and the four related families. The Caufields—Henry John Caufield and his sister Mary Jane Caufield--moved together to the frontier of Central Texas where they established flourishing agricultural-based businesses. H. J. Caufield prospered in free-range cattle ranching and Mary Jane Caufield Young prospered raising sheep in a more arid region. When the frontier moved further west over the next thirty years, the encroachment of farms, the fencing of the range, and the decline in the value of livestock spurred a change to intensive livestock and a later switch to cotton production. During the latter part of the nineteenth century, their children began to move into the small towns and nearby cities. Caufield's daughter married Josephus Cavitt who leveraged numerous small town agribusinesses off the income from his family's cotton production. At times Josephus Cavitt was involved in too many projects and businesses to present in chronological order. Instead, this paper uses a topical format focusing on each business and following it through the period. Mary Jane Young's daughter married Frederick Foote who continued to live on their sheep ranch and only cautiously entered other fields. When cotton prices fell, Cavitt was unable to pay the debts he had amassed and went bankrupt. The Foote family, who had little debt, hunkered down and survived with their land intact.

The source of the first generation's successes will be examined briefly with a comparison in the prices of manufactured goods and agricultural commodities. The sources of income and expenses for the second generation will be presented in more detail. The influences, politics, and economic forces that affected each generation's decisions—right or wrong—will be explored.

Each family suffered a different fate. The Cavitts neglected their holdings and lost most of their land during the agricultural slump preceding the Great Depression of 1929. The Young family carefully guided their investments and distributed them to the next generation. The Footes continued to hold their land, using their income from livestock to offset losses in cotton. The Caufields suffered a mixed fate. Henry Caufield passed his land to his children, who moved in turn to the city, became absentee landlords, and eventually losing their land. Those who continued to live on their farms or those who closely supervised their tenant farmers endured. None of the members of these families however, enjoyed the prosperity of their parents.

The period from 1880 to 1930 was a time of rapid change in agriculture. Mechanization decreased the amount of human labor needed to raise crops. Farmers unable to support their families on the land often moved to the small towns, or into the industrialized urban areas. When crop prices fell, those who had not mechanized or who had borrowed money were unable to meet their note payments and lost their land. But, farmers who lived modestly, who lived and worked on their land, and who avoided debt survived.

Economic historians usually paint with a broad brush (so called macro-

economics) that is compiled from statistical data bases to determine how historical events affected regional and national economies as well as large populations. Economists refer to the study of how individuals have reacted to such economic forces as microeconomics. A paucity of economic records complicates finding data on individuals from which macroeconomist draw their conclusions. Many people never kept records; some could neither read nor write; and many records either have been lost or destroyed. This study presents the detailed records kept by four related families—the Caufields and Cavitts who switched from cattle to cotton and the Young and Foote families who primarily engaged in raising sheep. Beginning in the 1850s these families kept exhaustive accounts of their expenditures and income in their varied businesses. The emphasis of this presentation will be on the economic forces that shaped these families' decisions. Using economic history in such a manner offers a unique view of the forces that shaped Texas during the nineteenth century.

Several characteristic values marked these middle-class farming families. First, education played a significant role in their lives. Church and family were also important. Thrift and living within one's means formed a core value of these families. Borrowing as little money as possible and paying it back as quickly as possible was a core value of the older generation. Those who transgressed these social and economic values did so at their own risk and with the families' disapproval.

Education was a valued commodity in these four families and all of the children were encouraged to attend college. As late as 1940, only about 54

percent of Southerners were literate. Only 11 percent had finished high school, and only 3.5 percent had attended college. Thus an emphasis on education made these families an exception to the norm. The original immigrants from Ireland could read and write—both men and women. In the Caufield, Cavitt, Young, and Foote families and their cousins, the second and third generations went to college—Princeton and Jefferson Medical School (the Caufields), Washington and Lee College (the Cavitts), Vanderbilt University (the Youngs), and Southwestern Presbyterian College in Chattanooga (the Caufields). The girls usually went to a Presbyterian finishing school in Nashville, Tennessee. Watt Caufield attended Milford College, a local Presbyterian college and the predecessor of Austin College in Sherman. The other Caufield boys attended Presbyterian schools in Tennessee. Tom Caufield met and married his wife, the daughter of the college's chaplain, while at college. Most of the Cavitt boys attended Washington and Lee College in Virginia, though they did not graduate with a degree. The Young and Foote children and grandchildren graduated from the Presbyterian School in Brownwood. Records show that the Young family had at least one child enrolled in college at Brownwood every year for thirty years. This emphasis on education occurred in a period when less than 3 percent of the American population had attended any college.

Each generation did not inherit wealth but started on their own, building a standard of living through hard work on their farms or in their businesses. They approached the future with an entrepreneurial spirit, looks for the best opportunities and investments. They achieved varying degrees of prosperity by

their elder years and on their deaths, left their children real goods—land, furnishings, and household goods--rather than cash inheritances. Some of their children continued to prosper while others lost their inheritance.

And they were thrifty. These people looked for the best bargains, watched their pennies, saved, and invested their profits, usually in land. They passed these traits from generation to generation, entering the pathway to prosperity most suited for the time—farming and the accumulation of land from 1820 to 1880; ranching, livestock, and land from 1860-1900; cotton and absentee land ownership while living in small towns and working in banking, merchandising, and professional careers from 1900-1930; and professional, scientific, and teaching careers in larger cities from 1930-1980. In each generation most achieved success and comfortable lifestyles.

Debt is the pitfall that ruins the unwary and reckless and eventually led to the downfall of Joe Cavitt and George Caufield. In Shakespeare's Hamlet, Polonius warns his son Laertes who was leaving to attend school in France, "Neither a borrower nor a lender be for a loan oft loses both itself and friend." Good advice that I repeated to my sons when they went off to college. I remember my mother saying to one of my brothers, "Be careful. You run into debt and crawl out." That advice has been proven true repeatedly in my personal experience. Finally I remember my great-grandmother, Kate Caufield telling my father who was buying cattle, "Don't borrow money you can't pay back. Lord knows, our family should have learned that by now." She always thought Joe Cavitt was "flashy" and was not surprised when he went bankrupt. This

paper has shown me where those feelings came from. American moral values can be transgressed only at the transgressors own risk. The economics presented in this paper repeats that lesson.

CHAPTER ONE

CAUFIELD

In 1848 Henry Caufield and his sister Mary Jane arrived in Wheelock, Texas, to stay with their first cousin Kate Dunn Cavitt. They had traveled overland by wagon from their home in Boligee, Alabama, to New Orleans, sailed by ship to Galveston, and rode the stagecoach to Wheelock to begin a new life. Eventually these two young people founded family agricultural businesses that exist to the present day. They ventured into the primary agricultural businesses that came to dominate Texas for the next one hundred years—cotton, cattle, and sheep. Their carefully kept records, ledgers, and letters allow the reconstruction of a micro-economic history of Texas agriculture. Such records relate the successes and failures of individual family members as they adapted to the changing economic forces that affected their endeavors.

The Caufields had arrived in the United States twenty years prior (1822) as part of the Diaspora of the Scotch-Irish fleeing economic depression. British economic policy had devastated the economy of Northern Ireland when the English government applied the Corn Laws to the region. The laws forced the products of Northern Ireland to be first shipped to England before being exported to other countries. The resulting tariffs, fees, and commissions enriched English merchants but made the prices for Irish goods uncompetitive on the world market. When the landlords began to raise land rents, even the substantial merchants and small landowners began to migrate.¹

The Scotch-Irish had originally been settled in Northern Ireland in the seventeenth century during the Puritan wars against Catholic-Irish rebellions. Oliver Cromwell and King William IV planted Protestant immigrants from England and Scotland in the region to ensure that a reliable and loyal populace inhabited Ireland. The Protestants shipped to Northern Ireland were often among the most acrimonious adherents to various Presbyterian sects, those whom Cromwell most wished to deport from England to keep peace in the countryside.

Initially the land granted to each family in Ireland was generous and ample. Over the ensuing generations, however, overpopulation and division of farming plots between heirs reduced the land available to later generations to small plots barely able to sustain a family. The reduction in prices for their produce and hand-made linen made sustenance precarious. When the large feudal estates refused to sell additional land for their children, even the small landowners began to leave. Henry Fullerton, who remained in Northern Ireland, lamented the departure of his son William to America noting, "I cannot understand why he is leaving. I will leave him twenty-seven acres for his family."²

As a result, beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, young Irishmen began to immigrate to the United States where land was cheap and available. Between 1730 and 1820 over 500,000 people left Northern Ireland and the population decreased throughout the rural areas by more than 50 percent. Many young families moved to urban areas where jobs were available. The countryside was virtually depopulated with only parents and perhaps one child

left on each farm.

Irish immigrants upon arriving in the United States brought with them a land hunger that had a profound effect on the Western frontier expansion of the new American nation. In their experience, land represented wealth and security. Thus, the Scotch-Irish immigrants sought to own as much land as possible. And they moved quickly and relentlessly to satisfy their hunger.³

The Scotch-Irish immigration began in earnest about 1730 through the port of Philadelphia. The new immigrants found land available on the frontier beyond the previously founded Quaker and German communities and they settled heavily in Western Pennsylvania. Initially blocked by the Allegheny Mountains to the west, they flowed south down the eastern mountain valleys through the Shenandoah Valley, into North Carolina, and then across the Cumberland Gap westward into Kentucky and Tennessee. Later immigrants arrived through the port town of Charleston, South Carolina, and moved along the newly constructed national highway into Georgia and Alabama.

Generally, the Scotch-Irish immigrated in large extended family groups. Although leaving Ireland later than most of the Scotch-Irish immigrants, the Caufields were no different. They arrived in the United States in 1822 aboard the transport ship *Celebes* through the port of Charlestown. The ship's registry contained twelve close family members—children, cousins, in-laws, brothers, and sisters. Included in the list were Watsons, Dunns, Fullertons, and Caufields. They met other relatives in Charleston, including George Hays who gave them employment on the plantations he managed for the next two years while they

recovered from their trip and adjusted to their new country.⁴

The Caufields followed a similar pattern of chain migration to the Blacklands of Alabama. The forceful resettlement of the Choctaw Indians from Alabama and Mississippi to Oklahoma had opened a vast amount of land for settlement; there was plenty of land for everyone. An assortment of relatives, including John Dunn and George Hays, scouted land recently released by the Indians. In Greene County, Alabama Territory, they found soil similar to that on their old farms in Londonderry, Ireland. The young males scouted the new land and, after crops were planted and houses built, the older family members and the children followed to their new homes. From 1822-1824, the Caufields and their relatives purchased land around the town of Boligee, twenty miles from the county seat at Eutaw. By 1824 they had secured title to their new farms, built cabins, and planted crops. Their parents and children joined them, traveling along the newly opened national road from South Carolina to Alabama.

The Caufields settled on lands between the Black and Warrior rivers in Alabama. The largest group arrived in the fall of 1824. The Caufields were joined by the Johnsons, Dunns, and Fullertons who had married Caufield sisters; the Watsons whose sister was married to a Caufield; the Henrys who were married to a Johnson, and other relatives including the McAlpines, McLemores, Hayes, and Castles. Boligee came to be known as an 'Irish' settlement and census records document that almost all the inhabitants were related. The voting tally-sheets for Boligee in 1840 recorded twenty-six male voters, nineteen of whom were kin. Other scattered relatives arrived during the next twenty years,

some to stay, some on their way to opportunities farther west.⁵

One of the first duties for these immigrants was to build a church. The Caufields belonged to a peculiar sect called the Brethren—a group of “free thinking” strict Presbyterians who refused to accept direction from the Anglican Church of England. They had settled together in Antrim, Northern Ireland, and later had immigrated together to the United States. By 1824, they had built their first church at Boligee, which stands to this day. Consistent with their beliefs, the building was a simple small wooden structure, containing wooden pews without cushions (one did not go to church to be comfortable). There was no elevation for the parson (preachers were no better than anyone else). The building contains no ornaments (Papist relics). Church records documented the same close kinship patterns, with nine family members out of thirteen children listed in church school. The cemetery around the church contained the first and second generation of the same families. Those families who stayed behind after the migration to Texas have continued to use the burial site to this day. Their children built very similar churches in Texas on Dunn’s Prairie near Wheelock and at Harris Creek on the South Bosque River.⁶

In 1835 the Caufield families began a chain migration from Alabama to Texas. The first wave laid their land grants about Wheelock in the Robertson grant. Henry Caufield and his sister Mary Jane joined their aunts and cousins at Wheelock in 1846. Henry went to work for his cousin Josephus Cavitt, driving ox-carts and freighting finished lumber and goods to and from Houston. In 1848, Caufield went into partnership with Cavitt and took 600 head of cattle into Central

Texas. For his labor, he was to receive one fourth of the increase in the herds.⁷

Once settled into the area along the South Bosque, Caufield began to establish a ranch of his own. He initially concentrated on raising cattle and horses, grazing them across the unfenced open prairie around his homestead. The Blackland Prairie around his ranch extended over an area from Waco to Crawford and from Oglesby to Lorena, covering several hundred square miles. He shared this range with only two other early ranchers—Neil McLennan and Aquilla Jones.

Caufield marked the cattle with his own brand, HC, and the Cavitts' cattle with JC or VC. Ear marks delineated the progeny of the cow and the inheritance of the owners. By 1857, Caufield branded 600 calves and had a herd of 1,500 head "running at large on the prairie." The next year he branded 700 calves. In 1863, Caufield purchased the IXL brand for his horses and mules. For fifty years Caufield continued to use the same brands, paying Josephus Cavitt, his brother Volney Cavitt, or their children a prorated share of any sales.⁸

The early settlers thought that the Blackland Prairie was suited only for livestock due to the lack of water and the dense black clay soil that plows found difficult to penetrate. They believed that soil which would not grow trees would not support crops. But subsistence farming to provide for the needs of family and stock became a necessity among Central Texas ranchers. Initially, Caufield "raised no crops. I am altogether on the range." About 1855, however, after starting a family, he changed his thinking. He plowed his first fields to produce grain to feed his growing family and for animal consumption. He protected his

crops with plank fencing and bois d'arc hedges. To his brother Watson he announced, "I intend sowing about four acres of wheat, planting six acres in corn, [and] sowing my little truck patch in oats. I aim to make enough bread and horse feed to do me this season." Each year Caufield increased his crop land, concentrating on corn, wheat, and oats. At first his plowed land lay on flat, river-bottom fields by his house. The oat patch and the garden were close to the creek and he cut a small irrigation ditch to provide a dependable water supply. Neil McLennan, watching his good friend and neighbor plowing the virgin land, remarked that "no good can come of this."⁹

In 1854, Caufield married Martha Jones, the daughter of his nearest neighbor, Aquilla Jones, and began to raise a family on his new ranch. He built a rambling house, adding rooms as each child was born, until it contained eleven rooms. Their children included Elizabeth (Lizzie), born 1857, Wiley Watson (Watt), born 1860; Thomas Aquilla, born 1863; Martin Cavitt (Mart), born 1865; Mary (Molly), born 1869; George Henry, born 1875; and Minnie Dee (Deedie), born 1877.

Cattle became the main business of the Caufield Ranch and they sought ways to market their livestock. In 1855, Shapely Ross led a cattle drive to Independence, Missouri, on the Shawnee Trail, which wound north through Dallas, eastern Oklahoma, to Sedalia, Missouri, the head of the western railroads prior to the Civil War. Following this lead, Henry Caufield began to trail his cattle to market as early as 1858 when his brother Watson and neighbors, Wiley Jones and John Black, drove a herd to Missouri. The trip took about six

months. The group left in April and had returned by October. Other local cattlemen followed their lead. Watson and Henry Caufield later led several drives after the Civil War to Abilene, including one in 1868, when Henry returned with a reputed \$75,000 in his saddle bags. Caufield's brother-in-law, William Young also led a drive in 1874.

Because most Central Texas ranchers did not have the vast herds later raised on the Panhandle range, most of the cattle were gathered together from neighbors and driven by the local young men under the supervision of several older ranchers. By 1880, Caufield and Young had stopped leading the drives themselves and began to send their cattle with other drovers. This strategy proved to be equally lucrative without the danger and responsibility of leading the drives.¹⁰

On the Caufield Ranch ranchers continued to increase development of the fertile riverside pasture lands. The acreage under cultivation increased steadily and, after the Civil War, hired hands plowed an eighty-acre field in front of the main ranch house. Caufield tore down a plank fence and planted Osage orange (bois d'arc or horse apple) hedges to protect this larger acreage. After extending the plowed land for cotton cultivation in the late 1880s, they built fences of barbed wire-- and the hedges, in turn, were cut down. A half-mile remnant of the hedge remains along the north side of the field next to Caufield Creek and a bois d'arc lane is still visible separating the Harris Creek pastures from a tenant's home and garden. As Central Texas farmers fenced the open range and cattle ranching became less profitable, Caufield broke more land to

the plow and began to plant cotton until, by the end of the nineteenth century, he had planted most his former ranch land in cotton.¹¹

Late in the nineteenth century two mechanical inventions of Yankee ingenuity--barbed wire and the windmill--changed the ranching industry. Because of a lack of wooden posts, fences to control livestock had been difficult to build on the treeless Great Plains. Initially farmers and ranchers used hedges, usually Osage orange, to deter stock from reaching crops. They built fences of stone or planks to keep the cattle out of plowed fields and to corral horses in pastures in the immediate vicinity of the ranch house. Generally the cattle were allowed to roam freely across the open prairie.

The Caufields built their first wire and plank fence about 1872 to enclose their horse and mule pastures. Barbed wire allowed ranchers to fence inexpensively large areas with a minimal amount of wooden posts. But because Henry Caufield believed that barbed wire injured the horses' hide and allowed the screw worm to infest the sores, his fence initially consisted of four strands of smooth wire strung through holes bored in the fence posts. Watson Caufield supposedly bored these holes with a hand auger. Each day he took a drill, a stool, and a jug of whiskey and drilled holes until he fell off his seat. The ranch hands then took him home where he napped on his cabin porch for the rest of the day.¹²

With the availability of barbed wire, farmers quickly fenced their fields, and the free range began to disappear. Cattlemen resorted to wire barricades to protect their grass against all comers and to prevent range bulls from mating with

their purebred cows. Access to large areas of previously free open range became ever more restricted. Population growth, railroad development, and the increase in commercial agriculture caused a rapid rise in land values and livestock owners soon faced the choice either of selling their herds and becoming farmers, or of selling their lands and moving their herds farther west in search of unfenced open range. The landowner's economic well-being demanded intensive rather than extensive land use and the profits realized from farming soon made land too valuable for grazing. The Caufields chose to do both.¹³

The Caufields began to use barbed wire extensively about 1882, stringing the wire along the boundaries of their property to keep cattle out of the new cotton fields. They plowed the sections of land along the South Bosque River bottom first, fencing their crops from the livestock, while allowing the cattle to graze over large areas of unfenced, open prairie. The river bottom fields were treeless, well-watered, and fertile, ideally suited to cotton. Initially the fences kept cattle out of crops, but later the family used fences to keep livestock confined in certain areas.

Determining the place for fences and the boundaries of the property was often difficult. Because the early surveys were inaccurate, with descriptions consisting of "a line running from a large oak tree" to "a mound of flat rocks," litigants often determined disputed boundary lines by detecting on which side of the post the owner had placed the wire and where rows of trees had grown. (The wire goes on the same side of the post as the cattle--this keeps the fence

from pulling apart when cattle lean on the strands.) Property lines became delineated on the originally treeless prairie by rows of hackberry trees, which had sprouted from the drooping of birds sitting on the fence wires.¹⁴

During the first half of the nineteenth century farmers and ranchers recognized the crucial importance of the weather and sought relief from nature's fickle ways. They were at the mercy of forces beyond their control--rain, drought, snow, and storms that determined the fate of crops and livestock. Letters written by these early pioneers, whether stockmen or farmers, referred to the weather and its effects. In 1855, Watson Caufield noted that "We have a very dry summer in Texas and but little prospects of making any crops. The Grass is all dried up in the prairies and no water for stock without going miles." In 1857, Mary Jane Caufield wrote that "Cotton is small." Yet, the following year Henry recorded that "Our ground is too wet to plough." In another letter he stated "Our cane and wheat crops look fine. Grass is splendid and cows and horses fat." By 1860, a severe drought was in full force and Caufield noted, "We have had no rain this year . . . My spring failed and I have dug a well. I have got plenty of water [now]." To provide reliable, year-round water sources for their livestock, Texas ranchers attempted to thwart the forces of nature with wells, irrigation, and windmills.¹⁵

Water which had always been a precious commodity now became even more important. Since potable water was necessary both for settlers and for their domestic animals and farmers built most dwellings close to ready water sources--either springs or streams—to supply the needs both of family and

livestock. Crops depended on natural rainfall but livestock needed a constant supply of fresh water. Limited rainfall, fewer streams, and long distances between springs and streams limited the usefulness of large areas of prairie. As fencing began to limit the access of free-roaming stock to water, streams became a source of contention in many areas. The technology already existed to drill water wells but some method was needed to pump water to the surface.

The development of drilling equipment and windmills changed the pattern of cattle ranching and accelerated the switch to intensive livestock raising. Windmills gave ranchers continual, drought-resistant access to water. Previously on the arid Great Plains rivers, creeks, and springs had defined the limits of most cattle operations. The long-legged Longhorn cattle could travel great distances to water, but newer breeds needed to be close to a water source. With the year-round water provided by wells and windmills, stockmen could protect their breeding programs by fencing out stray livestock and, by defining the boundaries of their land with fences, control their range and grass. By 1900 mechanical ingenuity had delegated the cowboy to digging fence postholes, fixing windmills, and racking hay.¹⁶

The windmill also allowed farmers to live closer to their fields and away from rivers and creeks. Caufield had built his original ranch house at the junction of Caufield Creek and the South Bosque River, on a slight rise above the flood level and alongside a deep pool. As early as 1860, during a severe and prolonged drought, he dug a well behind the house for his family and stock. The need for water became critical that year and Caufield had to trail his cattle to Hog

Creek and the North Bosque River to find water. By 1880, the Caufields used windmills placed on the ranch's existing wells to supply stock tanks in pastures without natural water sources.

Water and windmills became an important element in the development of the cotton/sharecropper cycle. Unlike farms on the more arid Great Plains, the spring-fed South Bosque River provided a drought-resistant water source for livestock. On the higher, waterless prairie as the Caufields began to plant cotton, they began to use the fences to keep the cattle and livestock in the tree-lined river bottoms and on hills too steep to plow. They placed the tenant farmers' houses next to the fields each rented. Near most of the tenant houses they dug a well and placed a windmill to pump the water for the tenants' family. Windmills filled elevated water tanks alongside each sharecropper's house and allowed for indoor plumbing.¹⁷

Increasing settlement changed the nature of cattle ranching in McLennan County. The population of the county increased fourfold in the two decades following the Civil War, rising from 6,000 in 1860 to more than 20,000 by 1880. The new settlers began to fence the open prairie and so crowded the Caufield family that they were forced to abandon open-range cattle grazing. Farms, fences, and population also pushed the cattle trails that had crossed the Brazos River at Waco westward making cattle drives from McLennan County longer and more expensive. Free-range cattle ranching which was dependent on large open spaces of cheap grasslands, moved westward.¹⁸

In 1882 the Gulf, Colorado, and Sante Fe Railroad came through McLennan County, giving farmers unhampered access to Galveston and national markets. Over the previous decade, every summer when yellow fever or any other disease threatened Galveston, Houston had closed the railroad between the cities, supposedly to prevent the spread of epidemics. But the Houston merchants also managed to close the road just in time to have the entire cotton crop shipped from Houston warehouses to European markets. As a consequence, in 1878, the businessmen in Galveston decided to build their own railroad to the interior cotton belt of Texas and to bypass Houston. They chartered the Gulf, Colorado, and Santa Fe Railroad, building west to Bremond, sending a spur to Houston, then moving north through Temple and McGregor, on to Fort Worth. At the Oklahoma border it met the Atchison, Topeka, and Sante Fe Railway lines running south, giving the new system an entrance to northern and western markets.

With easy access to national markets, farmers moved to northwestern McLennan County and began to fence the open Blackland Prairie. Small towns, including McGregor, five miles from the Caufield Ranch headquarters, grew along the rail line to market local crops. The days of free and open range for cattle grazing were over in McLennan County.¹⁹

McGregor was born on the back of a flatbed railroad car on September 11, 1882. On that day the Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railroad auctioned lots on one hundred and forty acres they had purchased from Dr. Gregor McGregor in Waco. The nearby small towns of Comanche Springs, Banks, and Eagle Springs moved to the new location—literally. Some merchants loaded their houses and business buildings onto wagons and moved them to the auction, placing the structures on the lots they purchased. The tracks of the Santa Fe and the St. Louis and Southwestern (Cotton Belt) rails crossed at the site of the new city and prosperity seemed ensured for local merchants. Within months, McGregor had twenty business.

The Caufields responded quickly to the changes in the local economy. Cattle had overgrazed the prairie and farmers had fenced up the open range. Ranchers lost access to free open grasslands for their cattle and cotton replaced cattle ranching as the primary agricultural product of Central Texas. The Caufield Ranch proved to be no exception. Henry Caufield began to specialize in raising mules and Shetland ponies in the hilly, tree-shaded pastures adjoining the old ranchhouse along the South Bosque River and converted his remaining open pasture into cotton fields. Caufield continued to invest his earnings in land,

eventually accumulating over 20,000 acres and becoming one of the largest landowners in McLennan County. But livestock continued to be an important and profitable portion of their ventures as Caufield began to ship his cattle from the new McGregor rail yards.²⁰

By 1883 the Caufields and their neighbors began to ship cattle by railroad directly to the Chicago stock yards. They gathered their stock at the new cattle pens in McGregor where the ranchers carefully delineated the brands and earmarks on the cattle before they were shipped so they could divide the proceeds accurately. In 1885, their records indicate they sent several car loads of cattle to the Union Stock Yards where Gregory, Cooley & Co. sold the cattle in lots over several weeks. They netted \$1,324 on a \$1,550 sale price for the first lot of forty head. Additional lots of Caufield cattle sold for \$5,576, \$3,568, and \$1,212, a total ranch income from this one shipment of \$10,356. Neil McLennan, Josephus Cavitt, and Pat Neff sold additional cattle in the same shipment.

Neff had ridden to Chicago with the cattle to insure that they were fed, watered, and safe. Someone had to travel with most cattle shipments to ensure the animals were watered and fed daily during the weeklong trip. The passenger also cared for injured and fallen livestock. The railroad recognized the necessity of the stockmen and provided one free passage for every four cattle cars. Neff drew \$40 to cover his expenses for the trip. Neff must have enjoyed the trip because he rode with the shipments every year for a decade.

The same group continued to ship cattle on the railroad. In 1885,

Caufield netted \$4,516 on six car loads. In 1886 they sent five car loads and sold them through Paxson, Shattuck & Son. McLennan netted \$995 on his share. In 1887, they arrived just before the market fell and McLennan sold 102 head at \$3 a hundredweight for a total of \$2,770 (about \$27 a head). Later that summer the price of cattle fell to less than \$10 a head and did not reach previous prices until World War I.

After 1885 Caufield and his partners used the new banking system to forward credit to their local banks rather than carrying cash on their person during the long trip home. The group transferred the money through the Drovers National Bank in the Union Stock Yards to the Waco National Bank.

Unfortunately the Chicago banks began to delay payment and to charge for the transfers.²¹

Stockyards soon opened closer including those in St. Louis, Kansas City and Fort Worth. In Chicago, the commission agents charged high prices for freight, yardage, forage, and commissions. They charged again to send bank drafts to the ranchers back to Central Texas. When the rival stockyards opened they competed with lower prices for forage and commissions and the cost of shipping was less. The Fort Worth Stockyards opened in 1903 and the ranchers began to ship their cattle to the new facility. Fort Worth was much closer, which decreased expenses--freight charges, commissions, and shrinkage. The Texas banks also did not charge to transfer funds within the state.²²

By the end of the nineteenth century, the more affluent and sophisticated consumers in the eastern cities began to demand young and tender beef. Texas

ranchers responded by introducing different breeds in their livestock programs.

The decline in the cattle industry forced Central Texas ranchers such as Henry Caufield to diversify from open-range grazing into specialized livestock breeding.

In 1875 Caufield introduced Durhams (shorthorns) as the first crossbreed on his ranch, followed later by polled Angus and Herefords. These breeds matured earlier and produced more marbled and tender meat than the native, grass-fed Longhorns. Besides being lean and tough to eat, the semiferous Longhorns were hard on fences and carried Texas tick fever. Fat and tender new breeds soon replaced the wild Longhorns.

By 1885 Caufield had 1,600 Merino sheep grazing on the main ranch. Sheep mixed well with cattle because they grazed on forbs, weeds, and short grasses which cattle did not normally ingest. The mixture of purebred cattle, sheep, horses, and mules both maximized the limited resources of the remaining pasture lands and satisfied the changing demands of the Eastern markets.

With the prairies fenced in McLennan County, the Caufields moved their free-range livestock production to ranches in West Texas. In 1876, they purchased 6,500 acres of insane-asylum and deaf-asylum land and leased an additional 10,000 acres in Shackelford County. They moved their beef cattle operation to that area and sent Mart Caufield to manage that ranch. The family sold the land in 1903 when they abandoned their range cattle operation to concentrate on growing cotton.²³

During the drought of 1886, Henry Caufield explored even further for grazing land, eventually purchasing land in northern Mexico south of Tombstone,

Arizona. He shipped 6,000 head by train to El Paso and drove them overland to his new ranch in the Mexican state of Sonora near the small village of Magdalena. Caufield sent his twenty-three-year-old son Tom and other trusted relatives to manage the cattle on this range. The ranch was successful and in 1889, T. B. Hood, manager of the Mexican ranch noted that he had counted 1,133 calves in 1887 and had sold 69 steers for \$1000 so far that year. He begged for a "car load of good young horses," to handle the increase in the cattle herd. Unfortunately, as Henry's children married, they no longer wanted to live on and manage the Mexican cattle lands. In 1892, the family decided to sell the ranch to Hood and invested the proceeds in banking.²⁴

In 1908, Henry Caufield decided to retire from ranching. He split his land evenly between his five remaining children, balancing ranch land and farm land, and transferring ownership of all his farms, ranches, and livestock. He had previously divested himself of the ranches in West Texas and Mexico, leaving only the home place containing about 10,000 acres. He moved into town and spent his last few years living with his daughter Molly and her husband Joe Cavitt in McGregor. In 1914, Henry Caufield died at the age of eighty-eight.²⁵

Caufield Family

The Caufield family began the transition to urban life before the turn of the century as Henry Caufield's children moved from their parents' farms into the surrounding towns. Henry Caufield had begun the process as he attained wealth and aged. He entered politics and the voters elected him McLennan County Commissioner from 1872 to 1886. He helped settle a local financial crisis by reestablishing the value of county bonds and building a new courthouse. Caufield also invested in a Waco bank about 1896.

The fate of his children varied. Some moved to McGregor, others to Waco, and still others stayed close to their farms. The oldest son, Watson Caufield, married Katharine McLennan, the daughter of Henry Caufield's friend, Neil McLennan, Jr. Kate McLennan Caufield was the dominant personality in this family and she carefully managed their land, supervised the tenants, making and saving money where ever possible. Desiring to enter the high-society of Texas ranching families, Kate Caufield moved her family to Alamo Heights in San Antonio. San Antonio, the largest town in Texas at the time, offered good schools, cultural events, and domestic conveniences that had attracted the children of the prosperous ranchers. The Watson Caufields built a large house on their portion of the ranch and lived there and in San Antonio until the Depression brought them home.

She managed their ranch very carefully as well. Though the negotiations would be done by Watson Caufield, the tenants knew that the final decision on

their renting land would be made by “Mrs. Kate.” They always visited the kitchen and to give their “howdys” to Kate Caufield. She refused to borrow or to lend money, even to family members. When the Depression hit and the price of cotton fell, she quickly sold the family’s Alamo Heights home and moved back to the ranch. On the land they lived frugally until cotton prices once again allowed them to return to San Antonio. At the beginning and at the end of the Depression they owed no money. Because of her influence, the Watson Caufields were the only members of the family to retain ownership of their lands.¹

Initially only one child decided to remain on the ranch but they soon sold their land. Joe Clifton, who married Martha Caufield, continued farming the old homestead. But after his wife’s untimely death in 1910, Clifton and his children sold their share of the ranch to George Caufield and Joe Cavitt. The Clifton children carried the notes on their mother’s farms until just prior to Joe Cavitt’s bankruptcy.²

One son, Tom Caufield, moved to Waco and was elected McLennan County Tax Collector in 1896, a position he held for twenty years. Cautious and thoughtful, Tom Caufield served as a counterbalance to the ambitious boosterism of his brother George and brother-in-law, Joe Cavitt. Tom had attended Southwestern Presbyterian University in Clarksville, Tennessee and became close friends with John Cavitt and Charles Caldwell, later pastor at the ‘First Presbyterian Church in Waco. There he met and married a local Presbyterian pastor’s daughter, Lillie Hendricks. These close friends and his

wife and her family advised Tom to be conservative in financial and moral matters.

Thomas Caufield's steady leadership was unfortunately lost due to his untimely death. Without their brother's stabilizing influence, George Caufield and Joe Cavitt became increasingly reckless in their investments. As George and Joe expanded their farming operations, Joe Cavitt purchased Tom Caufield's portion of the ranch, 918 acres, in 1920 from Tom's widow.³

Several of the children died before their father. Mart Caufield had left a widow and two small children. Henry Caufield had purchased the ranch near Albany from Butler Dunn for Mart to manage in the drier West Texas air. Mart and his family lived on the ranch for seven years. Afterwards, he moved to Miles, Texas near San Angelo until his death. Until his death, Tom had served as trustee for his brother Mart's portion of the Caufield ranch. He managed Mart's widow and daughters' affairs, eventually selling their part of the farms in 1919 to George Caufield and Joe Cavitt, so the girls could attend college and obtain teaching certificates. Another daughter, Deedie Caufield, died as a young adult from rheumatic heart disease.⁴

Son-in-law Josephus Cavitt and son George were the most ambitious of the lot, establishing, owning and managing assorted businesses and rental properties in McGregor. By 1920, George Caufield and Joe Cavitt had purchased the farms of all their siblings except Watson Caufield. George Caufield became a banker and later established an auto supply business in Waco. His businesses became closely allied with those of Joe Cavitt.

CHAPTER 2

CAVITT

In 1894, Caufield acquired a new son-in-law when his twenty-five-year-old daughter, Margaret (Mollie), married twenty-seven-year-old Josephus F. Cavitt, the son of Volney Cavitt and nephew of his best friend, partner, and mentor Josephus S. Cavitt. Cavitt had moved to McGregor in 1885 and engaged in a number of local businesses. Joe Cavitt was to dominate the family in the next generation.

The Cavitt family was quite large. Josephus F. Cavitt was born in Wheelock, Texas, in 1867, part of a family consisting of thirteen siblings. Eleven reached adulthood--four sisters—Ruth (who never married), Jessie Cavitt Taliaferro, Florence (Lizzie) Cavitt Goode, and Cora Cavitt Armstrong--and six brothers—James, Bell (who was a bit slow), Sheridan (Bud—who became increasingly erratic and alcoholic as he aged), Sid (who also was a bit slow and had trouble with alcohol), Sam, and Joe himself. The girls married well. W. F. Taliaferro was a physician in Beaumont; Robert Armstrong was a civil lawyer in Marlin; and William Goode was a banker, cashier, and part owner of the First National Bank of Bay City.⁵

The Cavitts had been in Texas for several generations and had become one of the wealthiest families in the state. Their wealth and their marriages made them one of the predominant families in Central Texas after the Civil War. They had migrated to Texas from Tennessee to the Robinson Grant in 1836,

just in time to part of the “Runaway Scrape,” the flight of Texas families to the Louisiana border in front of Santa Anna’s invading Mexican armies. Andrew Cavitt, the father of seven sons, died during the evacuation and was buried along the roadside near Millican. His wife Ann Cavett Cavitt (a second cousin) remarried another cousin, Cavitt Armstrong, and established the family on their lands around Wheelock in Williamson County, near Marlin and Hearne. The boys, Josephus, Volney, Sheridan, Richard, Andrew, James, and William married into other well established pioneer families including the Dunns, Caufields, Sparks, and Robertsons. In 1862, Josephus Cavitt purchased 8,000 acres in Bosque and Hamilton counties for \$10,000. He continued to add to his holdings and eventually, the Cavitt family owned extensive land in East Texas, around San Angelo, and along the Leon River in Coryell County. In his petition to President Andrew Johnson to obtain amnesty after the Civil War, Volney Cavitt listed assets of 10,000 acres, 1,500 sheep, 2,000 cattle, and 100 horses with a net worth of more than \$40,000.⁶

Josephus F. Cavitt had several characteristics that would cause him trouble as time progressed. Cavitt was florid, jowled, brash, pushy, and opinionated. The local people feared and respected Cavitt but they never really liked nor completely trusted him. He was a strict Presbyterian and an ardent Prohibitionist and he plunged with self righteous energy into whatever cause he decided to embrace. He was rich and knew it and felt he knew how manage any business. He invested his money and that of his relatives into any business he could dominate. Soon he was into too many things and could not devote the

time and energy to any one to make investment to make it successful. His nephew said, ‘Uncle Joe had an opinion on just about everything and knew he was right, even when he was wrong.’ Because of his sense of self-importance and entitlement and despite his inherited wealth, he would lose two fortunes—his and his wife’s.

In the small town of McGregor, Cavitt at first became a prosperous businessman. He purchased a major interest in the largest hardware store and invested in a number of agriculturally related industries. He joined the First National Bank of McGregor as Senior Vice President by purchasing a considerable portion of its stock. Soon he dominated the town.

After his father-in-law’s retirement in 1908, Cavitt became the manager of the Caufield Ranch, including the mule and Shetland pony operations. He also began to manage his wife’s 2,846 acres of cotton farms and those of most of her siblings. He owned 1,640 acres along the Leon River in adjacent Coryell County and integrated the operations of the two ranches. He tried a variety of other ways to increase the income of the ranches, including raising chickens, hogs, cattle, and sheep. Now he began to dominate the family as well.

In many ways Joe Cavitt was typical of many prosperous landowners who moved to the small towns at the turn of the century. He scurried busily about town, traveled around the country, and held a number of important local offices—mayor, State and County Democratic Party County Commissioner, member of the state Democratic Executive Committee, War Bond Director, Knight Commander of the local Masons, and member of almost every committee

formed in the area. The typical “Big Man About Town,” he was a “joiner” and a “booster,” participating in almost every local organization such as Masons, Knights Templar, and Odd Fellows. He traveled often to such conventions as the Farmers Congress, representing the local populace.

He also encouraged his other family members to participate in his activities. Cavitt promoted his brother-in-law George Caufield for state office in the Knights Templar and went so far as to buy him an elaborate uniform including a sword with a pearl handle. His wife was on the County Executive Committee for the World War I Red Cross. He pushed George to run for mayor of McGregor, an office George held throughout World War I.⁷

Joe Cavitt and George Caufield became the managing partners of the family enterprises and together they began to acquire their siblings' portions of the original Caufield ranch. George became a protégée of Cavitt and their business became closely intertwined. First they bought Martha Caufield Clifton's land from her heirs. Cavitt borrowed \$6,000 from cousins John and Norman Cavitt to finance his part of the deal. Eventually he and George refinanced and made notes to her heirs to be paid over ten years. In 1920, they acquired Tom Caufield's land from his heirs. Later they purchased Mart's land, which they held in trust for his children. They financed these purchases through large regional banks and insurance companies. They heavily leveraged each piece of land with little down payment and notes covering the actual value, and sometimes more. The income from the land paid the premiums on the outstanding notes but the narrow margin of net worth made for difficulty if the prices of cotton fell.⁸

In addition to his personal businesses around McGregor, Cavitt managed most of the Cavitt family's properties. He directed thousands of acres of Brazos River bottom cotton fields; he owned thousands of acres of ranch and farmland in the family's league along the Leon River in Coryell County; and he was trustee for tens of thousands of acres of ranch land around San Angelo which was held in trust for his brother Sidney. He also became a major investor of his siblings' income from their share of the Cavitt family fortune. Cavitt persuaded his brothers and cousins to invest with him in various businesses and land. He dominated the Cavitt family as well.

Cavitt's fortune rose rapidly between 1905 and 1925 and fell even more rapidly over the next five years. On a loan statement made in 1914, Joe Cavitt showed assets of \$192,200 with loans totaling \$35,000. He paid \$689 in taxes, the largest amount in that part of the county, on his farms and \$296 on his property in town—a net assessed value of \$146,000 (equivalent to about \$1.4 million in today's money). Though he continued to increase his net worth and income over the next decade, an increasing debt load from poor investments made him dependent on his wife's cotton income to keep up with his loan payments. When cotton prices fell Cavitt was in trouble and by 1928, he would be bankrupt.⁹

Mules

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, farmers poured into the Blackland Prairie of Texas, placing millions of acres under production--usually in cotton--and creating a burgeoning demand for mules. By 1889 the price for field animals had increased from ten to twenty-eight dollars to over one hundred dollars a head. The Caufields responded to market forces and expanded their existing mule breeding program and became a large regional producer. Originally they used most of the mules they bred in their own farming operation or sold or loaned them to tenants or local farmers. Under Joe Cavitt's leadership they began to market their animals on a regional and statewide basis to the general public.¹⁰

The mule is a fascinating creature. A sterile hybrid, the mule is an interspecies cross between a male donkey (jack) and a female horse. It exhibits the best qualities of each. Unlike most animals who reflect the characteristics of their mothers and the womb in which they develop, the mule more closely resemble their donkey sires in color and physical characteristics. They are usually more hardy, nimble, and intelligent than horses, but combine the size and strength of a horse with the endurance and placidity of a donkey.

No other animal has had as profound an impact on American agriculture, particularly the Southern cotton culture, than the mule. Because they can endure heat, abuse, and poor fodder (mules thrive on corn) and can carry heavy loads over hard roads in hot climates, mules became the animals of choice to

pull wagons and plows on Southern farms. By 1926, Texas contained more mules than horses.¹¹

Particularly desirable were the colts from a male American Donkey a sub-species descended from several pairs of donkeys given to George Washington by the Marquis de Lafayette and by the King of Spain. Other donkey stock available for breeding was smaller and less intelligent, including the Mexican burro, the Asian donkey, and other European breeds. The mule offspring from the American Donkey were particularly strong, hardy, and intelligent and the most desirable for cotton farming. They were able to pull a plow through the difficult "Black Waxy" soil and for the "sod busting" initial plowing of the prairie—a job that would soon break down a team of oxen or a horse. The Caufield ranch produced twenty to thirty of these large and desirable mules annually.¹²

Mules were one of the first specialized livestock raised on the Caufield Ranch. H. J. Caufield began to raise the animals prior to the Civil War. He used American donkeys almost exclusively for breeding. As the ranch prospered, the Caufield brothers brought mules, horses, and jacks to Texas from their family home in Alabama. Watson Caufield drove animals overland through Louisiana and shipped others from Mobile and New Orleans to Houston. In May, 1860, H. J. Caufield wrote his brother Watson "your mare had a mule colt, ten days old." Initially, Caufield raised mules for his own use and only sold a few to neighbors and friends. In 1866, as his breeding program increased, Henry Caufield purchased the IXL brand, which became the trademark for his horses and mules for the next seventy-five years.¹³

As their superior breeding stock became well known, their jacks became much-sought mates for local mares. Cavitt's prize jack, Sampson, an American Donkey produced large and particularly strong mules. He became a popular sire for the surrounding farmers and stood at stud year round. He had been bred in 1904 from a cross of a Spanish Jack named Jack Dewey M and an American Donkey jennet. Joe registered the pedigree with the American Jack Stock Stud Book. Sampson and his prodigy usually won the ribbons in local and regional fairs. The Caufields received inquiries from around the state and Sampson's colts became prized as matched teams for the new larger, multirow agricultural equipment.¹⁴

By 1910, mules had become a major livestock product of the ranch. When the Caufields shifted their cattle operation to Shackelford County, they expanded their local mule operation on their remaining ranchland in McLennan County. Caufield's new son-in-law, J. F. Cavitt, expanded the mule breeding program to his family league along the Leon River. He began to advertise in newspapers and farm journals. Profits were high and overhead was minimal because Cavitt grazed the animals on submarginal land not suited for farming and included the expenses in other livestock operations.

The Caufield Ranch also bred special types of mules. These included the offspring of Mexican burros which were extremely hardy and, though small, carried large packs through the roughest terrain. Another unique animal was a mating with one of the Caufield's spotted Shetland stallions which produced small spotted mules suitable for pulling children's carriages. The ranch also

produced a few hinnies. These animals, also sterile hybrids, are the result of the mating of a female donkey (Jennet) and a male horse. While mules more closely reflect the traits of their donkey fathers than their mothers, hinnies resemble their stallion fathers. A mule brays like a donkey and a hinny neighs like a horse. The hinny is smaller, more delicate, more horse like, and, though less desirable than mules for farm work, the dainty animals were especially desirable to pull ladies' carriages. Thus the ranch became known for offering the knowledgeable buyer a wide assortment of animals not available elsewhere.¹⁵

By 1900, the mule business had become one of the most profitable enterprises on the Caufield ranch, not only because of the superior stock being bred, but also because of the Caufield reputation for honesty. Mule traders, known for their sly methods of fixing up and selling old or nervous animals, traveled around the small farming communities of the state, arriving in the towns on trade day with a remuda of mules for sale or trade, attempting to get the highest price for their animals. Mule traders became famous for dyeing the gray hair of older animals to make them look younger, pumping air under the skin of sick animals to make them look healthy and muscular, and additional tricks designed to get a higher price for worn out mules.

Though some breeders preferred to sell only to mule traders and not individuals, Cavitt became known as an honest trader who would sell his livestock at a fair price to whoever came to his corrals in McGregor. With a good reputation and sound stock, he had a brisk business. He kept his animals in the mule yard behind the cotton oil mill or on the Leon River ranch, bringing the

available stock into town on the third Monday, McGregor's trade day. Farmers, looking for a new animal to pull their plows or traders looking for new stock, recognized the Cavitt mules as some of the best.¹⁶

Joe Cavitt expanded and commercialized the Caufields' mule production to fill the Central Texas regional demand. In 1910, he began to advertise his mules in various magazines and newspapers. A favorite magazine for state farmers was *Texas Farm and Ranch Magazine*. For several years Cavitt paid twenty dollars annually for a full page advertisement for the Cavitt Mule and Shetland Pony Farms. He received responses every time he published an ad. An advertisement in the Comanche *Chief-Exponent*, costing only one dollar for four notices, produced one quick sale. Eventually, as his reputation grew, he sold most of the animals to buyers from other towns as far north as Denton and as far west as San Angelo.

Buyers came from many places. Relatives served as a constant source of referrals. In moving about Texas, the Cavitts boosted their relatives' business interests. Norman Cavitt in Marlin and Sid Cavitt in San Angelo were particularly good referral sources. Other purchases came from the constant advertising Cavitt placed statewide. Unfortunately, although the demand was constant and Cavitt received letters every week looking for animals, many purchasers repaid their debts slowly, sending small partial payments and begging for more time to pay the balance. The whole operation took more time than Cavitt had to devote to it and by 1920 the number of animals sold began to decrease.¹⁷

Cavitt followed the standard practice for breeding mules. A farmer

desiring a mule brought his mare to the ranch for mating with Cavitt's jack donkey. Because horses never liked the smell of donkeys and because mares were often averse to mating with the donkey stallions, the breeders blindfolded the mares and penned them in stalls for mating. Stud fees ranged from \$5 to \$50 with the horses' owners paying after the colts were born. Each year Cavitt placed thirty to sixty mares at stud and produced an additional twenty donkey colts for other breeders.¹⁸

Unfortunately, stud fees often were difficult to collect as farmers moved, denied the colt survived, or defaulted on their debt. Because the mule is a cross between species, the miscarriage and deformity rate is higher than with interspecies breeding, so not every mating produced a viable colt. For example, the stud records for 1916 showed twenty-six animals bred. Eighteen produced live offspring. Of the eighteen mule colts born in 1916, Cavitt was unable to locate two farmers and three had not paid their stud fees by year's end. He collected thirteen stud fees at \$10-20 each, a high price for the times, for a net income of \$200.

In addition to stud fees, the ranch produced its own mule colts which sold readily to farmers seeking a large animal to pull the new multi-row plows and harrows. A large, quality mule sold for \$100 to \$200 dollars, and the ranch produced twenty to fifty of these mules a year. Finally, colts sired by Sampson on other donkeys also produced income. Cavitt bred about twenty donkey colts annually. From stud fees, mules, donkeys, and specialty animals, the enterprise netted about \$3,000 annually.¹⁹

Many buyers depended on Joe Cavitt for advice and sympathy. One purchaser wrote a constant stream of letters about the donkeys, progeny of Sampson, that he had recently purchased from Cavitt. His two jacks, Chief and Big Bill, won first and second at the local county fair. The next month the jubilant owner reported they had serviced thirty-one mares. Then the animals took two weeks off, to the consternation of the owner, before once again returning to work. During the animals' vacation, the owner beseeched Cavitt for advice on improving the animals' performance. He tried better feed and a private, quiet breeding lot, among other solutions. When the animals picked up the pace in several weeks, the owner gleefully reported they had serviced five mares in less than a week.²⁰

The need for mules decreased as farmers mechanized, purchasing tractors, trucks, and steam driven combines. As demand slacked, Cavitt's breeding program also slowed. The McGregor mule barn burned and was not replaced. By 1920, tractors had replaced mules on most farmers and Cavitt began to sell automobiles instead. Meanwhile every available acre of land, marginal and submarginal, had been pushed into cotton production.

Shetland Ponies

Another profitable livestock enterprise at the Caufield ranch was the Shetland pony enterprise. The Shetland has an interesting history. A small or dwarfed horse the breed was developed to pull carts in the local coal mines in the Shetland Islands of Scotland. About 1870, breeders on the Eastern seaboard of the United States and in Illinois introduced them to this country. In 1889, Mart Caufield, who had seen the ponies while attending college in Tennessee, purchased the ranch's first purebred stallion, named Ben Harrison, and a mare named Rhonda Miller, from Eli Elliott in West Liberty, Iowa. Elliott was one of the first major Shetland breeders in the United States. About 1880 he had begun to import ponies directly from the Shetland and Orkney islands and in 1885 established the American Shetland Pony Club as a registry for his full-blooded stock.²¹

While converting from range cattle to intensive livestock raising, Caufield and his family introduced Shetland ponies into Texas, eventually becoming the largest Shetland pony breeder west of the Mississippi River. The Caufield Shetland herd grew until by 1900 they annually bred seventy-five ponies for sale. Following the death of H. J. Caufield in 1908, his sons-in-law, Joe Clifton and Josephus F. Cavitt, continued to raise ponies until after World War I. The Shetland stud Ben Harrison produced new offspring annually both from other Shetland mares and other horses. For a full-blooded spotted stallion which could live as long as thirty years and was registered with the American Shetland

Pony Association, the Caufields charged as little as \$175. Half breeds and three-quarter breeds sold for even less; geldings cost only \$85 to \$100.

Eventually, the Caufield Ranch obtained a national reputation. Circuses and carnivals throughout the United States became a major sales outlet for the ranch.²²

Families, particularly young women and children, favored these small Shetlands for pets. The ponies were gentle, inexpensive, utilitarian animals that could easily be ridden and were strong enough to pull small buggies or two-wheeled carts. The most desirable ponies were only forty-five to fifty inches high at four years of age and were small enough for a child to control alone.

An advertisement Cavitt placed in the *Farm and Ranch Magazine* in 1917 brought a dozen responses from parents throughout the state. He purchased full page ads several times a year, which cost about five dollars each. The response was constant. John Honeycutt wrote, asking for a “spotted mare to breed to his stallion.” Those wanting a pony usually asked about price, color, or gender-- spotted mares were the most popular.²³

Most purchasers wanted a small, gentle pony for their children to ride several miles to school or to pull a small carriage over the muddy roads. D. G. Adair in Holland, Texas, wrote a typical letter, “Now what I want is one that is perfectly gentle for two little girls to drive to school in a small buggy a distance of two miles. The Children are age 8 and 10. They have never ridden or drove a horse.” The Adairs got their horses and were “perfectly satisfied.” S. McManus from Mowata wrote, “I see your ad in *Farm & Ranch*. I would like to bye [sic] 2

Shetland colts. Say one year old, for my twen [twin] Babies. Would [want] one of each sect [sex]. Mari [mare] and Stallion.” Two mares sold for a total of \$125 while choice stallions went for \$175 each. Brother-in-law Robert Armstrong wrote, “We have bought a ‘runabout’ for Rob’s little Shetland pony.” He requested a harness and bit from McGregor “as so many Shetlands are used there.”²⁴

Although some people believed that Shetlands had poor dispositions and tended to bite and kick, Henry Caufield always maintained that properly broken ponies were never mean. The Caufield Ranch had a good reputation for producing gentle ponies. United States Commissioner Joe Clifton, Caufield's grandson, recalled in an *El Paso Herald Post* article that, “While we were getting ready for the parade, we'd often give those Shetlands a real mauling. We would hang onto their necks, pull their tails, and crawl in and out between their legs. They'd take anything. Best natured animals I ever saw.”²⁵

Most of the children in McGregor and the surrounding farms and ranches soon acquired Shetlands. In 1912, they formed a Shetland Pony Brigade, which became a popular social event. The Caufield Ranch and Joe Cavitt were the sponsors and those children who could not afford the pets could borrow one from the Ranch. Initially the Brigade trained in the corral next to the ranch house; later they practiced their drills on the McGregor High School grounds. The Shetland Pony Brigade became a popular event in McGregor as the club members and their parents turned costume-making into a social affair where town members sewed fancy cowgirl/cowboy outfits with large hats and fringe.

The entire community watched the practices, and the girls quickly learned to ride four abreast and to perform simple drills. The riding club continued for years and many local children participated in its programs.²⁶

In addition to being included in most of the local parades, the Brigade became a feature in Waco's annual Cotton Palace procession. Because Waco was too far to ride from McGregor and the unpaved roads were too muddy for a stock wagon (no motorized trucks existed in those days), parents transported the ponies into Waco in cattle cars on the Cotton Belt Railroad. Mothers packed picnic baskets and the entire family rode the "dinky," the narrow gauge Cotton Belt train from McGregor to Waco. Fathers gathered to unload the horses and to saddle and unsaddle the ponies before and after the parades. Usually families watched the parades together and socialized. Several old photographs showed the Pony Brigade in front of the old Cotton Palace Exhibition Hall and marching four abreast through downtown Waco.²⁷

Despite the local visibility of the Shetland Pony Brigade, the most important buyers for the ranch stock remained circus performers. The Eastern circuses such as Barnum's sent buyers each year to select ponies for their shows. Other carnivals that purchased ponies included the Mollie Bailey family who wintered their circus northwest of Hillsboro near Blum and the Miller Brother's 101 Ranch Wild West Show from the Panhandle.²⁸

During the winter, freedom from daily appearances allowed performers from all over the United States the leisure to travel to the South Bosque and to choose, break, and train their ponies. Because Shetland ponies were the

favorite mounts for dwarfs and midgets, the ranch kept a special bunkhouse with chairs and beds cut down proportionally to the small riders' size. At the ranch circus people followed a standard training routine. Each performer chose a horse, matched for size and temperament, and trained all winter with that animal. The ponies learned a variety of tricks, such as allowing small dogs to jump onto their backs as they ran around a rink. When they finished their training, the diminutive riders and their mounts paraded once more down main street of McGregor to the train station and returned to their circuses. As the owners of the new ponies rode through town, the inhabitants, especially the children, turned out to watch the parade.²⁹

Other Livestock

Cattle continued to provide a constant source of income for the Caufield Ranch. Annually Cavitt shipped several hundred head from his ranches to the Fort Worth Stockyards where the French-Webb Commission Company handled the selling of the animals. In 1915 he sold three car loads--105 head of cattle--through Evans-Snider Livestock Commission Agents at the "Fort Worth Stockyards for a net of \$3,628. In 1918 he sold 118 head for \$4,439 and 284 head for \$15,648. In 1919, with the market prices high because of the demands to feed European armies, Cavitt sold four carloads of cattle (327 head) from his Leon River ranch and from the other Caufield ranches for over \$20,000. He shipped the animals to the Fort Worth Stockyards from the McGregor depot, taking advantage of the free ticket given by the Santa Fe Railroad to stockmen who shipped over four carloads and who wished to travel with his stock. Later that year he shipped an additional 247 head, which sold for \$16,256. In 1920, Cavitt continued to take advantage of the war prices, selling 269 head of cattle for \$18,349. By 1922, during the drought years, Cavitt sold only \$934 in livestock. He continued to ship cattle to Fort Worth, sending carloads every

year.³⁰

Cavitt raised other stock on his McLennan County ranch, including goats, sheep, and pigs. He was an innovator in using pedigreed animals to optimize his herds genetically. In 1905, Cavitt purchased registered sows, “Moncie” and “Myrtle,” purebred Essex swine, to upgrade the animals at the Caufield ranch. In 1915, attempting to further improve the quality of the livestock, he invested in pedigreed Duroc-Jersey pigs from the Texas A&M Department of Animal Husbandry. For several decades he annually shipped swine to the Fort Worth Stockyards, collecting \$577 for eighty hogs in 1909.

Cavitt kept a mixture of livestock—sheep, goats, horses and cattle—on the remnant of the pasture that remained after conversion to cotton. In 1906 he had purchased 285 Angora goats and 36 head of sheep for \$400 from his friend Henry Mitchell. Shipping on the railroad from Wheelock cost \$36. Cavitt placed the animals on the Caufield ranch, sold their wool, and, in 1910, sold several hundred head of the goats for \$3.50 each, making a tidy profit.³¹

Under the title of IXL Poultry Farms, Cavitt tried raising white Leghorn chickens. He formed a partnership with C. T. Pool who lived on the Caufield Ranch. Beginning in 1911, Cavitt purchased incubators from the Cypers Incubator Company in Buffalo, New York. Finding quality eggs proved a continual problem, especially in 1916. That year Cavitt had to return several shipments which had low hatch rates. He had initially purchased 500 fertile eggs from M. Johnson a breeder of single comb white Leghorns in Bowie, Texas, for \$35. Though Johnson sent an extra 100 eggs to cover infertile ones, over 250 of

the new patch of 1,000 eggs proved infertile and many others failed to hatch.

Cavitt tried several other egg producers. He turned to Trinity Valley Farms in Mesquite and the Oak Grove Poultry Farm in San Antonio, purchasing 500 eggs from each. Oak Grove proved to have 250 infertile eggs. The problem with infertile eggs recurred every couple of years much to Cavitt's consternation.

To boost sales, Cavitt exhibited his full-grown chickens at the Cotton Palace in Waco. Although he often sold roosters for twenty dollars each to local farmers who wanted them to breed with their hens, he slaughtered most of the chickens and sold them locally through the Cavitt-Lee Hardware Store and local butcher shops. This enterprise never did make much money and was abandoned a decade later after Pool died.³²

Cavitt added corn, oats, and wheat to furnish crop income from fields in rotation with cotton. In 1918, he earned \$4,381 on oats from his farms. In 1919, he collected \$4,610 from the McGregor Milling and Grain Company on 200,000 pounds of oats and wheat and \$2,190 from the Oglesby Rolling Mills on 64,913 pounds of wheat.

The farmer and the small town remained a single economic unit interdependent on each other. In the Old World, farmers lived in villages and walked to their fields. In the United States, however, because of the abundance of land and the distance between neighbors, farmers built their houses on their farms and walked to town. Still, the small town merchant purchased products from the local farms and processed them in gins and flour mills. They served as a marketing and distribution point for local crops. The farmer, in turn, bought his supplies and goods in the local stores. Texas communities thus did not develop into self-sufficient settlements, but became the mercantile center for an economic unit consisting of the surrounding farms and ranches. Uniquely, since American farmers lived away from the villages and had a choice of where to sell their products, they forced small towns to compete for their business.³³

Until the Twentieth Century, the basic economic and social organization of America remained the country town and for many decades they were the flowers of rural America. In the nineteenth century the majority of the population in the United States lived in towns with less than 3000 residents. The towns contained the church and the schools, which often set the moral and educational values for the area. Gradually the rural population moved from their farms first into small towns and later into larger urban areas. Unfortunately, the mechanization of agriculture which had decreased the need for farm laborers pushed young people in urban manufacturing jobs. And, by the turn of the century, urban

manufacturing centers overtook the rural town as the center of American life and the small villages began to wither and die.³⁴

Initially, the isolation of the frontier determined that population centers were self-contained, offering a wide variety of goods and services. Early merchants in these small towns had to furnish the greatest range of goods. As towns grew, more specialized enterprises, such as butcher shops, banks, and grain and feed suppliers, began to replace general stores. These local businesses constantly changed management, location, and names as merchants established new shops and old ones closed, sold, or moved elsewhere. Until the railroad system was completed, most villages remained isolated and a semiannual shopping tour into town usually satisfied the Western appetite for the comforts of life. The typical urban capitalist before 1900 was often a former planter's son who had sold his land and moved to town, founded a bank, opened a cotton gin, or established a mercantile business. Other small town businessmen remained absentee landlords.³⁵

Initially, natural geographical advantages--fords, springs, crossroads, waterfalls, approaches to mountain passes, or heads of river navigation--determined the location of most Western towns. Then, with the advent of railroads, proximity to the train tracks became the most important factor in determining the success of towns and villages. McGregor followed this pattern. It was founded in 1882 at the site where the east-west Cotton Belt Railroad (Texas and St. Louis Railroad) from Waco to Gatesville crossed the North-South Santa Fe tracks. The inhabitants of the older settlements of Comanche Springs,

Eagle Springs, and Banks located at water sources and at wagon crossroads moved to the new town next to the railroads. Thus, because of the railroad, McGregor became a center for the shipping and delivery of goods and the second largest town in the area, and one of the most prosperous.³⁶

The Gulf, Colorado, and Santa Fe Railroad, which passed through McGregor, began in Galveston in 1880 in response to repeated quarantines by Houston on the transfer of goods to and from Galveston. The merchants of Galveston determined to build a rail line giving them unrestricted access to the cotton producing areas and to Northern markets. Building west and south of Houston, the railroad turned and pushed north through Temple. By 1881 the lines passed through northwestern McLennan County and the railroad founded the town of McGregor along the right-of-way. The rail line pushed on to Fort Worth and eventually met the lines of the Topeka, Atchison, and Santa Fe Railroad at the Oklahoma border, giving the local farmers and ranchers access to national markets. The line was eventually absorbed into the larger Santa Fe line with access to both coasts.

Stimulated by the rail lines and the success of local cotton farmers, the process of town building proceeded rapidly in McGregor. With the amalgamation of neighboring hamlets and villages and also the establishment of merchants, banks, and processing mills for agriculture products the town grew rapidly. Small interior towns in the South serviced the cotton crop as their main economic function and cotton thrived in the soil of Central Texas. Railroads accelerated town building by facilitating the marketing of locally grown cotton and establishing

gins and mills to service the processing of cotton and other agricultural products. The first cotton gin in McGregor had been built in 1882, shortly after the railroad arrived.

By 1884, McGregor was the economic center for a large rural area in the northwestern corner of McLennan County. The community of 1500 had fifty-nine businesses including a weekly newspaper, the McGregor *Plainsman*, hardware and grocery stores, two hotels, several physicians, two cotton gins, a flour mill, and a major grain storage facility. In 1888, local businessmen established the First National Bank of McGregor. By 1890, McGregor had eighty-three businesses adding three cotton gins, a grain elevator, an artesian water company, and several hardware and grocery stores.³⁷

With continued growth, at the end of the nineteenth century McGregor had become a typical Texas farming community, both prosperous and provincial. It served as the rail and agricultural hub for northwestern McLennan County. The Santa Fe and Cotton Belt railroads crossed in the center of town, ensuring the farmers access to national markets. Successful merchants and local landowners built spacious houses within walking distance of the brick stores that lined both sides of Main Street. Like other small towns, McGregor developed a “Booster” spirit, promoting the local cotton market, wares, and real estate and competing for the local farmer’s business. The town soon had the high school for that part of the county, churches representing most the major denominations, and a trade day on the third Monday of each month. And, like most small towns, everyone knew everyone else's business, and everything that happened was the

subject of conversation and speculation.³⁸

One of the most important merchandizing events was the monthly "Trade Day." Each local community chose one day a month, usually attached to a weekend, as a special day when businesses opened early and stayed open late. The merchants scheduled special sales and offered entertainment such as band recitals, parades, and speeches. Politicians made the rounds on trade days to meet their constituents and garner votes. Traveling salesmen, mule traders, merchants from surrounding towns, and equipment salesmen set up booths and rented space to display their wares. Farmers and their families traveled from the surrounding homes to conduct business, enjoy the shows, and visit friends. Traveling preachers scheduled revivals to correspond with local trade days to widen their audiences and increase the chances of capturing converts. McGregor's trade day was the third Monday and it bustled with business that weekend.³⁹

When outlying county residents came to town the entire family usually planned to spend the entire day. They brought farm products to sell, the women purchased goods for their families, the family visited relatives and neighbors, and the men tended to their legal business. The business conducted by these rural residents supported the grocers and merchants and expanded the economic basis of the entire village.

As McGregor grew in importance, the neighboring farming families came to town on the weekends in their wagons, buggies, or cars. This trip was a thrilling event for young children. One daughter, describing coming to town,

related that ‘Our excitement continued to grow as we neared the city limits of this small country town. . . . This particular morning the street was overflowing and we soon saw the reason why. They were having a revival. We edged through it, delighted at the spectacle. . . . Then we drove over the bumpy tracks and to the end of the block, which put us right in front of the dry goods store where we were to do our trading.’ She and her family spent the entire day shopping, returning home tired but happy.⁴⁰

Cavitt Family Investments

Joe Cavitt dominated his family, took the responsibility for investing the income of his mother and siblings, and often thrust himself into family matters concerning land and investments. The Cavitt cotton farms, situated on the rich alluvial soils of the Brazos River bottoms near Hearne, produced annual incomes of several thousand dollars for each family member. Banks, at that time, paid little or no interest on deposits, thus Cavitt sought short and long-term investments with high interest to increase their income. When the cotton crop was sold, sisters Ruth and Cora and their mother sent their crop income to Joe to invest or let out on loans. In 1911, Ruth received \$583.84 as her share of the income from the Brazos Bottoms land. Joe loaned \$500 of her money to a Waco business man. The loans were usually small, \$500 to \$50, carried high interest at eight to ten percent, and came due in sixty to ninety days. Joe Cavitt personally handled most of these notes rather than processing them through the McGregor bank.

Because expenses were low in the small towns of Texas, the family could live very cheaply and still have large amounts of money to invest each year. They purchased most of their goods at the Mitchell Brothers Mercantile Store near Wheelock. In their store eight pounds of coffee cost seventeen cents; 24 pounds of flour cost 72 cents; and ten pound of sugar, 53 cents. The Mitchells were cousins by marriage and longtime friends and partners with the Cavitt

family. In addition, the sisters received a portion of the income from the store. Thus, a little money went a long way.

Unfortunately, the sisters and their mother spent much of their time in a constant round of visits—Wheelock, Bay City, Bryan, Hearne, Austin, San Antonio, San Marcos, McGregor, New York, and Colorado—they were at home less than six months a year. And when they were at home, they entertained a continuous list of guests and family with hired help. The girls hated to be alone at the old homestead and they felt entitled to whatever luxuries their inherited wealth could buy. They spent all their income and began to encroach on their principle, leaving less to live on each year.

During 1907, after selling the 659-acre “Arkansas Place,” for \$4200 cash, the girls felt particularly flush. The land was on Cedar Creek in Coryell County and had been part of their inheritance from their father, Volney Cavitt. With their new income, Cora went to New York City and West Virginia for the summer. Ruth and her mother went to Colorado Springs. Joe and his family met them later with sister Lizzie and her husband at Saratoga, Texas to take the waters for a month.

Unfortunately, the money from the sale was soon gone. Ruth was soon writing to Joe complaining about her low bank balance. After he had admonished her for spending too much money, Ruth wrote Joe, “I’ll be economical if I go to New York so I can stay all winter. It is a fine place to wear any old thing you happen to have.” The money flowed—trickled and gushed-- through their hands. Though they could not spend all their inheritance over the

next twenty years, they did manage to put a significant dent in their wealth.⁴¹

Joe Cavitt also managed the business affairs of several of his brothers and served as trustee for his brother Sid Cavitt. Sid was a heavy drinker, did not manage his money well, and could be difficult to deal with. In 1904, Joe Cavitt purchased 6,400 acres (ten square miles) near San Angelo for his mother Clara Cavitt from the estate of Harold Westcott for \$11,000 (\$2/acre). The sale included 607 head of cattle (\$6,070), eleven horses (\$600), wagons, harnesses, and nine sacks of salt (\$130) for an additional value of \$6,745.

Clara Cavitt placed this ranch in trust for her son, Albert Sidney (Sid) Cavitt, to be managed by his brothers, Josephus Francis (Joe) Cavitt and James Volney (Jim) Cavitt as trustees. Whenever they negotiated with Sid, John and Joe Cavitt, the trustees took their other brother, Bud Cavitt along. Bud seemed to be able to handle Sid better.

The brothers tried to be careful stewards. The local San Angelo National Bank served as the local overseer of the lands and accounts. A portion of the leased ranch was state school land on which principal and interest was paid annually, and another portion was railroad land that was clear of debt. Initially, they leased about half a section to a Mr. Patterson for \$17 an acre. Sid raised primarily sheep and some cattle on the remaining land. But taxes and payments to the Texas Permanent School Fund were a constant source of concern as Sid often ignored taxes and debts. In 1909, even though the ranch had produced a good income, Joe Cavitt had to pay the taxes because Sid had already spent his money. The bank was not very helpful, making payments to the wrong agencies,

resulting in a constant flow of letters from Joe Cavitt to keep matters straight.

Fifty years later, because of Joe Cavitt's careful management, the land would sell for \$150,000 (\$30 per acre) and each sibling received a share.⁴²

Sid Cavitt never could decide if he wanted to stay on his ranch or live in town. He moved back and forth constantly, neglecting his cattle and sheep. When he did work on the place, he had some success. In 1909 he sold thirty-three bags of wool for a net income of \$1,400. But Sid did not like to winter on the ranch and would move to town, leaving his brothers to find someone to care for the livestock. He would spend his cash income and leave the taxes and land payments to the state for Joe or his brothers to handle. Cousin Norman Cavitt, John's son, often spent the winter on the ranch caring for the livestock and visiting with his Uncle Sid.

Titles always caused problems. In 1916, the trustees litigated several suits over the title to several hundred acres. R. R. Wade owned two small tracts of land, seventy-three acres in all, in the midst of one of the large pastures. He had been paid rent of twenty cents an acre since 1911 but offered to sell for \$12.50 an acre in 1916, an exorbitant price for that time. When the owner threatened to sell to another buyer who would need access through the larger tract, the trustees bought the land. Then the county decided to build a road through another pasture. Settling the disputes over price took several more years.⁴³

Sid Cavitt married in 1916 and his wife Maude proved to be a great help in keeping him steady. Her life was tough on an isolated ranch in West Texas and

she had to deal with her Cavitt relatives. She cooked and cleaned for the workers. Amenities such as flowers were difficult to raise. Even a garden was problematic. “The hogs came through the barbed wire fence and rooted out the garden,” she wrote. Joe Cavitt and his sisters sent presents to the wedding but did not attend because they thought the new wife a bit “low class.” Their mother visited Sid frequently and her attempts to keep peace seem to have caused more problems than they solved.⁴⁴

By 1917, Sid had decided once again to run the west Texas ranch and, when the lease expired, moved back on the land. The spring wool that year brought 23.2 cents a pound for thirty-two bags of wool—7,500 pounds or \$1,500 in net income on the San Angelo market.⁴⁵

In 1919, Sid sued for control of his land. The trial was held in San Angelo and the local firm of Wright and Harris represented the Cavitt brothers. The court reset the trial date several times, resulting in confusion, inconvenience, and expenses. Joe Cavitt had to pay the expenses of his witness and with the constantly changing trial date, the cost mounted. The case continued intermittently until 1926. That year Sid wanted to lease his mineral rights for oil. The brother trustees decided to let him do as he wished and to spend the money as he wished. The trustees, however never dissolved the trust; Sid never gained control of the land; and when he died in 1948, the remaining siblings and their heirs sold the land.

Another troublesome relative was first cousin Mary Cavitt Washington and Cavitt became involved in her divorce settlement. Mary had married a man from

West Virginia. Initially they lived on her portion of the family league on the Leon River, but the climate and work was too hard and they moved back to his home in West Virginia. On the death of her father in 1886, Mary received \$6,650 from the estate and 573 acres in Coryell County which she sold to cousin Bud Cavitt for \$10,000. In 1910 she left her husband and later divorced him. He had used her money as his own, purchasing an orchard and home near Romney, West Virginia. She sued for her inheritance and eventually received \$3,236 cash and the orchard, which she later sold for \$2,800. Mary returned to live at her father, Josephus Cavitt's, home near Wheelock. Joe and his cousin John worked several years to recover her money. They hired a West Virginia attorney and recorded depositions, and made trips to court, eventually winning the case on appeal. Later the purchaser of the orchard was constantly late paying his notes, another chore placed on the cousins' shoulders.⁴⁶

Some of his relatives did quite well without Joe Cavitt's supervision. First cousin John B. Cavitt and his adopted nephew Norman kept careful watch over their land near Wheelock and often invested with Joe Cavitt. Brother Sam lived nearby and also farmed his own land. Their share of the Cavitt inheritance had been several thousand acres of Brazos River bottom land, including the J. Dunn league. John carefully and personally supervised his farms and tenants. The cost for tenant housing could be quite high. In 1910, seven two room houses, cribs, and wells for new tenants cost \$1,900. He paid the cost by letting the builder lease 300 acres for three years. In addition, John operated several mercantile companies including Skinner Mercantile in Rogers and the

McWhinney Mercantile Co. in Holland. The Cavitt family in Wheelock traded with Mitchell Brothers Mercantile, in which John also owned a portion.⁴⁷

But life was not always smooth. During 1913, John and Sam Cavitt suffered from a series of barn burnings by a disgruntled tenant. The man fled and the brothers were never able to prosecute the perpetrator. Tenants sometimes left suddenly, taking the Cavitt's livestock with them. And there were always disputes over boundary lines.

John, however, carefully managed his money, living a bachelor's life with his nephew, Norman. John became a money lender and banker. In 1919 he held notes for \$125,216 and expected an income from interest alone of \$8,784. In 1922, he personally had notes out for \$165,245, most at 7-10 percent interest and received income of \$13,341 on his money. He also made money on his cotton, cattle and mercantile businesses. He listed his only annual expense as \$100 for lawyers.

Because of their thrift, Sam, John, and Norman often had extra cash which Joe Cavitt borrowed frequently for his speculations. In 1906, when the brothers purchased a major portion of the McGregor National Bank, Sam wrote, "If his ideas are correct we will surely get rich, in fact will make that barrel of money we have talked of so long." They later loaned Joe Cavitt \$7,000 to purchase the McGregor grain mills. The duo also loaned cash to Cavitt on his land. Like Joe, they eventually lost money in most of his investments. By 1922, Joe Cavitt's major debtor was his first cousin John and Joe was already a year behind on his interest. By 1925, he owed John \$18,654 in first and second liens

secured by his wife's farms and owed Norman \$10,000 also secured by the farms. The cousins had carefully tied each note to a piece of property. John Cavitt always expected to get his money back. When the agricultural depression came, neither brother nor cousins had borrowed money, and though they lost on some of their investments with Joe, they kept their land and ended up owning most of Joe's land as well.⁴⁸

Other family members were also careful with their money. Will and Lizzie Goode were the most frugal. For example, in 1905, they had purchased an acetylene gas generator for which they used to power eleven lights in their home. They believed that the light was much better than electricity, "mellower" and much less expensive. In 1907, Lizzie and Will Goode moved to Sparks, Louisiana, to run the Old River Lumber Company which made cypress shingles. They were willing to live rather primitively until they could sell their investment. Another sister, Cora, had married Robert Armstrong, a prosperous and respected attorney in the community of Bryan. The Armstrongs also lived quietly and well. Both families survived the depression with their fortunes intact.⁴⁹

When his mother died in 1920, the family let Cavitt handle both the funeral and the estate and to split the land among the siblings. The estate included \$38,000 in notes and cash, plus the old homestead with house and 333 acres of land. Each child received in cash or in land the equivalent of \$4461. The four girls took an undivided interest in the home place. They calculated that brother Sam Cavitt owed the estate \$16,000, and he paid the balance over several years. Joe personally covered several bad notes he had made for his

mother and lost more money than he received from the settlement.⁵⁰

Real Estate

Another source of long term income was investments in real estate which needed constant supervision. In 1904, Cavitt purchased the Corner Drug Store in McGregor for his sisters. He supervised the site, collected the rents, repaired any damage, and sent them their rents. One of the local physicians, Dr. Connally, rented space in the building for \$25 a month. Druggist Frank Smith paid \$50 a month for the front half. An awning placed over the store front in 1905 provided a sheltered sidewalk across the neighboring eight stores.

Expenses remained high. Because the building was built on the ground, the wooden floor rotted, warped and sank in 1910, just as Smith was putting in a \$300 cold drink stand. Repairs only cost \$75 but, combined with the \$300 in repairs paid the previous year, insurance, and annual taxes of \$20, the family did

not make a lot of money on the building. The roof needed repairing in 1916. Cavitt attended to the problems through Cavitt-Lee Hardware. In 1918, a replacement for the awning cost \$500. They sold the store in 1920 for \$5,000, a small profit.

The sisters freely traded their partial ownership in the store, as they did all their properties and investments. Those needing ready cash sold their portion of the real estate to whoever had excess income for investing. Cora Armstrong bought sister Ruth's interest in the store in 1908 for which they paid \$1,000 because Ruth wanted to go to Colorado Springs. Ruth later bought Lizzie Goode's portion of one of the farms when the Goodes needed cash for investing in their saw mill and timberlands in Louisiana.⁵¹

The family gradually began to sell their land holdings to cover their living expenses. They were offered \$75 an acre for their 'Brazos Bottoms' land in 1906 but refused to sell. In 1906, they did sell another farm, the "Arkansas Place" about 650 acres along Cedar Creek in Coryell County for \$6 per acre. Cora and Lizzie had purchased Florence's portion in the farm and Ruth received another share. They received \$4200 for their land.

The sale proved to be more difficult than anticipated when a defect in the title delayed closing. During a switch in land in 1886, the wife of one of the owners had failed to sign the deed. This and a poor description of the land boundaries allowed her daughter by another marriage, a Mrs. Ashe, to claim part of the land. This defect resulted in litigation lasting for three years before the title could be cleared through a default judgment. Mrs. Ashe offered to settle for

\$500 but Joe pushed it through, paying only \$87 in expenses. Later, in 1909, Mother Clara Cavitt and he children sold part of the Andrew Cavitt League in Coryell for \$3 an acre.⁵²

Cavitt League

The old Cavitt league on the Leon River was another enterprise Joe Cavitt managed. In 1862, his father Volney Cavitt and uncle Josephus Cavitt had purchased 12,000 acres along the South Bosque and Leon Rivers next to their own league for \$10,600 from the heirs of J. L. L. McLean and Sophia St. John. The owners were Northerners and had to sell to avoid confiscation by the Confederacy. Joe Cavitt had purchased his siblings' and cousins' shares in the league and accumulated 1986 acres of his own in the Andrew Cavitt survey. He purchased 177 acres from cousin Clara Cavitt, 348 acres from brother B. B. Cavitt, and 611 acres from cousin Mary Washington. His brother Bud had another 2500 acres on one side and cousin John had 2500 acres on another side of his land. The land was located in Coryell County between the small hamlets of Cavitt and Leon Junction along the Leon River.

The Cotton Belt Railroad ran through this property and served as a constant source of irritation. Animals wandered onto the tracks and were frequently injured. In 1907 the railroad paid \$215 for a Hereford bull killed by an engine. However, in 1917, when Cavitt complained that several jacks and Shetlands had been lamed by a cattle guard along the right of way, the railroad blamed the horses and mules for walking the cattle guards and refused to be responsible for their injuries. When taken to court, the railroad relented and paid for the animals.⁵³

The taxes were a mess, the land had been passed down undivided and

many cousins and others had failed to pay their share of taxes on different fields in different years. Cavitt had to straighten it all out. Even then, in 1916, Cavitt received a notice from C. E. Stockburger, tax collector for Coryell County that the taxes on the jointly owned 1,982 acres had been only partly paid and that receipts for several other years were missing. Cavitt paid all the taxes and expenses, clearing the indebtedness on the entirety. Brother Bud and Joe worked in concert to improve the land, building levees along the Leon River and fences along the railroad.⁵⁴

Cavitt tried various methods to make money on the property. He harvested pecans, selling 1,700 pounds at eight cents a pound in Fort Worth. He contracted to sell cedar posts from the Leon River farms and offered to sell railroad ties to the Cotton Belt. He tried to raise cotton along the river. A flood in 1907-1908 was particularly disastrous, breaking the levee along the river and devastating the cotton crop and Cavitt suffered heavy losses.

Livestock remained the primary source of income. Cavitt ran cattle, Shetlands, and mules on the place. The farm produced forty-four heifers, which sold for \$2,204 in 1917 and between twenty-five to fifty head went to the stockyards most other years. Eventually he sold the land to his brothers Bud and Cousin John.⁵⁵

Business

Cavitt-Lee Hardware served the local community and surrounding area, providing a full range of goods. Established in 1905 by William Lee, the store sold--in addition to hardware--food, furniture, windmills, and undertaking equipment. Small retailers generally advertised a wide range of goods produced by a variety of manufacturers. Jobbers, usually traveling by railroad, collected small orders from these merchants, and supervised the shipping and delivery of goods. The merchants at this time generally divided into those who traded in hardware, those who retailed groceries, those who handled clothing, and those who sold drugs. For many of the larger items, the hardware store served as a middleman, securing the order, sending it to the manufacturer, and charging a commission on the item when it arrived at the store where the customer picked it up.⁵⁶

By 1906, business was booming. Cavitt purchased a majority interest in the store for \$5,000 and renamed the emporium Cavitt-Lee Hardware. Most of the Cavitt family purchased their goods there. He shipped goods, including beds and mattresses to relatives as far away as Bryan and Wheelock. In addition, Cavitt required his sharecroppers to purchase their goods and “furnish” through his store. This business was a great success and provided the foundation of Cavitt’s income.

Thanks to the automobile, a farmer living in rural McLennan County was in weekly touch with Main Street. The county resident might go to town for his

groceries or hardware weekly. Rows of black roadsters lined Main Street as the more prosperous farmers came to market and brought their families. And Cavitt-Lee Hardware was one of the first places they went to make those purchases.⁵⁷

Over the next decade, Lee and Cavitt purchased other competing stores, lumberyards, and businesses, combining them into their main store and placing smaller local outlets in the surrounding hamlets. The process was often complicated. In 1909, Joe Cavitt and G. W. Lee, with Henry Hanover as partner, purchased the Oglesby Lumber Company from D. R. Boone. Located in the nearby town of Oglesby, the lumber yard siphoned business from their McGregor store and the Cavitt-Smith Lumber Co. next door to Cavitt-Lee Hardware. J. H. Barton Lumber Company of Pittsburg, Texas offered the grounds, buildings, shed, and remaining merchandise for sale. E. R. Bolton, vice president of William Cameron & Company contacted Cavitt and his partners to eliminate a pesky competitor. The present owner had leased the land and buildings for \$20 annually and the lease was transferable. The previous owners had rented the top floor of the building to the Masons for \$10 a year, and they wanted to continue to rent. Dr. Boone, of nearby Lime City, a local producer of white lime, had once owned the lumber yard and carried notes on the merchandise. He wanted to dispose of the business but also wanted to be able to continue to purchase merchandise wholesale. The buildings and land were valued at \$600, the inventory at \$6,750, and fixtures at \$150. Another complication, as so often happened when Cavitt purchased land, necessitated a lawsuit at an additional cost of \$100 to clear title in the Coryell County district court from claims by the

heirs of a William Beatty.

Having eliminated unwanted competition, cleared the title, and overcome all obstacles, the partners operated the store as a branch of Cavitt-Lee Hardware, managed locally by their partner Henry Hanover. While Hanover served as manager and secretary-treasurer of the company, J. Q. King was the local operator. G. W. Lee served as president and Cavitt as Vice-President. The new partnership paid a 25 percent dividend of \$775 for Cavitt's thirty-one shares the first year after they purchased the operation. The next year Cavitt earned a \$3,100 dividend. Soon however, business decreased and the company was absorbed into Cavitt-Lee with a loss. At the end of 1909, Cavitt borrowed \$16,000 for new merchandise for both stores.⁵⁸

The hardware stores prospered as the local economy thrived on cotton sales. By 1918 the Cavitt-Lee partnership stock was worth \$20,000 and the stores in McGregor and Oglesby had \$37,000 in undivided property. The McGregor store contained \$36,000 in merchandise and the Oglesby store contained \$8,000 in unsold goods. The entire operation was now worth \$73,000. Ominously, there were \$20,000 in accounts receivable. In 1921, the McGregor store had an inventory of \$41,000 and a net worth of \$86,000. The stock was valued at \$60,000 but accounts receivable had risen to \$32,000. Cavitt was President, George Caufield, Vice-president and the Lee brothers were on the board of directors. The Oglesby store remained small, containing \$6,000 in unsold merchandise and worth \$38,000. The joint operation was now valued at \$112,000.

The partners engaged in other businesses as well. Initially they rented the second floor of the hardware store to an establishment that made tinned goods, bending sheet tin into buckets and other tin ware which sold downstairs in the emporium. Later, G. W. Lee, who had attended embalming school, opened a funeral and embalming service in the attic of the store. Bodies were raised through the freight elevator and carried into the mortuary, where Lee embalmed the remains for burial. Eventually Lee separated his funeral home business from the hardware store and moved into a separate facility. He and his son continued to operate the funeral home for the next fifty years.

Cavitt began to sell automobiles from a garage behind the hardware store. He contracted to sell Jackson automobiles made by the John Deere Company. Each car sold for \$1800 each (a Ford Model T sold for \$300-\$500). At that price he had few buyers. The car had serious mechanical problems, and after a few years he dropped the dealership and John Deere stopped making the car.⁵⁹

Agricultural Businesses

Between 1910 and 1916, cotton prices fell and local businesses suffered. Cavitt and the Bank had invested heavily in a number of local businesses, most of which experienced difficulty. Other local cotton based businesses experienced difficulty during this period and Joe Cavitt and the McGregor bank intervened when necessary. Grantham Bros. Gin suffered insolvency in 1912 but, as Joe Cavitt wrote to Charles Smith, "They shut their eyes, gritted their teeth, and went day and night . . . They will reduce their indebtedness with us to about \$1,000 by next year." Mr. Gullidge and his McGregor Dry Goods Company did not do as well. In this case, because the bank was more conservative and would not make a loan to a failing business, Cavitt lent his personal money to secure an \$11,000 note in 1913. The company went bankrupt in 1915. Cavitt tried to salvage or sell the business but had to put it through liquidation in 1917. It was a total loss.⁶⁰

The largest money loser was the McGregor Cotton Oil Mill. The mill extracted oil from cotton seed and cotton seed hulls, which sold at a premium for livestock supplements. In addition, the mill had bins for storage of grain and other agricultural commodities. These could provide a tidy profit if managed correctly.

Unfortunately, the McGregor oil mill had a troubled past and its problems continued. The original owners had retired their debt but, during the agricultural depression of 1912, had again borrowed against the plant from the bank. Like

all good bankers, Cavitt patronized the businesses that owed him money, processing 70,000 pounds of his own cotton seed hulls through the facility in 1912. Because of concerns about poor management, the bank kept a close eye on the owners and required that they provide a personal endorsement of the stock to the bank to secure their notes. The mill did not pay its notes and eventually Cavitt and other bank officers attempted to retrieve the bank's investment. At the end of 1914, Dr. J. E. Brown, Sam Amsler, and Joe Cavitt took over the operation of the oil mill. Cavitt invested heavily in the mill. That year the mill had 500 shares, 100 owned by George Caufield, 119 owned by S. Amsler, 142 owned by Joe Cavitt, and 122 owned by Bud Cavitt. Cavitt secured loans from John and Norman Cavitt for \$10,000 to finance his part ownership.⁶¹

By this time, cottonseed oil was an important byproduct of the cotton business. After 1880, the manufacturing of cottonseed oil became feasible with the perfection of mechanical crushers capable of separating the seeds from hulls and lint. Railroads provided the means to ship the oil, which became the major ingredient of margarine and other food additives. At the gin 1,400 pounds of field cotton yielded 500 pounds (one bale) of cotton lint, 75 pounds of waste, and 875 pounds of seeds. Three bales of cotton produced 2000 pounds of cottonseed, which when processed gave 575 pounds of hulls, 310 pounds of oil, and 925 pounds of cake. The cottonseed cake and hulls sold as cattle feed. These byproducts provided an estimated \$6.67 an acre additional income to farmers.⁶²

The cotton mill continued in financial difficulties. In 1916, in order to

finance the operation of the McGregor Cotton Seed Oil Mill, Cavitt and the bank secured a loan of \$25,000 from J. D. Sugg in San Angelo. Initially, under Cavitt's leadership, the mill broke even or made a little money. But it remained heavily capitalized and indebted and during turndowns in the economy had no reserves upon which to draw. The oil mill even lost money during the prosperous war years in 1917-1919. Eventually, financial records indicate that during the poor cotton markets of 1921-1925, the business began to lose \$25,000 annually.⁶³

Several reasons led to the eventual failure of the business. Waco had established itself as the premier cotton processing center for Central Texas and had a rival cottonseed oil mill. To succeed, a cotton oil mill needed volume and most the cotton seed from farms up to ten miles away. Cavitt never overcame the competition. He needed to contract with local cotton gins and farmers for their seed and they were not interested because they purchased the seed from farmers at one price then resold the seeds to the mill at a higher price. Cavitt offered premium prices, cutting his own profits, to local farmers who would haul their seed to his mill. The gins undermined his attempts and shipped their seed to Waco. Though he eventually purchased several cotton gins in South Bosque, Oglesby, and McGregor, which supplied seed to the mill, Cavitt was unable to make the business profitable. He closed the plant in 1919 after trying several times to revive the business under different managers. He never attracted enough cottonseed and finally sold in 1923, after losing over \$50,000.⁶⁴

In addition to the McGregor Cotton Oil mill, Cavitt purchased and ran the McGregor Milling and Grain Company with Sam Amsler as president and brother

S. A. 'Bud' Cavitt as vice president. Joe Cavitt served as Secretary-treasurer. A. J. Hickerson had established the grain mill at the turn of the century, but fell on hard times in 1910. Cavitt and his friends in the bank purchased the mill's stock to save the bank from foreclosing. Its holdings consisted of the mill itself, containing storage for 10,000 bulk bushels and 10,000 milled bushels. Two other storage facilities contained a capacity for both 25,000 stacked and 25,000 bulk bushels. An adjacent small building held 20,000 bushels and a barn sheltered twelve carloads of hay. In 1910, Cavitt processed 26,000 pounds of oats through the mill for a profit of \$421.65. That year, the mill made \$3,100; in 1912, \$7,800; in 1913, \$9,200; and in 1914, \$9,600. The business grossed \$39,000 in 1915 for a net profit of \$2,605. The dividends accumulated, reaching \$21,000 in 1915. But the profits did not cover the debt service.

At the end of 1915, Cavitt sent a check for \$100,000 to the American Exchange National Bank in Dallas to settle his accounts and notes there. This one payment wiped out all the profits in all his businesses over the previous decade, and he still owed money. Cousin John still carried personal notes of \$20,000 and a note for \$7,000 on the grain mill.⁶⁵

In 1912, Cavitt began an ill-fated attempt to develop and sell a new agricultural implement, the Cotton Chopper. McGregor and most other farming communities had a local person who tinkered with farm equipment and frequently obtained patents. Some entrepreneurs even began production of their inventions. A local inventor, June Schrieb, had invented and patented a horse drawn mechanical device to thin the weeds in the rows between the cotton

plants. The machine contained several curved blades that, when placed between the rows of plants, undercut the weeds and other plants growing there. In 1906, Schrieb had exhibited the cotton chopper and a mechanical washing machine at the State Fair of Texas and won several awards. Schrieb started production of both machines in McGregor but soon failed because of poor management and slow sales. Cavitt became interested in producing the implement locally. If the labor intensive chopping of weeds from the midst of cotton could be mechanized, the potential savings for cotton farmers were immense.

Cavitt began to build and market the implement from his factory in McGregor. He incorporated The Texas Cotton Chopper Company in 1912, later changing the name to the Texas Implement Manufacturing Co. with \$200,000 capital in 1916. Production began in a local blacksmith's shop. Northern steel mills made the iron parts on order and shipped them to McGregor for assembly. By advertising in several trade journals, he lined up a number of North Texas hardware stores to serve as dealers. Cavitt sold the implement to the dealers for \$65 wholesale and they, in turn, sold it to farmers for \$85 retail. By 1921 he had sold over one thousand Cotton Choppers.

Unfortunately, the cotton chopper did well in level alluvial soils but did not function as well in hilly or broken fields. As his initial success turned sour and dissatisfied customers complained to his dealers and to the company, Cavitt tried to make both the farmers and the dealers happy by replacing defective parts. He sent a salesman, M. A. Jones, around the local area to satisfy customers and

sell the cotton chopper to local retail outlets. Bad weather, poor roads, poor credit, unscrupulous retailers, poor cotton prices, and a bad product hampered Jones. He gave up in six months.

Cavitt continued to produce and market his cotton chopper intermittently for a decade before finally liquidating the company at a loss in 1925. He lost \$50,000 on this venture, including \$6,000 in Liberty bonds he had used to secure his debt.⁶⁶

Banking

Henry Caufield had led the family into the banking business in the 1880s when he became an initial investor and board member of the Citizens National Bank in Waco. In the late 1890s, Caufield, feeling his advancing age, no longer wanted to travel the fifteen miles into town to attend bank meeting and sold his shares. Following his father-in-law's lead, in 1906, Joe Cavitt and his family purchased a minority interest in the First National Bank of McGregor by buying sixty-five shares for \$800. Other family members followed Cavitt into banking. His sisters also purchased several hundred shares in the First National Bank of McGregor as a long term investment, giving him a major interest in the bank and a place on the board of directors.

Established in 1898, the First National Bank had thrived in the rural town. In 1907, Cavitt persuaded his brother-in-law, George Caufield, to purchase five shares for \$800 and become assistant cashier. That year the bank had capital and surplus of \$75,000. By 1913 the bank had a capital of \$50,000, deposits of \$161,000, and profits of \$46,000 with a board of directors that included Samuel Amsler, Dr. J. E. Brown, Charles Smith, J. F. Gullledge, and J. F. Cavitt. Cavitt became Executive Vice President of the bank and George Caufield joined the board in 1913 as Vice President.

In 1911, Cavitt encouraged his brother-in-law, George Caufield to purchase a one-fifth interest in the Bank of Oglesby, a state bank which they later joined to the First National Bank of McGregor. Caufield paid \$2,000 to

Charles Smith for his share. Smith who had retired to Santa Ana, California, kept some of his stock in the McGregor Bank for many years and served as an advisor to Cavitt and Caufield. George Caufield later bought Smith's bank stock and became an officer in the First National Bank of McGregor. When Caufield suffered financial losses during the disastrous cotton crops of 1923, he sold his shares in the Oglesby bank to the First National Bank of McGregor, which manages the institution to this day.⁶⁷

Cavitt insisted that George Caufield purchase the trappings of a successful businessman. In 1904, while in North Carolina on vacation, George arranged to buy the home of R. L. Bewley, the chief cashier at the bank, who was moving to Austin. The two story house was on two lots, had a servant's house, and contained seven rooms including a bathroom and three bedrooms. Utilities included hot and cold water inside, water outside, and electricity in every room. It was quite a house for its day. Bewley had paid \$6000 for the home new and had added \$19,800 in improvements. George purchased the house for \$5,000, borrowing the money from the bank.⁶⁸

Management of the bank was often difficult. One of the major directors, Dr. Brown became ill, dying several years later, and was unable to participate in the bank's management. Amsler, though titular president because he owned the majority of the shares, was not to be an effective leader. Cavitt assumed leadership of the institution and served as unofficial, temporary, and interim President over the next decade. George Caufield rose to become vice-president in 1914.

Cavitt's sister Florence and her husband William Goode invested in the First National Bank of Bay City (\$50,000 capital). Goode eventually rose from cashier to president. Mr. Goode became ill and died in 1920 but his widow kept her interest in the bank for many years.

In 1916, Cavitt's sister Lizzie sold her twenty-seven shares in the McGregor bank for \$175 each. She needed money to buy a new house. Her income was tied up in timber lands purchased by her first husband in Louisiana. Brother Sam Cavitt bought her shares for \$4,725. Lizzie, evidently short of cash, complained that she did not get her stock dividend before the shares sold. Though she had sold the stock before the dividend was due to be paid, after a series of letters, Sam Cavitt sent her the fifty dollar dividend anyway. Lizzie then returned the money as not really hers. Both brothers were a bit exasperated.⁶⁹

Cotton as a Way of Life

The early settlers in Central Texas had raised more cattle and corn than cotton, but that changed. In 1860, the Blackland Prairie produced 70 percent of the states cattle. By 1890, however, Central Texas produced only 38 percent of the state's cattle and cotton dominated the region's economy. The black clay soils that constituted the Blackland Prairie, soil that early settlers thought unfit for cultivation, had proven to be exceptional cotton growing land.⁷⁰

Cotton needs good soil and a warm climate to flourish. It is a member of the mallow family and is a woody annual that needs thirty to forty inches of rain annually and a 120-day growing season. The Blackland Prairies of Texas, an area stretching south from Sherman and Paris through Central Texas, Waco and Austin and ending just north of San Antonio, offered an ideal habitat for cotton. In 1880, cotton began to surpass cattle as the chief cash crop of McLennan County and for the next fifty years (1880-1930) it dominated the agricultural market of Central Texas.

During the 1890s Texas became the largest cultivator of cotton, producing 1.9 million bales of fiber on 7.1 million acres (.33 bales/ acre) out of twenty million bales grown on 15.8 million acres nationwide. The entire Blackland Prairie region produced 44 percent of the cotton in Texas, over one million bales, in 1900. During the "Cotton Boom" of 1900-1920 McLennan County became one of the largest fiber producing areas in the state. In 1900 the county was the fifth largest cotton growing area in the state with just under 100,000 bales. By

1910, it had risen to the second largest, with 133,000 bales.⁷¹

The Cavitt family's wealth depended on cotton, and the crops raised on the Brazos River bottom land was their main source of income. They owned thousands of acres of prime black cotton land along the Brazos and Navasota Rivers. The farms had been leased to C. G. (Fred) Woods and his partner Edwin Wilson by the boys' father, Volney Cavitt. The two partners continued to farm the land until the Depression. The Brazos Bottoms farm contained about 800 acres in cultivation, and Wood rented the land to his tenants for \$6 an acre. While Woods supervised the farming, Wilson, a cotton broker, ran a local merchandise store in Mumford from which the tenants had to purchase their goods. In 1905, the two partners harvested three quarters a bale an acre of cotton on the Cavitt farms. In 1909 the farms paid each sister \$1143 annual rent. Wood sold the 1915 cotton crop from the "Brazos Bottoms" farms at 11.5 cents a pound, and forwarded \$5000 as the Cavitt portion of the crop. Every year Woods complained of the cost of rent and of ditching, levee building, weed control, and upkeep on tenant houses. Though they made a great deal of money farming the Cavitt land, Woods and Wilson always "poor-mouthed," offering big plans but failing to finish their side of the bargain because of a bad crop. Yet they continued to rent the rich alluvial soil over many decades.⁷²

Woods first proposed building a levee along the Little Brazos River in 1905. He planned to use convict labor for drainage and ditches and projected the cost for the 600 yards needed to connect to the adjoining farm's levee at

\$350. Woods was to pay half the cost, but he never seems to have quite gotten the job done. By 1908, the low price for cotton and the high expense of renting convicts led him to cancel the job at the price he had quoted. He proposed again in 1910 to build a levee ten feet high on a thirty foot base at a cost of a thousand dollars. He was to connect to neighbor Bob Astin to form a six to seven mile stretch of continuous levees. This also did not get finished. In 1913, severe floods covered the Brazos lowlands, ruining the crops. The damage was worse in the fields without protection. The water, which swept across the unleveed Cavitt fields, resulted in the spread of Johnson grass throughout the Brazos Bottom farms. For many years afterwards, Johnson grass invasions of the cotton crops became a continuing problem. Fred Woods, the farm manager, complained he spent many extra hours clearing the pesky weed. The Cavitt family expressed considerable concern about keeping good tenants when they had to fight floods and invading Johnson grass. Finally, convict labor was used; the ditches and levees were built; and the tenants were kept.⁷³

The cost of labor in cotton farming has played an important role in the development of rural Southern life. Whether through slavery or the debt peonage of sharecropping and tenant farming, the cotton farmer was tied to the land. Poor health, malnutrition, ignorance, small farm size, and the financial system imprisoned the sharecropper. The tenant farmer fared only marginally better. This aspect of cotton cultivation has been a popular topic for historians, particularly those interested in social development in the South.⁷⁴

By the end of the eighteenth century, the tenant farmer working for shares

as land rent began to replace the small landowning farmer. In Central Texas, tenant farmers and sharecroppers represented two different classes in the agricultural ladder. The tenant farmer owned his own equipment and animals, rented the land, often lived in their own houses, and paid the owner cash rent amounting to one fourth of the cotton crop and one third of the grain crop. They owned the crop and could sell it themselves. In McLennan County, tenant farmers tended to be either blacks or new immigrants, usually German. These were ideal tenants as only a few of these families moved about between farms. A sharecropper, on the other hand, used the owners' equipment and animals, lived in the owners' houses, and worked the land, but the landlord owned the crop. The sharecropper received one half the cotton and grain income. After debts were paid at the company store, he often had nothing left to show for his year's labor. In Texas, white sharecroppers outnumbered black sharecroppers by five to four.⁷⁵

Tenants were given between eighty to one hundred and twenty acres to farm and a house in which to live. The "Cavitt Place" totaled 1000 acres and contained twelve tenant families. By 1910, the Caufield Ranch supported over twenty families and a hundred tenants. Houses were typically two or three room clapboard structures on raised stone foundations. In 1906, the Cavitts built six tenant houses costing \$150 each on the river bottom farms. The tenants had access to woodlands for hunting and firewood, pasture to run their hogs, additional acreage sufficient for livestock, and a garden and sugar cane came with the house. Wells and windmills provided water. The Caufields also

provided matched teams of mules for plowing from their ranch. These were generous accommodations for the time. Tenants considered the Caufield and Cavitts good landlords and attempted to obtain plots on their farms.⁷⁶

Each fall, after the crop was in, the annual migration of the sharecropper families began. About a third of all farm families in Texas moved each year looking for a better opportunity and a higher standard of living—a goal that usually eluded them. The Caufield records contain numerous, usually poorly written, notes from farmers requesting a farm with a house and mules. Most wanted only what they and their immediate family could farm. The usual letter included, “I am writing you regarding a place for 1920. I am not satisfied here and have decided to come back.” In some cases the wife wrote. In others, the tenant came by personally.

Cavitt placed his tenants at halves, keeping title to the crop and requiring them to purchase their goods at Cavitt –Lee Hardware. This use of the credit-lien system forced his sharecroppers to live from harvest to harvest, often ending each year further in debt than the previous year. When they moved, sharecroppers usually abandoned their debts. The credit-lien system led to disastrous consequences when the hard times came. The sharecroppers had no assets, and when they left for other farms, they often owed large debts at the Cavitt stores, debts which would never be paid. This unpaid debt eventually caused Cavitt to lose control of the hardware store.⁷⁷

All the Caufields, except the Watt Caufield family, took sharecroppers on a half basis—that is the owners furnished a house, seed, fertilizer, equipment,

and animals, and received half the production of the farms as rent. The Watt Caufield family hired only German tenant farmers, furnished land and a house, but not seed or animals, and took a third of the income as rent. Watt regarded these new immigrants as hardworking, thrifty, and dependable farmers. Many of the Watt Caufield tenants would come to own portions of Cavitt's farms.⁷⁸

Merchants and landowners took a considerable risk on the cotton crop. The cropper generally had little choice in where he purchased his goods or how much he paid for them in the "company store." Though the merchants charged enormous rates of interest on the 'furnish,' the goods they required the sharecropper to buy from their store, they still lost money. The merchant and planter were often in debt to the Northeastern banks and wholesale houses who charged them interest as high as 18 percent. Facing a poor crop and mounting debts, the tenant often absconded with their families to get a new start elsewhere but left the merchant with an unpaid and uncollectible debt to absorb just when times were the hardest.

A rapid increase in the number of tenant farmers relative to owner-operators characterized the last two decades of the nineteenth century as landowners switched from livestock to cotton. The self-sufficient farmer who raised all his own food with little left to sell for cash began to disappear. By 1900, the numbers of farms in Central Texas had increased from 51,000 in 1880 to over 100,000. The percent of tenants nationwide rose from fifteen percent to twenty-one percent of all farmers during 1890-1900. Tenant farmers operated about fifty percent of these farms while sharecroppers farmed about thirty

percent. Few tenants were able to buy their own land because fluctuation in land prices and the high cost of land made mortgages necessary. But banks demanded cash payment for mortgages. In addition, farmers too poor or unprogressive to buy farm implements or those who expanded their operations too rapidly soon joined the ranks of the landless and often became tenants on their own farms.⁷⁹

Sugar cane could be grown in most Southern climates and a small stand of cane planted in an area unsuitable for cotton produced enough molasses to feed a large family year round. Molasses came to play an important role in the diet of Southern cotton farmers and often furnished a major source of calories for the poor tenant farmers. It was poured over all food, particularly corn bread. Unfortunately, a dependence on molasses and cornbread and the lack of green vegetables during the fall, winter, and spring months resulted in Pellagra, a vitamin deficiency, in many of the poorer families.⁸⁰

In 1916, Cavitt, seeing an opportunity for extra income, purchased one hundred pounds of 'Red Top' ribbon cane seedlings and planted them around each tenant's house. Joe Cavitt ran the cane press and sugar mill for his farms and the surrounding areas. After the cane ripened in the fall, farmers cut and transported it by wagon to the Cavitt press situated under the oak trees along the South Bosque. There the cane was ground between circular stones turned by mules or oxen. The juice flowed through sluices into a central vat where it was slowly heated, evaporated, and cooked to molasses. Each miller had his own recipe—some adding sulphur and others did not.

The final product was placed in tin buckets and distributed according to the amount of cane each farmer brought. Cavitt kept half of each farmer's molasses as a processing fee. He stored the tin buckets in a small wooden shed, periodically taking some to town to sell in his hardware store, to give as gifts, or to be eaten by his family. The finished molasses sold for 10-15 cents a gallon and the crushed stalks became fodder for his livestock.⁸¹

Education and Schools

The lives of cotton farmers, whether landowner or sharecropper, were tied to the cycles of the cotton crop; therefore, school was offered when children had few duties in the fields. School began when the crops were harvested in the fall and finished when the time came to plant in the spring. Once the farmer harvested his cotton and sent it to market, bills could be paid, debts settled, new purchases contemplated, and education given the children. In the fall after the cotton was picked, the farmers planted other crops, such as wheat or oats, butchered hogs after the first frost, broke horses, weaned calves, and drove steers to market. During breaks in the cycles, the parents sent their children to school. Since the school year revolved around the cotton crop, classes began in late October when the cotton crop was picked and ginned. It continued until planting time in April. Because of the time consumed by farming, in rural areas the school term was 117 days compared to 160 days in urban areas.⁸²

Schools played an important role in the lives of the cotton farmers. The middle-class farmers demanded that their children have an education. Tenants and sharecropper families viewed education as a means for their children to escape their circle of poverty. Parents established local schools, funded by the families within three to five miles of the schoolhouse. This was considered the farthest a child could walk in bad weather. The schools were one or two room structures where a single teacher taught all ages and grades simultaneously. Usually the small independent schools were run by three person school boards

who made all the decisions, hiring the teachers, maintaining the school house, and obtaining supplies, fuel and water. The curriculum reflected the values of a rural society with a strong emphasis on the basics—reading, writing and arithmetic. The school house served as an education center for children and recreational outlet for their parents. At the end of the term the teacher and students celebrated with plays, recitements, and picnics avidly attended by their parents and the surrounding community.⁸³

The Caufields established a school on a piece of land about one mile from the main ranch house. Prior to the establishment of a local school, the family had educated their children at home with tutors or sent them to live in Waco and other larger urban areas for high school. At a time when only three percent of the population graduated from high school, they affirmed their support for education with their own funds. Receipts for the lumber indicate the total cost paid by Henry Caufield was \$127. A community effort about 1880 erected a two room plank building. A later addition to the Harris Creek school with windows and moldings cost \$809.⁸⁴

State support for free schoolbooks was new to Texas. The legislature in Texas passed tax-supported free textbooks for all Texas schoolchildren beginning with the 1918 school year. School records show Tom Caufield applying for free textbooks from the state late in 1917. Tom and George Caufield stood bond to county judge James Alexander in 1919 for books worth \$331 for the school and the bond was forwarded to the State Department of Education to the new Free Text Book Division. Despite its support, the state

demanded careful use of the books, dictating that bookcases must be built to state specifications and the eventual return of the books.⁸⁵

The Caufield School was typical of many rural schools of the day, a two-room wooden building heated by wood burning stoves and occupied by two teachers with students in grades from first to sixth. Young Cavitt Caufield walked daily across the fields to the Caufield School to start a fire in the stove. On weekends he cut, carried, and stacked the wood needed for the week. Caufield described the school as a “two room affair” with a “pot bellied stove” in the back. The teacher sat up front behind a desk and in front of a blackboard. “We had desks and benches. All ages were taught in the same class by the same teacher. I don’t know how she did it.” The largest enrollment in the Caufield School was sixty pupils in 1923, with two teachers covering six grades.

The school house was used for other purposes as well. Religious services were often held there and in 1912, Mr. Hall preached at the school. The grange used the building for seminars in crop rotation, cotton and corn husbandry classes for the local farmers and tenants.⁸⁶

Across the state, school consolidation followed a report in 1936 encouraging consolidation and larger classes to improve education and save money. But even more important in encouraging consolidation was the improvement in roads that allowed school buses to deliver children from ten to fifteen miles. From the Caufield school house the nearest schools were the South Bosque school four miles away. Aquilla Jones and his wife had established the school at Harris Creek in about 1860. The Jones family gave

twenty acres for a school, a cemetery, and a church--“any denomination except Baptist.” The McGregor schools eight miles away included grades one through nine. The closest high schools were in Waco, fifteen miles or McGregor, ten miles away. In 1941, the Harris Creek, the Caufield, and South Bosque schools had consolidated into a two-storied brick building along the Cotton Belt railroad tracks near the small community of South Bosque. The school still only offered grades one through nine.⁸⁷

By 1950 few of the one room schools remained. The old brick South Bosque School was torn down and the bricks used to build a more modern house. South Bosque withered and died when the local road was rerouted and Mr. Buice closed his gin, moving his grocery and filling station to the new highway. Only a few bricks and the embankment of the railroad trestle remain at South Bosque. The Caufield School burned in the 1940s and the site is now a garden. The cemetery and church (Baptist) still occupy the site of the Harris Creek School, but the school building is gone. The Woodway Consolidated Independent School District is the modern residual of these small locally controlled schools and the elementary, junior high school, and high schools are now located in Woodway and Hewitt.⁸⁸

Religion

Church was another important part of rural life. The Cavitts and Caufields were Presbyterians, and they actively supported their local church. They felt their success was based on “good sound liberal Presbyterian principles.” Initially, they attended a non-denominational church built on land donated by their grandfather, Aquilla Jones for a church, cemetery, and school. The Harris Creek Church became dominated by the Baptists, and the Presbyterians organized and began to attend a Presbyterian Church in McGregor.

As the church grew, they began to raise money in 1911 to build a new and larger sanctuary. Each family pledged \$300 to \$500. The Caufield family was particularly generous--each member, including elderly Henry Caufield, pledged \$320 to meet their goal. George was given the responsibility of obtaining the furniture. They purchased the furnishings and pews from Biddle-Lindsey Mfg Co. in Jackson, Tennessee, and the cornerstone and stone works from J. W. Gough Monuments in Waco.

The church remained small and only intermittently could afford a full time minister. Dr. Caldwell from the First Presbyterian Church of Waco preached monthly to the faithful. Other traveling ministers filled the pulpit most other Sundays. The dwindling congregation closed the church in the 1950s and sold the building to another denomination, who painted out the names of the Presbyterians who had given the stained glass windows, and who eventually tore

the structure down. The remnants of the Presbyterian congregation now drive to Waco for Sunday services.⁸⁹

Prohibition

The prohibition of the sale of alcoholic beverages and closing saloons once again became a major political issue during the turn of the nineteenth century. The cause pitted middle class women and religious institutions against new immigrants and the “rougher element,” especially blacks and Mexicans. Backed by preachers and church people, the Prohibitionists assumed the moral high ground and campaigned to legally outlaw the sale of alcoholic beverages.

In Texas the fight became one between local, county, and state parties. The “dry” element evoked memories of small towns, time honored Protestant folkways, and rejected the corruption of the cities. Earlier, in 1885, a savage campaign to outlaw drinking in McLennan County had been led by Dr. J. B. Cranfill from Crawford and B. H. Carroll, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Waco. The Youngs, Cavitt’s cousins from Turnersville, had been a part of this campaign. The strategy at that time had been to pit the moral dry rural areas against the corrupt “wet” urban precincts. The campaign failed, losing in both the rural and urban precincts. Following the defeat of prohibition in a statewide election in 1887, Cranfill left Crawford and Turnersville for Dallas to become publisher of the Baptist Standard. The issue lay quiet for a time but the prohibitionists made an attempt in 1911 to vote a statewide prohibition of alcoholic beverages. It failed in a much closer vote.⁹⁰

Prohibition again became a burning issue in Texas politics during the 1917-1918 election. Joe Cavitt had actively supported Prohibition since 1905

when he first led the campaign to vote McGregor dry. This year, as part of a statewide referendum, Cavitt eagerly embraced the Prohibitionists' cause, raising hundreds of dollars in the McGregor area, which he used to print circulars supporting the dry cause. He served as the local banker for prohibition funds and sent telegrams of support to local religious and political leaders. Arthur Barton, the new and activist president of the Anti-Saloon League wrote praising Cavitt for his efforts. Once again, Prohibition lost the election, both locally and statewide.⁹¹

Like many small communities, McGregor with its heavily Baptist population attempted to pass local option dry ordinances repeatedly during the early years of the twentieth century. The population, however, was divided between Lutheran German settlers who liked their beer and more fundamental Protestants and the precinct changed from wet to dry five times over fifteen years. The dries succeeded, only to be outvoted by the wets two years hence. One local saloon owner remarked the wet/dry controversy only determined whether he "could sell booze out the front or the back door." Fortunately, state law precluded referendums on local option prohibition within a year of an election on a similar subject or the town would have voted every year.

In 1919, after women had obtained the vote and while male soldiers were away fighting in World War I, Texas voted for statewide prohibition just in advance of the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment. In this case, the triumph of Progressivism, the attack on the liquor trust, and the xenophobia of the World War succeeded in achieving what had eluded the Prohibitionists for over thirty

years. Eventually, the Eighteenth Amendment settled the issue for several decades.⁹²

Other members of Cavitt's family did not embrace his cause. His in-laws, the Caufields, thought he was "a bit nutty on the subject." Watt Caufield liked his toddy and kept his whiskey jug hanging in the well. His wife, Kate McLennan Caufield, a staunch Presbyterian, did not approve and refused to have liquor in her house. If you wanted to have a drink with Mr. Caufield you asked if you could have a "drink of well water." Caufield was more than happy to oblige. The other Cavitts were known as "hard drinking men."⁹³

After the repeal of national prohibition in the 1930's, McGregor remained wet during the Second World War and became one of the few places the soldiers stationed at Fort Hood (or a worker at the local ordinance factory) could buy a drink between Brownwood and Waco. After repeated efforts during the 1950's, the dry element finally succeeded in passing a prohibition ordinance which remains in force today. In 2005 McGregor did allow the sale of beer at stores. Cranfill would be happy to know that his home ground—Turnersville and Crawford—have remained dry for over a century.⁹⁴

World War I

The World War interrupted the rhythm of life in McGregor. Many all of the young men in the area were drafted into the war effort. Before the United States entered the war, W. S. Amsler, son of the bank president, took a job with the YMCA running rest areas for the soldiers. In September 1917, Norman Cavitt, serving as First Lieutenant, Cavalry, American Expedition Force, left New York for Europe. Volney Cavitt, Joe's only son, received his draft notice in July, 1918, while attending college at Sherman. He was classified 1A. John Henry Caufield left for the front in December, 1918, and returned in January, 1920. All the boys returned home safely.⁹⁵

As World War I engulfed the country and raised patriotism to a fever pitch, every small town tried to outdo each other in supporting the American cause. The Caufields and the Cavitts, as leading men in McGregor, became active leaders in the efforts to sell government bonds and gather donations for the American Red Cross war fund. Tom Caufield served as the chairman for the county chapter and Mrs. J. F. Cavitt served as a member of the executive committee. Caufield gathered pledges totaling several thousand dollars, ranging in value from \$25 to \$200 dollars, from McGregor business and forwarded them to the Waco office of the American Red Cross. As the War began to wind down, the National Red Cross office began to insist that all funds be forwarded to the national office. When some donors did not meet their pledges, the local Red Cross chapter tried to send Caufield out to collect promised funds and then tried

to hold him personally responsible for the unpaid balances. After a series of increasingly nasty letters, Caufield quit in disgust.

Not to be outdone, George Caufield led the local effort to sell war bonds. In a series of rallies, he led the small town of McGregor in purchasing over \$150,000 in Liberty bonds and War Saving Stamps, \$65,000 over their allotment. As mayor George Caufield led local residents in gathering scrap metal for the war effort and the Masonic lodge in collecting and donating war stamps from their members.

Joe Cavitt became the local chairman of the Interstate Council of Defense. Because of local gossip about his son who was 4F in the draft because of poor vision, Cavitt announced in the newspaper that he was donating all the profits for the McGregor Oil Mill to purchase Liberty Bonds (the mill did not make a profit that year, just like all his other businesses).⁹⁶

Prosperity, Prominence and Wealth

The sense of community in McGregor led local leaders to organize and join neighborhood clubs and national fraternal organizations. Local clubs put on theatrical productions to raise money for local causes. Most “respectable” men joined in the fun and staged “all male” weddings with some of them dressed as bride and bride’s maids. Not to be outdone, the women staged all female wedding. Large crowds attended all the productions and the plays went into extra showings. Cavitt and George Caufield became active in the local Masonic chapter and attained some state prominence in the organization. Politics attracted many of the successful merchants and local “movers and shakers” Cavitt became a member of the McLennan County Democratic Party Central Committee. He attended all the local and state conventions and solicited funds for the national party. In the campaign of 1920 he raised \$43.50 from thirty-two of McGregor’s business leaders, presenting a list of the contributors to the state party convention. Cavitt represented McLennan County at the Farmers Congress in 1911. He later joined its successor, the McLennan County Farmers’ Association, and by 1924 was on the board of directors.

The prosperity from the war allowed the Cavitts and Caufields to indulge in one of their enduring fascinations--automobiles. In 1910, Joe Cavitt purchased a Jackson and, through an agreement with M. A. Holmes of Fort Worth, the state agent for Jackson Automotive, became the local agent for the company. The Jackson was a vehicle made by the John Deere Plow Company

and distributed throughout the Southwest. They sold for \$1700 each. Tom Caufield bought a Hudson Super Six. George Caufield purchased a Pierce Arrow. Watt Caufield bought a Ford. Everyone felt prosperous and began to take trips—The Cavitts to Colorado, the Caufields to North Carolina. The local farmers also feeling prosperous with the high cotton prices, bought tractors and Model T Fords and traveled to see relatives.⁹⁷

As Josephus Cavitt's prosperity increased and his importance spread over the region, in 1913, his first cousin John Cavitt recommended Joe for the Board of Trustees of the Texas Presbyterian College for Girls at Milford, Texas. John Cavitt had helped found the school in 1902 and the college was a small success until overcome by the Depression in 1932. The school was very convenient for the families, located just a few blocks from the railroad. Mary Ann Foote's daughter Ruby attended the college for a semester. She was homesick and spent most of the time in the infirmary barraging her parents with pitiful letters from herself and her friends until at last they relented and she came home. Ruby never went back to school. Mart Caufield's daughters, Lizzie Caufield Clifton's daughter, Martha, and other family members attended the college for various lengths of time.⁹⁸

The trustees actively involved themselves in the running of the college. A serious discussion at the trustee meeting of 1915 involved putting a fire escape on the resident halls. The trustees visited the school to determine the feasibility of placing the fire escapes on the outsides of the buildings. In 1916, John Cavitt and a committee traveled to Mississippi and Alabama, interviewing candidates

for the presidency of Milford. The committee decided on a Mr. Summerfield from West Virginia as the new president. The trustees then worried that he was single but decided to place Mr. and Mrs. Pasty, the English teachers, in the rooms in the women's dormitory formerly occupied by the previous president and his wife. Miss Louise and Miss Hillock were retained as matrons. Mrs. Pasty took the position in charge of the home department. In 1917, the Board of Trustees for the Texas Presbyterian College for Girls in Milford signed notes and pledged \$100,000 for the Carribel McDaniel Memorial Endowment Fund to build a new administration building. Cavitt donated \$10,000 and his cousin John in Marlin also gave \$10,000. J. K. McDaniel contributed the majority of the funds donating \$50,000. The fund eventually contained \$110,000.⁹⁹

Joe Cavitt served as a member of the board of trustees and as president of the Board until 1928. During those difficult years, the college suffered for income. The trustees had rented the land around the college to a local farmer who was unable to pay his rent. With little outside income and endowment, the college was dependent on the tuition paid by the students. Enrollment fell during the Depression and the remnants of the college were consolidated with Austin College in Sherman in 1935.¹⁰⁰

By 1919, Cavitt was well on his way to being a millionaire. He had accumulated over 2700 acres of McLennan County cotton and ranch land. He owned eight to twenty lots in McGregor. On his net worth of over \$100,000 in land in McLennan County alone, he paid over a thousand dollars in property taxes, making him one of the largest land owners in the area. In addition, Cavitt

had inherited all or part of 3000 acres in Coryell County on the Leon River and several thousand acres of Brazos River Bottom land. He owned interests in a gin, cotton seed oil plant, mule barn, hardware store, and drug store. He had 1000 head of cattle, 2000 head of sheep, pigs, mules, and Shetland ponies. Yet, despite his apparent riches, Cavitt lost money that year.¹⁰¹

That same year, Josephus Cavitt reached the height of his influence. He was vice-president of the McGregor National Bank, secretary-treasurer of the McGregor Milling and Grain Co., vice president of the McGregor Oil Mill, president of Cavitt-Lee Hardware, Secretary-treasurer of Oglesby Lumber Company. He was secretary treasurer of the local Masonic Lodge, member of the Democratic Party Central Committee, and head of the Local Civil Defense League. His wife was on the board of directors of the local Red Cross. He was soon to be a member of the board of directors of the McLennan County Farmers' Association.

The new found wealth of oil eluded both the Cavitts and Caufields. Beginning in 1919, various groups drilled or leased land in the area. Oil was never found. Attempting to cash in on the oil boom, Cavitt and George Caufield formed the McGregor Oil and Milling Company, selling \$50,000 in stock at \$100 a share. Cavitt purchased 23 shares. Later they formed the Ranger Quarry Company to furnish gravel and fill to the oil fields. Neither company made money. Business was handled by D. A. Kelley, a prominent Waco attorney. The families remained rooted in the old economies of livestock and cotton.¹⁰²

Mechanization of Cotton Farming

By 1900, mechanization had revolutionized the farm industry and agriculture was the backbone of the American economy. Any innovation that increased farm production was a boon for the farmer and for the economy. Between 1860 and 1880 the United States Patent Office issued over 100,000 patents for farm implements. Forty thousand of those were for cream separators alone. Steel headed plow shafts to break the thick prairie sod, and animal-pulled harvesters came on the market. Between 1860 and 1900 the value of American manufacturing of agricultural implements rose from 21 million dollars to 101 million dollars.

Pioneered by John Deere, steel plows steadily improved and the version first manufactured in 1877 is still used today. The Sulky or riding plow took the farmer out of the furrow and onto a seat. Moline introduced three-row plows in 1884. Seed planters or drills became available for planting grain and then corn in the 1870s. By 1900 steam engines were drawing sixteen row plows, four harrows, and seed drills in one operation.

The savings from mechanization came in manpower and that in grain production was the most dramatic. The labor required to produce one acre of wheat fell from sixty-one hours to three hours in 1900. The farmer that had taken ten days to harvest seven acres now could harvest seventy acres in the same time. Families and groups of families scrambled to invest in the large harvesters which allowed them to farm larger and larger acreage. By 1920, grain

production--wheat, corn, and oats--became totally mechanized with tractors plowing and planting, and thrashers and combines harvesting and binding the stalks.¹⁰³

Steam machinery had an incredible impact on farming. Central Texas farmers quickly obtained the latest farm machinery, but the steam implements were huge and dangerous. The weight of the behemoths compacted the earth beneath their wheels. And they needed constant monitoring to control the steam pressure, wood or straw to feed the furnaces, and water to cool the engines. Explosions and fires were common. Steam driven combines joined harvesting, threshing, stacking and binding the grain into one giant machine. As the huge, steam-driven implements rumbled across the Blackland Prairie, farm boys scrambled to bring wood to feed its hungry fires and water to quench the thirsty monsters. Long belts connected the steam engine with the separator, which poured the grain into wagons and spewed the straw into huge stacks. The whole mess was highly flammable. Cavitt Caufield remembers the panic of the operators who came looking for him when he stuck the water wagon in the South Bosque River. They frantically pulled the tanker out of the mud and raced to cool the machine before it exploded. Regardless of the danger, farmers embraced the new implements and the cost of producing all food commodities fell 50 percent by 1900.¹⁰⁴

The exception was cotton. The cultivation of cotton remained one of the last major American agricultural products to become completely mechanized because of the complexity of growing the crop. Raising cotton depended on a

cycle of cultivation that included plowing, planting, chopping, picking, and ginning. Each of these steps demanded its own specialized equipment.

Because the major cost in cotton production has been labor, any process that mechanized a single step in cotton production increased the productivity, profits and individual income of the cotton farmer. Though improved plows and planters gave the cotton farmer more free time, the amount of land farmed by one family still remained limited by the time necessary to harvest the raw cotton.¹⁰⁵

Though each step in the labor intensive production of cotton lent itself to mechanical improvement, a plethora of cheap labor led many Southern landowners to continue older hand methods of cotton farming despite innovations. While they embraced some improvements enthusiastically, other new methods languished, and mechanization moved forward by fits and starts from region to region. For example, in the South Carolina Sea Islands landowners continued to use workers with hoes to plant and weed cotton, despite the ready acceptance of plows throughout the rest of the South. Landowners in that region had large amounts of capital and overhead invested in land and access to a large pool of cheap labor. Yet these same groups of planters were the most enthusiastic promoters and developers of new cotton hybrids that increased their per acre fiber yields. In other instances, such as the use of tractors for crop cultivation, tradition and a lack of capital inhibited widespread acceptance. Some owners, reluctant to displace and deprive sharecroppers of their livelihood, delayed accepting mechanization. In addition, mechanization was thwarted because Southern banks tied their funds to

ownership of cotton by taking the crops as loan payments and then engaging in commodity speculation, leaving little cash to loan. Also, the lack of ready cash and the crop-lien system retarded the introduction of improved machinery into the cotton culture of the South. Banks often had little excess funds to lend to small farmers and landowners for tractor purchases and they would not lend the money to buy new implements until the debts accumulated over the past year had been cleared at harvest time.¹⁰⁶

The first successful mechanization of cotton production--ginning--continued to adapt to keep pace with cotton production. As farmers produced more cotton, merchants developed larger gins and substituted steam and electricity for animal power. Cotton gins perfected the means for removing more dust and debris. In 1933 the cost of cotton ginning had fallen to 30-50 cents a hundredweight (500 pounds to a bale). Additional charges included bagging and ties (\$1.00) and transportation (10 cents a bale). The ginners had learned to fire their steam engines with the debris from the cotton, and cottonseed became as an additional source of income--especially important since seeds constituted 50-60 percent by weight of picked cotton. The cost of ginning a bale of cotton and transporting it to the railhead decreased to less than one cent a pound. But when cotton prices fell from twenty-five to five cents a pound during the decade of 1920-1930, farmers were unable to make a profit.¹⁰⁷

Improvements in plowing and planting were the next major step in the mechanization of cotton farming. Initially, improved plows increased the productivity of cotton farmers by simply increasing how much land each family

could farm while the amount of cotton raised per acre remained the same. One man with a horse and a one row wooden plow could farm about four acres a day. One man, a mule, and a steel plow could farm about eight acres a day. One man, two mules, and a two-row plow could farm sixteen acres a day. Before the tractor, partial mechanization and animal labor allowed the American farmer to cultivate about seventy-five acres per person versus only two acres per person in India and other underdeveloped countries where hand labor performed all cultivation. One man, one tractor, and a four-row mule-pulled plow could farm forty-five acres a day. With the introduction of tractors, the cost of cotton cultivation per bale fell from \$12 to \$3-4 per bale. That calculates as a fall from three cents a pound to less than one cent a pound for cultivation costs.¹⁰⁸

As the number of tractors increased over 300 percent in the 1920s, farms consolidated. Farmers plowed larger acreage with less labor, and the number of tenant families living on the land declined dramatically. Presently, the most effective farmer in the newest tractor pulling a 16-row plow can farm 150 acres daily--a 37 fold increase in productivity. Farm mechanization also led to fewer but larger farms. Through the 1970s, the number of farms in the United States continued to drop, even as the number of acres in cotton production increased. Soon sharecropper houses lay empty and rotting along the edge of the fields. The remnants of those dwellings today are marked only by a lonely clump of trees and perhaps a broken windmill.

Mechanization of other steps in cotton growing continued to increase pre-harvest productivity. By 1930, of the thirty-nine man hours required to bring an

acre of cotton to harvest, chopping and hoeing consumed thirty-two of those hours (at twenty-five cents an hour and a half bale an acre, over three cents a pound). Weeds competed with the cotton plants for water and nutrients. They decreased plant size and the number of cotton bearing boles. Traditionally, hand labor had chopped weeds from around the cotton plants several times during a growing cycle. Plows, harrows, cultivators, and rotary hoes pulled by animal power damaged the fragile young plants.

Local inventors developed a variety of mechanical and chemical devices, including the cotton chopper developed at McGregor, to facilitate weed control. Most of these devices had rotary blades and/or rotary plows that thinned the cotton and turned under the weeds but also tended to damage the adjacent cotton plants. Further improvements allowed application of arsenic and other insecticides from plow-like implements pulled by animals or later by tractors. Beginning in the 1930s many farmers used thermal weed control which burned the weeds close to the ground. Each of these devices had serious drawbacks and needed supplemental hand labor to complete the crop. Using a mule-drawn mechanical cotton chopper, farmers could clear eighty acres a day versus three quarters of an acre by hand hoe chopping—almost a hundred fold increase in productivity (and a drop in costs to a half cent a pound). But the last hurdle to mechanization of cotton production—harvesting—continued to elude American ingenuity until after World War II. After the end of World War II, the development of herbicides solved most of the problems of weed control and eliminated plowing, chopping and hoeing. By the mid 1950s, the production of

cotton was completely mechanized.¹⁰⁹

The invention of the mechanized cotton picker revolutionized rural Southern life and relieved the harvest bottleneck when an efficient and economical cotton picker became available. Its use spread slowly through the South. In 1950, only 5 percent of the cotton crop was harvested mechanically; by 1960 over 50 percent was mechanically harvested, and the human cotton picker became a thing of the past. According to one government estimate, each tractor had displaced three to five tenant families. These workers had moved into neighboring small towns for employment but depended on seasonal employment, chopping and picking cotton, to supplement their incomes. While the population of small rural based towns such as McGregor rose slowly from 1,435 in 1900 to 2,018 in 1920, the population of neighboring urban areas such as Waco increased from 20,000 to 56,000 over the same period. The average human pickers harvested 200 pounds of cotton a day compared with the mechanical cotton picker, which picked 15,000 pounds of cotton a day. The widespread use of machines to harvest the cotton crop forced the final remnants of the rural population off the farms and into the cities. The loss of seasonal jobs picking cotton pushed unskilled laborers deep into poverty, and they began to migrate to Northern industrial jobs.¹¹⁰

An unexpected consequence of this final step in mechanization was the mass out-migration of hundreds of thousands of unskilled rural farm workers to towns and to the Northern industrial cities in search of work. The urban areas began to increase rapidly in population as farmers moved into the cities. The

cities often found difficulty in digesting the mass of people moving into urban areas. Black sharecroppers began to leave Southern farms in the 1900s and by 1930 the percent of blacks living in towns had risen from 19 percent to 39 percent. During World Wars I and II blacks developed a taste for the freedom of urban life and sent word to their relatives to come north and west to the cities. With the loss of season income from cotton chopping and picking in the 1950s, more blacks began to move north to factory jobs. The movement of black Southern farm workers and tenant farmers into the Northern cities led to the final liberation of blacks from the peonage of Southern life.¹¹¹

Agricultural Depression

Raising cotton is a gambler's trade, and in the early and mid 1920s' the luck ran out for Texas cotton farmers. As prices had risen during the war, Texas farmers had borrowed money to clear more land and planted it in cotton. By 1924, 56.7 percent of Texas cropland was planted in cotton. After World War I, the prices for cotton fell to the lowest levels in thirty years. The disbanded armies no longer needed uniforms and the devastated economies of Europe were unable to afford new clothing. Previously, cotton had dropped from \$.23 a pound in 1868 to \$.15 in 1870 and \$.07 in 1878. Briefly, the price rose to \$.35 in the decade 1910-1920 before falling to \$.05 in 1926. Land that had produced incomes of \$60 an acre now was lucky to give \$30 an acre and the cost of raising cotton lint remained at 9 cents a pound.

1924 was the last good cotton crop for over a decade—drought, insects, and root-rot decimated the plants. During 1920-1925, the boll weevil struck Central Texas the hardest since it had come into the area, drastically reducing the cotton yield by 30 percent in some areas. To further compound the cotton farmers' misery, in 1925-1926 a severe drought struck Central and East Texas, causing crop failures.

Having anticipated good crop prices and hoping to mechanize and increase their yields, farmers—tenants and landowners--had borrowed heavily to pay for land, tractors and cars. They were unable to meet their debts and

borrowed more in anticipation of a better crop the next year. Low prices, poor weather, pests, and bad luck struck Central Texas farmers for four straight years. Landowners who furnished seed, housing, and mules to their tenants were unable to meet their expenses. Those who allowed their tenants to charge at their stores carried even heavier debts. Deeply in debt, sharecroppers abandoned their farms and moved west, leaving the owners with no hope of recovering their outlays. Landowners stacked cotton in bales along rail yards waiting for prices to go up. It never did.¹¹²

Cotton had fueled the Southern economy, and when cotton prices fell, so did the incomes of the merchants and bankers in the small towns. McGregor and Joe Cavitt were no exceptions. The income for Southern farmers had risen little during the seven decades following the Civil War. Prior to the war the average income for Southern workers equaled that of their Northern brethren—about \$150 to \$200 annually. In 1900, while salaries nationally averaged \$310 a year, a teacher in the South could expect around \$159. The price of cotton rose from five cents a pound in 1914 to twenty-eight cents a pound in 1917, peaking at thirty-five cents a pound in 1919 before falling to thirteen cents a pound in 1920. In 1937, the average income was \$314 in Texas compared to \$604 for the rest of the country. By 1949, the median income of white Southerners had risen to \$1900 and that of non-whites was about half that of their white neighbors.¹¹³

The farm crisis was nationwide and affected all agricultural crops. The markets in Europe closed as the European farmers recovered from the devastation of the war and their countries closed the import markets to

encourage local productions. The enormous surge in agriculture encouraged by President Wilson to support the war effort glutted the markets. Prices fell. Farmers, who had borrowed money to expand their farms, purchase tractors and automobiles, and to cover trips, could no longer pay the interest and taxes on their farms. Most could not believe that the Depression would last, particularly with the prosperity continuing in the cities. They tried to hold on, borrowing more money, increasing their debt load. Farm prosperity was replaced by bankruptcy and foreclosure.¹¹⁴

The Cavitt and Caufield farms suffered just as much as the other farmers. 1921 was a good year and Cavitt made 128 bales of cotton which sold for 22 cents a pound. In 1924, the family farms produced three/fourths to one bale an acre, selling at 25 cents a pound and earning \$12,000--\$13,000. In 1925, drought hit hard in Central Texas and Cavitt earned just \$12 on 120 acres of cotton that the previous year had earned \$300. Some, including George Caufield, made no crop and actually lost money. George needed every penny of income to cover his debts, having borrowed heavily, up to \$125 an acre at eight to ten percent to cover previous expenses and losses on an auto parts business in Waco.

The Fall of George Caufield

George Caufield made a series of poor investments that led to his downfall when cotton prices fell. In 1909, George had purchased a portion of the land of his sister, Martha Caufield Clifton. Bart Moore, a cousin and trustee for the children of Martha Clifton, had taken a note for the \$10,250 balance for land valued at \$26,850. By 1917, George was behind on the notes to the Clifton children and Joe Cavitt took over 250 acres, plus part of the debt. In 1920 Moore had foreclosed on the note and was in the process of selling the land to Joe Schleper, Albert Jus, and George Buchannan, former tenants.

In 1914, he purchased a 320-acre farm in Hale County. from C. O. Surratt for \$8,852, hoping to refinance at a higher price. The banks refused to lend money even on the price he paid. He obtained loans of \$7,500 at ten percent interest. He was unsuccessful in leasing the land for oil and only obtained land leases for cattle. In 1921 he tried to sell his 230 acre Hale county farm for what he had invested—\$12,800 in land, a house valued at \$1000, and a barn valued for \$500. By the end of 1922 he was forced to sell the land at a loss for \$5,000.

In 1916, he speculated in real estate in Hamilton County, purchasing 130 acres from H. N. Porterfield by assuming \$4,000 in indebtedness. Caufield obtained an \$11,000 note from Joe Cavitt, which he covered with \$5,000 equity for the note in the farm, leaving a \$6500 note balance. He tried to borrow on the land equity for \$6,000; but the bank would only loan \$4,000 on the land. He had

invested \$2,000 in lots in El Paso, which he placed in escrow for the note.

When he was late in payments, the bank went to court and foreclosed on the land and the lots.

Caufield and J. C. Kilgore made a number of investments together. In 1917-1919 they began to sell supplies to Camp McArthur, a World War I army camp outside Waco. Because they failed to document his sales, the Quartermaster Corp delayed payment for several years and never paid the entire bill. The partnership lost \$7,500 when Kilgore defaulted on their note.

The partners had started the Ranger Quarry Company in 1918. The next year they had \$17,347 in costs and \$19,000 income for a \$2,070 profit. When Kilgore defaulted on his notes, Caufield loaned the company \$8,600. They had also set up the Waco Oil and Refining Company and the Waco Oil and Development Company with Caufield holding fifty shares in the refining company and four shares in the development company. The purpose was to acquire oil leases. This company also went into default.

In 1919, Caufield purchased a building at Fifth and Ellis in Waco from O. J. Miller for \$6,500. Establishing the Caufield Company, he moved his family to Waco and began to run an automobile repair and parts store. He purchased a new home for \$7,500 with a \$300 note. By the end of the year Caufield Company had assets of \$57,549 on sales of \$45,455 and a loss of \$26,630. He soon accumulated \$11,000 in bad debts, making only \$8,040 net income, a net loss of \$2,115.

Caufield covered part of his losses from farm income, with \$865 income

from his 35 shares in the First National Bank of McGregor, and with \$240 from shares in Cavitt-Lee Hardware. He was forced to sell 639 acres of his cotton farmland to Joe Cavitt for \$85,382. This, however, covered only the outstanding notes on the land.

Caufield's auto business did not prosper either and by the end of 1921 he was in financial trouble. First, Caufield sold 412 shares at \$75 each of the Nelson-Battery Co. to J. F. Miller. He then had to sell one third of the business and mortgage the inventory. T. A. Clifton purchased 432 out of 1000 shares for \$90 each. Caufield had paid \$100 each for the shares when he purchased the Nelson-Bell Battery Company the previous year. By 1920, the total loss on the company was \$26,630, a large sum for those days. Caufield had only \$2,130 income from his farms in 1920 as the drought settled in on the county. The bank stock paid \$700 and Cavitt-Lee Hardware stock paid \$210. At the end of the year he owed an additional \$15,000 to the First National Bank of Brenham. He had 200 acres in cultivation, and owed \$8,600 cash balance with seven notes for \$564 each. His income in 1922 was \$9,500 including \$333 from his bank stock. Caufield sold his last 430 acres in McLennan County for \$67,625, which after paying his mortgage, left a net personal income of \$11,462.¹¹⁵

George had borrowed money to finance his life style and his investments, depending on income from his farms to pay the debts. When cotton prices fell he was in financial trouble. As long as the cotton income flowed he was safe. As early as 1914, he borrowed \$9,000 for the McGregor Bank. In 1920 he purchased four lots in McGregor, in addition to his own home, borrowing the

money from the bank. He often made small unsecured loans to local farmers. But when the agricultural depression began, tenant farmers and other landowners were unable to pay their loans and he began to slip further behind on his own payments.

George began frantic rounds trying to collect what he could on his outstanding notes. The process of following the degeneration of George Caufield's investments is painful and convoluted. Most were a total loss. Joe Cavitt tried to help his brother-in-law without success. Cavitt purchased several pieces of land from George for himself and through various entities, including ten acres in McGregor for the Cotton Oil Mill. At the end of 1924 George Caufield was broke and trying desperately to save what he could.

In 1925, George Caufield took bankruptcy and became a tenant on his own land, moving from his fine McGregor home to a small cottage made from part of the original homestead, which had been divided and moved down the road. His wife and three sons, Ambrose, George, and twelve year-old Cavitt, shared his fate. George lost his bank shares, his big cars, his land, and his fine home and furnishings. Cavitt Caufield for whom the family had shipped their car to North Carolina so he could be nursed from the croup by drives in the hills, now walked across the muddy fields to start the fires at Caufield School to pay his tuition. He had to live with friends in McGregor and work evenings at the drug store to go to high school. George Caufield never recovered from the shock. He never attempted to engage in commerce again. His wife accompanied him and never uttered a word of complaint until her death.¹¹⁶

The Fall of Joe Cavitt

By 1923, the failure of the cotton crops for two years in a row and a series of bad investments began to press Cavitt financially. He left a large outstanding balance at Cavitt-Lee from the unpaid "furnish" or advances to his sharecroppers. In 1923, G. W. Lee purchased Cavitt's interest in the hardware store. He bought seventy-six shares of the store's stock from Cavitt for \$200 a share by assuming the unpaid balance at the store of \$4,800 and a note Cavitt owed for \$10,000. Cavitt's days were numbered as he sold his assets one by one to pay his debts. At this point, however, he still owned 2,846 acres of cotton land, a house, and fourteen lots in McGregor.¹¹⁷

In 1924, Joe Cavitt's troubles began to gather and he would be the next to fail. He was behind in his notes to Dallas Trust Company for a total of \$107,000. Gum Brothers Company wrote Cavitt in 1925 to remind him that the taxes had not been paid. Cavitt was behind on two of his notes to the Farm Credit Company of Dallas for \$8,000 each. They held four other notes of \$8,000 each for a total of \$48,000. He had borrowed money on his wife's land from C. K. Durhan and Son for a total of \$39,000 and another set of notes on her land for \$43,900. He was able to refinance \$35,000 of the notes from Gum Brothers and Dallas Trust and Savings with the Dallas Joint Stock and Land Bank. But that year the boll weevil hit hard, the crops were small, and his income decreased again. In 1926, cotton sold for ten cents a pound which was about the cost to raise the crop. In 1927, it sold for six cents a pound. The delinquency notices

began to arrive from the loan companies.¹¹⁸

By 1928, Josephus Cavitt had also been forced into bankruptcy, owing \$50 to \$100 an acre on land that sold for \$25 an acre. Throughout the farming districts nationwide, the value of land decreased as the country moved into the Great Depression. The cotton growing areas suffered more than others. Though he tried desperately to find lending institutions to carry his debt, foreclosure followed. The Farm Credit Company sold 325 acres of his land for \$37,000, leaving a balance of \$13,000 due. Other farms sold later for \$18,000 and \$22,400. Both were purchased by German sharecroppers working the Watt Caufield farms. And both sold for less than the bank had invested in the loans. With a failed crop and no income, his sharecroppers abandoned their farms, leaving Cavitt with a huge unpaid balance at the hardware store.

In 1926, G. W. Lee (William Lee's son) bought Cavitt out by assuming the unpaid balance Cavitt owed at Cavitt-Lee Hardware. Cavitt sold all his assets and moved back to the original Caufield ranch house on 200 acres of his homestead, land exempt from foreclosure under Texas law. He began to trade with Lee's rival hardware store, S. Amsler and Son.

In 1928, Cavitt outlined his prospects in a letter to his son Volney. "In '24, I had about 1000 acres of cotton worked out when the hail struck it, which made the year unprofitable. Then in '25, I had to borrow money to pay the last years expenses. '26 made a very good crop but 'half the cotton died and the rest brought a very poor price, 6cts, which caused me to fall behind even more. In '27 I planted about 650 acres of small grain when the cotton died and harvested

a light crop which did not return the cost of making and harvesting. All the while living expenses, taxes, and interest were accumulating and the loan companies wanted their money. . . . From this you can see I have nothing left. I am now farming the place for John and Norman (Cavitt) on the halves. . . . The Baileys have bought our home (in McGregor) and we have until March 1st to get out. We are going to the ranch. The home place was exempt.”¹¹⁹

The show was over.

CHAPTER THREE

THE YOUNGS

Every Texan is familiar with the three icons of the Texas economy—oil, cotton, and cattle. Texas, however, has a fourth major agricultural product that is often overlooked—the sheep industry. Sheep and wool have been major factors in the Texas economy long before oil or cotton or cattle became important. The Spanish missions along the San Antonio River listed thousands of these animals in their inventories during the seventeenth century. During the eighteenth century sheep and wool were main pillars of the Mexican economy. Today, wool and mutton continue to be an important agricultural product in Texas and throughout the Southwest.¹

Although the mission herds had been gone for half a century, shortly after Texas Independence several Anglo families began to experiment with sheep in East Texas. Among these families were the Youngs and Cavitts. Other groups had noted that large areas of Texas, especially in the Hill Country, were ideally suited for sheep, and by 1860 several million sheep roamed the Texas grasslands. While the Caufields and Cavitts moved to McLennan County and raised cattle and cotton, the Young and Foote families followed a different path, settling in Coryell County and raising sheep. They quickly realized that the best product from their animals was their wool, which fetched high prices on the local and international markets.

William Young and his family followed a familiar pattern upon immigrating to the United States and Texas. After arriving in Philadelphia in 1820 as part of the

Scotch-Irish Diaspora, the family settled near relatives in Boligee, Alabama, for several years, acclimating to America and recovering from their trip. During the 1830s several single family members traveled to the newly opened lands in Texas to look for new opportunities. In 1833, the older family members began to move West with their extended kinship group to the Robertson Grant in East Texas to take advantage of cheap land offered by the Mexican Impresarios. Upon arrival in Texas they applied for and purchased a labor of land (177 acres designated for farming). They located their labors near their relatives, around Wheelock. They also obtained a league (4,251 acres designated for raising livestock). These larger sections of land they located in what is now Coryell County. This type of chain migration where early immigrants, usually single males, immigrated then wrote and sent for their families and other relatives, who followed in a continual string from the old country to the new settlement and then farther West, was common among the Scotch-Irish and other immigrant groups. The tightly knit family unit was the most important unit of their society, and they tended to migrate as communities of interlocking kinship groups.²

In December, 1833, the younger members of the Scotch-Irish families who had settled at Boligee, their children, and other relatives began moving overland to Texas. Their destination was Sterling Robertson's colony on the Brazos River near Sarah Ville de Viesco. After leaving Boligee, they traveled in a train of ox carts, wagons, and carryalls, following the Federal Road through Vicksburg to Natchitoches. They traveled six days a week, resting their teams and attending religious services on Sundays. After crossing the Sabine River, they followed the

Camino Real, the Old San Antonio Road, westward through San Augustine and Nacogdoches, reaching the Robertson Colony in February, 1834, after an arduous three-month trip.³

The members of this expedition formed a close-knit community of inter-related families. Robert and Hugh Henry, William and John Fullerton, James Dunn, and James Young led the caravan. In the wagon train were Henry and Sarah Caufield Fullerton, William and Mary Fullerton Henry, Hugh and Elizabeth McMillan Henry. Ann McMillan and her children--Andrew, James, George, Edward, and Mary Young McMillan, a niece, filled another two wagons. James and Isabell Caufield Dunn, Letitia Caufield Ellis, and Elizabeth Ellis Watson occupied still another wagon. James and Mary Dunn Young and their children--William Ewing Young and John Young--filled two more. These eight families founded the community of Stagers Point just north of the Camino Real and lived near each other for the rest of their lives.⁴

The kinfolks, as they had in Ireland and later in Alabama, clustered their farms next to one another along Peach Creek and Cedar Creek in what is now Williamson County. James Dunn had determined the exact site of their settlement when his wagon bogged down on the Old San Antonio Road. Riding about while the families camped for the night, he crossed an area of open prairie and decided to place his claim there. His kin settled together in the wooded area bordering that open prairie between the Trinity and Brazos rivers that came to be known as "Dunn's Prairie". They named their settlement "Stagger's Point," a term derived from "striver," meaning a determination to succeed. They quickly secured land grants, built homes, forts, and churches. As was the custom, they scattered

their leagues (4,428 acres for livestock and grazing) throughout the general area, usually southwest of their East Texas homes. Using cheap land as their main assets, they quickly reestablished their middle-class, agricultural livelihood on the Texas frontier. After their cousins had settled in Texas, the children of the original six Irish families who had settled in Boligee, in 1822, began to join their relatives in Texas during the 1830s and 1840s. Continuing the chain migration, other relatives followed them until only a few of the older family members remained in Alabama.⁵

The Scotch-Irish families brought their folkways and their religion with them to Texas. Religion was of great importance to fundamentalist Presbyterians. Isabell (Aunt Bell) Caufield Dunn, shortly after arriving in the Robertson Grant, established the first Presbyterian church-- the "Old Irish Church"--a log cabin on the Red Top Prairie between Staggers Point and Fort Dunn. Soon the Reverend Peter Fullewilder began preaching a strict Presbyterian creed from the podium of the church. The members started a school in the church to provide the education the Scots valued so much. James Dunn built a fort on the highest part of his land to serve as a protection from Indian raids and as a site for political and family gatherings. They placed the cemetery behind the fort.⁶

Shortly after his arrival in Texas, William Ewing Young began to correspond with his cousin and close friend, Henry J. Caufield, encouraging him to come to Texas. In March, 1848, Young wrote from near Wheelock, that "the winter here has been the mildest I ever saw in any country. . . . The grass [is] up very pretty over the prairie. . . . The cattle are beginning to fatten up and look slick." When his mother's illness and death in 1848 left Henry Caufield lonely and unhappy, Young

commiserated: “Henry I’m sorry your [sic] left so lonely back in old Greene.”

Knowing that Caufield loved to hunt, he added, “The turkeys are fine and fat here now. Last week . . . we came across a drove of old gobblers and . . . I can tell you its fine sport to get after an old gobbler with your cow whip.” Young’s letters convinced Caufield to migrate to Texas.⁷

In 1849, a year after their mother’s death and several months after their father remarried, twenty-one-year-old Henry Caufield and his twenty-three-year-old sister, Mary Jane, emigrated from Boligee to stay with relatives in Texas. They left their two younger siblings, sixteen-year-old David and twelve-year-old Elizabeth, home with their father and stepmother. An older brother Watson Caufield had left earlier that year for the California gold fields. Traveling overland to New Orleans, the pair went by boat to Galveston, then by stagecoach to Wheelock. Immediately after their arrival, they lived with Aunt “Bell” Dunn at Dunn’s Fort. Shortly after that, Henry began to drive ox carts and herd cattle for Josephus Cavitt who had married his cousin Kate Dunn. By 1850, Caufield had established a ranch in McLennan County on the South Bosque River. Mary Jane continued to reside with her aunts and cousins until she married William Young and moved to Coryell County.⁸

In 1852, William Young married Mary Jane Caufield. Initially they lived in the house of Young’s mother, and William and his brother George farmed and ranched in partnership. Later they settled in the Wheelock area on Young family land where their first two children were born. There they continued to farm and raise livestock. In 1858, they purchased their first land. Young reported that, “I have bought a piece of land from cousin Josephus Cavitt. “I got the piece of prairie in front of Mother’s

tract from here to the San Antonio road containing two hundred acres and then I got a piece above Mother's field for a building place including the Black Jack Grove at the side of the field. It contains about eighteen acres and then I got fifty from Mother and forty-three acres from George Dunn." The land cost \$600.

The couple kept careful records of their income, expenses, and sheep in a series of ledgers as well as noting important events in letters to their relatives. The pair made money whatever way they could. Mary Jane Caufield Young wrote her brother, "I have some two hundred fifty or three hundred pounds of butter put up to sell when the weather gets cool so I can send it to market. . . .we have had as many as a hundred [of our milk cows] up. We did not milk more than thirty of them." Accounts for their 1859-1860 flock of sheep showed costs of \$4.70 a head with a total investment of \$1,939. In 1859-1860, Young "sold his wool in Houston for \$749." This amount compared favorably with the income of \$881 which father-in-law Thomas Caufield in Alabama derived from cotton and the \$800 brother-in-law Henry Caufield earned on his cattle ranch in McLennan County.⁹

Looking for opportunity, Young had expanded his livestock herds and ventured into raising sheep and wool production with his brother George and cousin, Josephus Cavitt. In 1850, he cautiously purchased a small number of animals. By 1858, Young wrote, "Brother George and I are farming and sheep herding in partnership. . . . We have about two hundred and sixty of an increase." They initially purchased the locally available Spanish Chaurros breed favored by the Mexicans. They soon realized that the most income could be derived from wool. Although known for their hardiness and well-flavored meat, this strain, unfortunately,

produced wool fleeces weighing an average of only five pounds. Mary Jane Young wrote her brother that “William has commenced shearing. . . . He weighs the fleeces as he shears them. The lightest was 1 pound, and three quarters and the heaviest was 9 and three quarters. They generally weigh from three to eight pounds. Some of them are very fine wool.” In order to increase their wool production, the brothers decided to crossbreed their sheep with the Merino, a variety known to produce fleeces of twenty pounds or more. Merino sheep were also known to have a strong herding instinct, which prevented scattering of the flocks, and to tolerate drought and scanty forage.¹⁰

Merino stock, however, was hard to come by. The Merino, a breed developed and prized by the Spanish, produced extremely fine wool. To protect their monopoly on fine wools, the Spanish monarchy had forbidden the export of any Merino, even to their American colonies. Fortunately, on the ascension of a Bourbon to the Spanish throne in the mid-eighteenth century, the new monarch gave his cousin, the French king, a herd of Spanish Merino, which the French raised on the royal farms at Rambouillet. The French had no qualms about exporting their new acquisitions. About 1810, Americans, eager to obtain breeding stock, began to import the French Merino--the Rambouillet strain. The Americans paid large premiums for full-blooded stock which was prized for their fine fleeces and suitable for making dress goods, which demanded high prices in the marketplace. These French Merinos were available to the Texas sheep men--but expensive. The Youngs sought to purchase crossbreeds which were more available and less expensive.¹¹

Young, his brother, and Cavitt combined their efforts to obtain Merino breeding stock, thereby upgrading their flocks. The weather thwarted their initial attempt to obtain Merinos crossbreeds. In 1858, Young wrote that "Cousin Josephus went out to Arkansas this spring to purchase a lot of sheep, but the water courses were so high he did not buy at \$1.50 for grown sheep and 75 cents for lambs," because he could not get the animals across the rivers. Finally, late in 1858, Cavitt and Young succeeded in purchasing purebred Merino rams in Arkansas for \$200 each and began to interbreed the animals with their existing stock, significantly increasing the wool yield from their flocks. Young noted that the animals yielded fleeces of twenty and twenty-two pounds.¹²

Their joint venture was quite successful and by 1859 Cavitt had 1,100 crossbred sheep, while Young and his brother had about the same. Young recounted his business to Watson Caufield, "You wanted to know how our sheep were doing. We bought at first 470 head--\$1.70/head first cost and all expenses up till [sic] January 1, 1859 was \$1,939.12. Credit on sheep till January 1, 1859 was \$598.76. We had, first of January, 740 head. A net increase of 270 head. Our keep costs about 3 [and] one fourth dollars per head. . . .We have this spring already 317 lambs. Now about 1,057 head. Our wool netted 23 one-third cents a pound. I have engaged it this year at 25 cents /pound, to be delivered in Houston. Last year they averaged 5 lbs / head." They transported the wool on oxcarts to Houston to the Boston market, as did most Texas sheepmen of the day. They had no net income for 1857, using the wool money to build sheds and fences. Young purchased an additional 240 head for \$1,000 in 1859.¹³

To upgrade their flocks further, Young traveled to Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Arkansas, in 1860, purchasing, and driving a herd of crossbred Merino back to Texas. He wrote: "We had a very rough trip from Virginia with our sheep. I started with 250 head and I have 240 head here—part of the ten were sold. We have been eight weeks on the road." Later he wrote, "We have a rather short crop from our stock this year. We have about 310 lambs from our home stock . . . We now have about 100 lambs from [the new sheep]." Young had purchased the 250 mixed breed sheep for a total of \$1,045.30. Additional expenses included the cost of transport on the railroad to Mississippi (\$1.59 a head or \$394 total), a horse to herd the animals for \$30, and feed for \$52. For about \$6 a head, the partners had successfully increased their herd size, obtained strains that produced more wool, and crossbred the new animals with their existing animals.¹⁴

Unfortunately, the new sheep did not continue to thrive in East Texas, resulting in a move by Young to his family league in Coryell County. In 1858, Mary Jane had written, "Our sheep are doing very well. We have had about two hundred and sixty of an increase." But by the next year, during a severe drought, she wrote, "Our sheep have not done well this summer. They suffer for both grass and water. . . . The black tongue has been among the stock. The range was too small for the number that was on it and William has started to move his sheep upon the Middle Bosque." Henry Caufield noted, "W. E. Young and family have moved up to the country about 25 miles above me."

The immediate cause of Young's move to the family league in Coryell County was a prolonged drought in East Texas and the resultant overgrazing of his land.

But experience had also taught the East Texas sheep man that he must get away from the humid coast. In the hot and humid climate of East Texas, the Merino had suffered from insect infestations and infections in the redundant skin and wool round their necks. In the more arid acreage in the Cross Timbers Region of Coryell County, twenty miles northwest of Gatesville, the sheep herds thrived. From the initial 393 acres he now owned, Young ranged his sheep over the unfenced adjacent grazing land, building his herds to over 3,000 sheep by 1888. He eventually owned over 4,000 acres and was the largest taxpayer (after Mr. Pancake) in Coryell County.¹⁵

About 1860, Young and his new family moved to their family league in Coryell County. He built for his family a fortified wooden house able to withstand Indian attack on a knoll beside the Middle Bosque River. The two-room log cabin with dirt floors served until he built a much larger home in 1870. Mary Jane Caufield Young transferred her two infant children to her new residence in the summer of 1860 with a note to her brother Henry, "William had started to move his sheep up upon Middle Bosque. He has been up to look at the country and likes it so well that he intends to pack up all his moveable goods and chattles and leave this area as soon as he conveniently can." That year they purchased 393 acres and began a partnership in sheep and land acquisition.¹⁶

The Texas legislature had sectioned Coryell County out of Bell County in 1853. Although Fort Gates had been closed and the fort moved further west in 1852, the area, particularly around Gatesville, had attracted enough population to become reasonably safe. The three hundred residents organized a county

government in 1854. The area remained scantily populated with Gatesville having a population of only 434 people in 1880. Turnersville, originally known as Buchanan Springs, was not organized as a township until after the Civil War, but by 1880 had a population of over 200. Young and his family moved to the northwestern corner of the county where protection was less assured. Young built his new home on a hill beside a spring next to the Middle Bosque River.¹⁷

With the onset of the Civil war and the withdrawal of Federal troops from the Texas frontier forts, Indian depredations began to increase, and the boundary of safety receded to a line just west of Gatesville. Because of the increased threat of Indian raids, Young moved his family back to East Texas for the duration of the war. He, however, stayed in Coryell County close to his remaining livestock and served in the local militia, scouting the frontier areas around Gatesville. Young kept a diary of his daily activities, the weather, and his daily work from 1860-1868.¹⁸

Like many Texans, in 1863, Young sent a friend, S. Mayfield, to Mexico with a wagon load of wool to buy goods. Mayfield brought back needed supplies including 82 pounds of coffee, 50 pounds of sugar, salt, rope, and fabric for clothes. Young and Mayfield split the cost of the trip, with Young paying \$21.32 as his share.

During the Civil War, the Texas legislature divided the frontier into three districts, placing a field officer in charge of each. George Erath was given the command of the central district headquartered in Gatesville. Erath noted that "the frontier was also unprotected and the legislature passed a law calling out the militia in the frontier counties. They were to act on the minute plan, that is some few to be always scouting, the rest to be in readiness at any time called. They were to furnish

themselves everything, except, perhaps, ammunition.” Erath’s Frontier Battalion consisted of older men and those not eligible for Confederate service. Because he did not approve of slavery, Young had to “keep his head down” and joined the Frontier Battalion with Erath as his commander. Erath noted that, “this service was in the shape of local protection. Only in case of invasion were the men to be taken out of their counties.” He spent most of his time at home, minding his animals but occasionally “scouted about” for several weeks at a time. While gone, he employed young boys to watch his herds. In 1863 he hauled his wool to Houston, only to have it confiscated by the Confederate Subsistence Bureau to make uniforms for the army. But the ports were closed; Galveston was blockaded; and he could not have shipped it out anyway.¹⁹

During these turbulent times little commerce was exchanged. The Confederate currency was quickly devalued and useful only to pay taxes which rapidly increased as the Confederate cause failed. As the value of the currency fell, Young had to barter cattle and sheep the supply the needs for his herdsman. But his purchases were minimal—less than \$200 annually. In 1863 Young paid \$28.84 in Confederate (\$8.67), state and local (\$20.17) taxes. By 1864 inflation had increased the Confederate taxes to \$150.35 and state and local taxes to \$103 when paid in Confederate scrip or in “kind”—crops or livestock. The Confederate “war” tax rose from \$45 in 1863 to \$131 in 1864 to \$350 in 1865. By the end of the war Young, who had started with cash reserves of over \$4,000 in 1861, had \$125 in cash—\$48 new issue Confederate currency, \$15 in state issue, and \$65 in Bank of New Orleans notes. That year he received his final payment of \$100 on his

Confederate war bond—in Confederate currency. In other words, he was broke. He had to start all over again--but he had his land and his livestock.²⁰

Following the cessation of hostilities and the return of Federal troops to the Texas frontier, Young moved his family back to Coryell County and resumed raising sheep. Though the size of their herds had fallen to about half the prewar level, the next ten years were ones of prosperity as the price of wool rose and their flocks expanded. Wholesale prices for wool, which had been thirty cents a pound in 1861, dropped to twenty cents a pound during the years immediately following the war, falling to no lower than twenty cents during the ensuing decade. Unfortunately, the prices of wool followed the general downward drift of farm prices into the nineteenth century, reaching lows of eight cents a pound in 1897 before rising to thirty-nine cents in 1900. Prices continued to be high throughout the first two decades of the twentieth century. The family's herds increased from 1,131 to 2,655 head. Sheep sold for \$1.25 to \$2.50 a head throughout this period.²¹

The high prices for wool started a nationwide "sheep boom" as ranchers throughout Texas and the West moved into large-scale sheep production. As a result, the numbers of Texas sheep increased from two million out of thirty-nine million nationwide in 1867 to six million out of fifty-seven million in 1885. The numbers of animals rose rapidly throughout Texas, primarily in South Texas. In the Cross Timbers region of Coryell County, sheep rose from ten thousand to over one hundred thousand head. Young prospered in this period and was joined by a young neighbor, Frederick Foote, who also began to raise sheep. As the boom continued, factories in the East processed fifteen million pounds of wool in 1890, and the price

of wool began to fall from oversupply.²²

Young kept careful accounts of the expenses for his herdsman and of the wages he paid all his workers. He generally kept two men busy year round. In 1866 Young paid George Redfran \$15 monthly to herd sheep for three months (\$45). Less a \$5 cash advance, \$2 for cloth for shirts, \$3 for two pairs of shoes, and \$2.50 for tobacco, gave the herdsman a \$32.50 payout at the end of the quarter. Likewise, herdsman John Jones had a \$5 cash advance, \$2.75 for 2 shirts, \$2.50 for tobacco, \$2.50 for two pairs of shoes, and \$1.25 for a rope deducted from his pay at \$15 per month for four months (\$60), a net of \$46 income. Other wages were similar. Shearing paid 5 cents an animal, averaging \$18 a day. Two days of plowing paid \$2. These accounts seemed to be standard wages for the region and the work. The total expenses for the wool in 1879 showed shearing costing \$87, sacks \$26, hauling twenty-three sacks (7,642 pounds) of wool to Houston cost \$24. The wool brought \$923 for a net profit of \$748. Young usually made about twice that amount, sending 80 sacks of wool to Houston in 1884.

In addition to his sheep, Young, in partnership with his brother-in-law and friend, Henry Caufield, raised cattle, horses, and mules. Caufield had established a ranch in McLennan County, about twenty-five miles away from Young's sheep operation and marketed Young's livestock with his own. They moved livestock between their lands in response to drought and other conditions. Cattle, horses, and sheep--all showed a profit in the hands of these entrepreneurs. Henry Caufield and his brother Watson drove several of their herds combined with Young's, and neighbors' cattle north to Sedalia, Missouri and later to Abilene and Dodge City,

Kansas. The men would form a “cow catching” group in the early summer, bringing in all the cattle they could find. Each brand and earmarking were carefully recorded. Local owners were notified and could either come and get their animals or send them to market with the rest. Any unclaimed animals were advertised for the owners.

Often, instead of taking the drive north themselves, Young and Caufield sold their cattle to trail drivers gathering together a herd. In 1870 Young and his hands sold 46 cattle at an average price of \$15 a head (\$690) to Dandy Tolbert, including 19 head from Caufield. The following year he sold 20 head to T. H. Trotter. The buyers put the cattle into herds of about 2,000 that they were gathering to trail north. In 1874, Young, himself, took a herd of cattle north to the Kansas markets, including cattle for Henry Caufield. Though he primarily raised sheep, Young continued to purchase numerous small lots of local cattle at six dollars a head, earning fifteen to twenty dollars a head when sold in Kansas. But, by 1882, like many successful ranchers, Caufield and Young either sold his cattle to contract drovers for the market drives or shipped them north by rail directly to the Chicago stockyards.²³

After the War, Young’s family continued to grow. Joining his daughter Katie and son William, four additional children were born over the next decade, one boy and three girls—Elizabeth Caufield Young (b. 1858), William Watson Young (b. 1860), Mary Ann Young (b. 1861), Catherine Cavitt Young (b. 1863), Josephine Young (b. 1865), and William Thomas Young (b. 1866). Willie died at five and was buried on the hill next to the stone house. The other daughters married E. G.

Tenney (Katie), D. W. Freeland (Lizzie), and E. A. Brenzholt (Josie), all of the husbands had worked on their father's ranch. The next to oldest daughter, Mary Ann Young, married Frederick Foote and moved to his neighboring sheep ranch. The youngest child, William Young, attended business school at Bowling Green, Kentucky, before transferring to Vanderbilt University in Nashville where he earned a degree in engineering (1888-1891). William E. Young sent his son \$30 a month to cover tuition and living expenses during those years, carefully deducting the amount from the boy's income from the ranch. William T. Young never returned to ranching. After constructing bridges for the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, he worked for several years for the Youngstown Bridge Company out of Nashville. He established and ran his own civil engineering firm, building bridges throughout the South. W. T. Young married in 1892. After the death of his first wife, W. E. Young remarried and fathered four children—Josephus Cavitt Young (b. 1891), Nancy Lee Young (b. 1893), George Thomas Young (b. 1894), and Charlotte Elizabeth Young (b. 1895), all of whom attended Daniel Baker College in Brownwood.²⁴

Mary Ann and William Young continued an extensive correspondence for fifteen years. Before her marriage she wrote her brother weekly. Afterwards the correspondence continued with letters twice a month but never less than monthly. In fact the Young family all wrote frequent letters. The other sisters wrote William every month or so. But Mary Young was the queen of correspondence, writing ten to fifteen letters weekly to relatives and friends and, in turn, she received seven letters and five postcards in one week, most of which she preserved.²⁵

Education was important and since there were few settlers in the region, Young had to contract tutors for the children. In 1874, although he was on the county school board, he hired a Miss Hovey for \$10 a month to teach his and neighboring children, using the church building at nearby Thorp Springs as a schoolhouse. He purchased 5 dictionaries (\$3.33) 2 grammars (\$2.50), a music book (\$1.33), and three other books (\$2.55) for the school. The following year he paid Mrs. Black \$50 for the six-month school year. By 1880, the school in Turnersville had grown and became the center for education. The children drove or rode to school on Shetland ponies purchased from the Caufield ranches. The teachers, usually young, unmarried women, were under constant surveillance by the town. Mary Young wrote about one new teacher, "I don't like her looks. She is about 15, low and fleshy. She dresses in bright colors and wears much jewelry." Mary was twenty-five, unmarried and wore only "proper, Christian" clothing. Young with his sons-in-law contributed the majority of the funds to build a schoolhouse at Turnersville in 1896.²⁶

Every one of William Young's children and almost all of his grandchildren attended college. Most attended Daniel Baker College, a Presbyterian school in Brownwood. Young lived for a time there, supervising the education of his progeny. At one time nineteen children from The Turnersville Unity Presbyterian Church were attending the school. The family noted that a member of the Freeland family was attending Daniel Baker College every year for thirty-five years.²⁷

As his prosperity increased, Young had built a stone house on a knoll beside the Middle Bosque River next to an older wooden home which was turned into a

bunkhouse. In 1871, he began constructing a two story house which took two years to build and cost more than \$2,000—quite a sum for those days—about \$200,000 today. Though Young hauled the lumber himself from Marlin in a ten-day trip by ox wagon, the house was expensive. The costs for the house were: materials \$ 1,010, hauling \$115, sand \$115, masons \$460, and carpenters \$368. The resulting structure contained six rooms, two staircases, and a chimney in every room. The original kitchen was a separate frame structure in back of the house. The family added a dining room and kitchen later. The house stood until it burned in 1927. Remnants of the eighteen-inch thick limestone walls, where cattle now graze, are all that exist today.²⁸

Young also continued to purchase land as it became available. By 1887 he owned 2,795 acres worth \$10,190 and livestock worth \$6,265, including 2,200 sheep, 120 horses, cattle and hogs. In 1892, after the division of his estate with his children, Young had 1,362 acres left and 2,700 sheep and 30 horses. In addition he was agent (lessee) for D. E. Kerney's 1,147 acres and 240 acres for Mrs. L. E. Young (his brother George's widow). He had thirty-one sheep in his herd belonging to his children, for which he paid them a prorated share of each years' wool.²⁹

Judging from her correspondence, Mary Ann Young was quite opinionated. While she was being courted by Frederick Foote, her sister Josie was also being courted by Edward Brenholtz. Mary Ann did not like Brenholtz, who was a Quaker from Illinois. She considered him an opportunist who exploited his relationship with her sister to move into the big house and live well. She thought him lazy, never doing his share of the work about the ranch and a hypocrite for quoting scripture to

her father and “sweet talking the old folks” while cussing and lying behind Young’s back. She called him a “serpent” who “bad mouthed” brother William and anyone else who stood in his way to fortune. The girl’s mother protected and favored Brenholtz (in Mary’s opinion) while her father ignored the whole situation.

Six months after Mary was married, Brenholtz married Josie Young in a ceremony at the Young home. They continued to live in the Young’s home but the relationship with old William Young began to change. He tolerated much less from the couple, especially after his wife died. Within a year they had their first child and William moved them to a tenant house several miles from the home place. With time and children Mary Ann began to soften to her sister but never had much use for her brother-in-law. The other sisters, who were older and had their own families and homes, seemed to tolerate the situation with more equanimity.

Entertainment was not lacking, even in the countryside. Church was a social gathering lasting most of Sundays. Although the weekdays were filled with work – cleaning, washing, ironing, and cooking--the Young home was just off the highway to Crawford and visitors were frequent, often staying overnight. Likewise, Mary often visited her sisters in town, spending the evening and nights with their families. Reading and letter writing filled the evenings. Weekends often consisted of trips to town for goods and business and parties in town or other neighbors’ houses. In a two-month period, Mary Young visited ten friends, received ten or more visitors, and went to eight parties and dinners. She chose not to go to several more.³⁰

Mary Jane Caufield Young died in April, 1888, and the family buried her next to a child in a plot near her stone house. She had been in ill health for several years

prior to her death and, as she faded during the last six months, the sisters took turns caring for her. Sister Lizzie Freeland seems to have shouldered most of the burden of care. After her funeral, the family carried her body from the dining room, where the service was held, to her garden for burial. Forty people attended her funeral supper. They enclosed her grave in an iron fence and planted her favorite garlic about her tombstone, where it persists today.³¹

After his wife's death in 1888, William Young remarried to Mrs. Sarah Ferguson McHucheeon, the widow of the minister of the first Presbyterian Church of Gatesville. Reverend McHucheeon had been the minister of Unity Presbyterian at Turnersville for many years before being called to Gatesville. The family had been friends for many years. Mrs. McHucheeon had moved to Turnersville after her husband's death and became close friends with the Youngs. She helped during Mary Jane Young's final illness and comforted William Young after his wife's death. Of course, the girls were scandalized, particularly Mary Foote who had a few thoughts on the situation, making tart remarks about her elderly (sixty-one-year-old) father who began dressing in a black suit, fancy cravats, and hat.³²

Before his marriage, Young divided his wife's effects between his children. Mary Ann Foote sent her brother's share of personal effects—quilts bedspreads and pillows--to him at Vanderbilt. Willie had returned to Turnersville briefly at the end of the school term and the beginning of the summer but left before the household was divided. William received the family bible and a gold nugget brought back from the gold fields by Watson Caufield and given to his sister. Lizzie got the family organ. She saved a lock of their mother's hair for each child.³³

Young then proceeded to divide his real property. First he wrote a detailed document, noting what he and his late wife had invested in their joint business affairs. He set aside the livestock and land that had been purchased by their mother from her inheritances and the gain from the sheep she had purchased. In addition, he divided approximately one half of his own livestock and land among his five children. Each of the children--the four girls and son William--received about 200 acres, 200 sheep, and other livestock. To avoid future litigation, which he felt his first family would inflict on his second family after his death, Young demanded a quit claim from each of his children on the remainder of his property. The rest, about 1,362 acres, 2,700 sheep, and 30 horses, including the big stone house and the surrounding 399 acres, he kept.³⁴

Young and his new wife married quietly at the Union Presbyterian Church in September, 1888. They went on a honeymoon then returned and began to remodel the stone house. Once again the daughters were scandalized. Mary lamented the hardships that she, her siblings, and their mother had endured with her father's penurious ways. Now he dressed in suits and his wife wore silk. The house had been remodeled and painted only once in their lifetimes and here he was doing it all at once for this new wife—including new lace curtains! The next year she tartly noted the arrival of her half-brother, "the new prince," and that she just had not had time or "the desire to visit the old home place."³⁵

After his new marriage, Young undertook to educate McHucheson's two girls by her first marriage and his own children by his new wife. Eventually, he and his wife moved to Brownwood where he fathered a new family consisting two boys and

two girls. The family stated that for many decades there was always one of the Young children or grandchildren attending Daniel Baker College at Brownwood. He continued to supervise the sheep ranch until his death in 1898, but left the day-to-day operation to his sons-in-law Frederick Foote and Freeland. On his death in 1898, his four new children divided the remaining half of his personal estate, which consisted of 1,200 sheep, 36 horses, 56 head of cattle and 16 hogs valued at \$2,500. Young was buried next to his first wife, Mary Jane Caufield, and their infant son on the ranch he loved. All his remaining property he divided between his new family.³⁶

CHAPTER FOUR

FOOTE

The Foote family had resided in western New York state and New England for several generations. Adrian Foote had married Mary Cornelia Beardslee, who had also been raised in New Berlin, Chenango County, New York. Her mother, sister Caroline, and great uncle Cyril Beardslee continued to live there. After serving as a major in the Union army during the Civil War, Adrian Foote and his wife moved to Ashland, Massachusetts, a town of about 1,000 located 100 miles west of Boston. There he became the general manager and treasurer of Warren Thread Company Mills, a woolen factory owned by Jordan, Marsh & Company, a group of Boston investors. His proximity to the wool markets in Boston would be a major benefit to his son's sheep ranches. The Footes were a rather tight-knit family. Adrian and his two bachelor brothers—Andrew who became chief teller (equivalent today to senior vice-president) for a bank in Sterling, Illinois, and John, who worked the family dairy farm in New Berlin--kept in close contact with each other. Adrian and Mary Foote had four children—Frederick, Francis, Jessie, and Henry.¹

During the economic depression of 1873-1875, Frederick Foote discovered limited opportunities in Ashland and therefore decided investigate the Texas land that his mother had inherited from her father. Foote family history reveals that his grandfather Jesse Beardslee had won several sections of land in Coryell County in a poker game in New Orleans prior to the Civil War. Actually, what probably happened is that an uncle, Cyril Beardslee, who lived in Texas between 1830 and

1850, speculated in land with his partner, John Adriance, a prominent Republic of Texas attorney. Cyril induced his brother Jesse, Fred Foote's maternal grandfather, to invest in Texas land warrants. They placed their warrants near each other in the northeast corner of what is now Coryell County. Mary Cornelia Beardslee Foote inherited this land at her father's death.²

In September, 1875, twenty-year-old Fredrick Foote left Ashland and traveled to Texas to determine the value and best use of the land. Shortly after his arrival in Waco he contracted pneumonia and his visit to Coryell County was delayed until after a local black nurse had fed and cared for him until he could travel. After recovering from his illness, Foote journeyed to Coryell County to look over the family land. He returned to Waco and worked in and about the area for several years, learning the local people and the economy.

On the advice of William Young, a neighbor in Coryell County, Fred Foote decided to raise sheep on his family's rocky land. Cattle required a larger initial investment and matured more slowly, while sheep could be grazed inexpensively with rapid returns on the unclaimed, overgrazed range. Initially, he began to herd sheep on shares with a family friend from Ashland, Ezra Morse, who owned a nearby ranch. An ambitious man could start his own flocks by raising stock for a more established landowner and receiving one third of the increase as part pay. Most decided to take livestock for their salary, instead of cash. Fred Foote began purchasing his own sheep in 1879 in partnership with his father Adrian Foote and eventually built a large sheep ranch.³

The Foote league was located in the northwestern corner of Coryell County; it was an excellent habitat for sheep. Located in a semiarid and rocky portion of the Cross Timbers area, it had been overgrazed by cattle the previous decade. Sheep thrived on the weeds and forbs that grew in this overgrazed area. They ate grass as

a last choice during the winter months. Cattle, on the other hand, thrived on grass. The two make ideal companions on the same land as long as there was sufficient forage for both during the winter. The new county seat, Gatesville (population 1,400 in 1888), was twenty miles from the Foote ranch and furnished close railroad access. Nearby Turnersville (population 200 in 1888), only five miles from the ranch house, had stores that furnished food and hardware needed to operate the ranch.⁴

Though raising sheep had become a major business in the semiarid western portion of Coryell County, it constituted only a small portion of the state production. In 1888, local sheepmen owned 40,675 head of sheep out of the state total of 3.8 million head. They produced 271,270 pounds of wool valued at \$41,434 (about one dollar gross income per animal) compared to eighteen million pounds statewide worth \$2.9 million.⁵

Foote and Young did not become the largest sheepmen in the West or in Texas. But they had chosen well. Their land was ideally suited for sheep and could hold about 2,000 head without supplemental feeding—which happened to be the number of sheep that one herder could handle without help. They began a long and prosperous venture in sheep, wool, and other livestock and crops.

The entire family took great interest in Frederick's sheep ranch and eventually every member of his family joined the venture. Father Adrian Foote invested heavily in the venture, pledging his salary for years in advance to ensure the operation's success. Because Henry was to be an equal partner in the enterprise, Adrian took money from Henry's salary to make payments on the notes. Fred Foote paid an equal share of the notes, did the work, but did not draw a salary and plowed all his equity back into the project. Uncles John Foote and Andrew Foote invested both in land and sheep. Great uncle Cyril Beardsley and his son-in-law H. H. Harrington purchased sheep and leased their land to the ranch operation.

John Foote, Adrian Foote's bachelor brother from New Berlin, had invested in sheep with the family and by 1886 had 550 head on the place. Foote earned half the wool clip and half the new lambs by supervising the herds. Additional labor cost \$260. The size of Uncle John's herd grew until he sold 220 head in 1892. Even in 1896 John Foote still had a considerable number of animals on the Foote ranch, including 96 ewes and 60 lambs valued at \$106. The wool clip on the animals produced \$59 and the sale of 140 head had brought an additional \$132 of income.

Even sisters Francis and Jessie Foote sent small sums to buy additional sheep. Francis, while teaching school in Westchester, sent thirty dollars of her earnings to Fred to purchase five ewes and a ram. In 1883, she made five dollars on her sheep (a 16 percent annual income on her investment). By 1885 she owned

twenty head. The next year she asked Fred to sell the animals; he sent her the money to buy cattle at her new home in Nebraska. Jessie sent clothing and shopped for goods in Boston.⁶

Only brother Henry and Uncle John Foote, however, actually visited and worked on the ranch with Fred Foote. In 1880, Henry Foote spent several months with Fred while expanding their sheep herds, building sheds, and enclosing pastures. Henry would eventually inherit a half interest in his mother's land. In January 1882, Uncle John Foote stopped at the ranch for several weeks, stopping in Kansas on his way home.⁷

The Footes were prodigious letter writers. Several hundred letters flowed from all family members to Texas over the next decades. Frederick Foote never suffered from a lack of advice from those who would supervise his business from afar. Father, mother, uncles, sisters, and brother Henry all wrote regularly. Father Adrian Foote was particularly punctual in his letters, writing sometimes twice weekly with advice.

Sister Francis was a frequent letter writer, averaging monthly letters. She also forwarded her copies of various magazines and books, including the *Century*, a favorite topic of discussion. Sister Jessie wrote at most two or three times a year. Henry's letters came every month or so and were often full of angry recriminations against his father. Uncles Andrew and John corresponded every couple of months. Cousin H. H. Harrington wrote frequently, while pursuing title questions then asked annually for an accounting.⁸

The family correspondence covered more than just ranch matters and reveals their close interrelationships. Fred's mother wrote every month. She never ceased to worry about her son and in 1882 wrote, "I cannot help thinking of the trials and toils of the life you have chosen in that barren country." She sent him a coat for his birthday and several pails of dried apples and cranberries.

Adrian, as the patriarch of the family was a font of advice—wanted or not. He attempted to control all aspects of the ranch, as he did his family in Ashland. He subscribed to livestock journals and a Galveston newspaper (the only one worth reading according to Adrian Foote). He combed the local Massachusetts sheep farms for equipment and animals to enhance the stock.

Adrian Foote could also be a bit overwhelming. During the week of December 20, 1886, he wrote several letters pressing his son to tend to determining the boundaries of their land in Hamilton County for taxes purposes. Adrian looked for surveying chains and instruments around Ashland. On December 24, he began a series of letters stressing the importance of drilling water wells, quoting the exact depth and size of piping to purchase. Shortly thereafter, he discussed the importance of building sheep sheds for the winter, prescribing the exact size, shape, and structure of the buildings. The next series of letters contained an in-depth analysis of the merits of an \$800 artesian well drilling machine. He also included a price list (Adrian recommended splitting the cost with Fred's neighbors). Fred seems to have allowed distance to dissipate the urgency of his father's prolific free advice.⁹

Beginning the Sheep Venture

In 1880, Fred Foote began to supervise his own herds. He initially contracted to raise sheep on shares with Ezra Morse, a neighbor in Ashton, Massachusetts, who owned and lived part time on an adjoining ranch. He herded Morse's animals with those he had earned the previous years and other sheep he had purchased. The first years of their partnership were difficult. During the winter of 1880, they lost many of their animals to freezing weather, wolves, and drought. This herder ran off, leaving Foote without extra help. Morse lost the majority of his investment and was not happy.¹⁰

Several local friends from Ashland, including G. W. Randell and his son Frank who worked and lived on the Morse Ranch, began to herd for Fred and became close friends. G. W. Randell returned the next year to Ashland with his wife Lucy died of tuberculosis several years later; but Frank Randlett spent several more years working for Fred. Frank Randlett eventually returned to Ashland to look after his elderly parents, but continued to take a close interest in Fred and Henry and their sheep.

Businessmen began to take note of the rising young sheep raiser. The merchants in Turnersville started to sell Foote goods on credit. Wool factors solicited his business. In 1879, Fred had received a notice from J. R. Franklin, a wool factor in Waco, who wrote him soliciting his wool clip along with that of his neighbor William Young and offering prices of 23 to 24 cents a pound. In 1880, Foote contracted with Franklin to sell his first clip, starting a relationship that lasted

several decades.

Meanwhile, back in Ashland, the family became more interested in the prospects of the ranch. This interest led brother Henry Foote to work with Fred on the property. Henry Foote, on the way to join Fred, arrived in Waco a few days prior to Christmas, 1880, bringing clothes sent by Adrian and Mary Caroline Foote and a \$46 roundtrip ticket. Henry planned to stay and become a full partner in the ranch, but he quit after just six months. Fortunately he had kept the roundtrip ticket. He traveled back through Chicago, transferred at Sterling, Illinois, visited his Great Uncle Andrew Foote, and arrived in Ashland by late spring, 1881. Great Uncle Andrew had offered Henry a job making barbed wire at the local factories at \$1.90 a day. The work was not to Henry's liking.¹¹

By 1881, the ranch was beginning to make money with activity increasing rapidly. For forty years Foote recorded each expense in a day book which he carried in his pocket and transferring the aggregate sums to a ledger he totaled annually. The first few notations in his day book indicated that fodder for the animals and food for the herders were the largest expenses. In 1881, he purchased 135 pounds of cotton seed at eighty cents/pound and 298 pounds of bran to feed his animals. The herders' board included bacon, sweet potatoes, and butter (six pounds) and cost \$290 for the year. Another major expense included purchasing two horses for \$125 and \$3 to have them shod and fed. The total net income from the ranch that first year was less than \$100.¹²

In 1881, Adrian Foote began a quest to purchase 1,000 ewes to finish equipping the ranch. First he considered buying them in Michigan. But he decided

it was too late in the season to ship pregnant ewes with their heavy winter wool coat. Packing them too closely in the freight cars would result in unacceptable losses in both ewes and lambs. He therefore recommended buying the animals in Texas; he sent \$200 to pay for the sheep. He later noted that sheep could be purchased locally at \$3 a head for ewes without the cost of shipping. He recommended buying local sheep. Fred Foote purchased 500 ewes for \$2,500 which the owners delivered from San Antonio to the Coryell County ranch. Fred then purchased an additional 500 ewes for \$3,000 in the spring of 1882. The ranch was now fully stocked.¹³

Uncle John wrote that he was coming to visit soon, probably late in December, 1881 or early January, 1882, to look over his investments. He was traveling with a group from New Berlin on their way to take the waters at Hot Springs, Arkansas. Uncle John wanted to be picked up at the train station in Waco on December 27, 1881. He arrived, stayed at the ranch for several weeks, and returned via Newton, Kansas in January, 1882.¹⁴

While Fred and Henry worked through the Texas winter in the windy prairie country, life in Ashland continued to progress peacefully. Sister Jessie wrote that she and her sister had ice skated on the local pond, had been to several plays, had traveled to South Farmington to hear Henry Ward Beecher, and had enjoyed thanksgiving dinner.

Buying the Land

Herding sheep, drilling water wells, and building sheds were not the only problems facing Fred Foote; he needed to obtain clear title to his land which was often a prodigious feat in Texas. Cyril Beardsley had owned 3,600 acres with John Adrienne for over thirty years. The original Foote grant was purchased about the same time by Cyril's brother Jesse, Caroline Foote's father. During the next decade, problems proving title, conducting surveys, and delineating the exact area of each land grant consumed most of Fred Foote's time.

Obtaining a clear title to Texas frontier land was complicated. Although the Beardsley family had patented their land in 1856, numerous squatters had lived on various portions of their grants and all the surrounding ones. Some had paid taxes, and some had left their "land" to their children. For example, several families claimed prior ownership to parts of the Beardsley grant. Each claim had to be cleared.

The Foote purchases were further complicated by a typical Texas problem—poor surveys. The initial land surveys were often imprecise—"from a large oak tree . . . to a stack of white rocks"—and sometimes the actual boundaries of adjacent grants overlapped or were not contiguous, leaving unclaimed areas between the boundaries. Before a clear title could be registered, the boundaries had to be resurveyed. To facilitate delineating the boundaries, Adrian Foote purchased survey tools together with a survey chain and sent them to Texas.¹⁵

Back taxes were also a problem. To cloud the titles further, as Texas created new counties, the new entities often failed to survey and delineate their boundaries. Each county then demanded taxes on the same piece of land, often selling the property for delinquent taxes, even if the taxes had been paid in an adjoining county, thereby creating confusion, overlapping of tax debts, and contested titles.

Coryell County had been created from the western portion of Bell County in 1854. Previous titles and taxes had been recorded in Bell County. Hamilton and Bosque counties were created about the same time. The Foote and Beardsley grants lay at the junction of the three counties with parts in each entity. Proving tax payments became even more difficult when the Hamilton County courthouse burned on November 26, 1886, destroying all records of past taxes. The Footes labored for six years to obtain a clear title to their own land and eight years to clear the title on Uncle Cyril's property.¹⁶

The Foote land joined those of the Young family on one side and that of the Dunn family (the Young's cousins in Wheelock) to the north, which made those boundaries and fence lines somewhat easier to determine. But, since numerous children and cousins had inherited undivided portions of the grants, fence lines became a complicated family matter. As fences were built, each family carefully watched the fence line to avoid encroachments. Those involved split the costs according to percentage of ownership. But, collecting those expenses from all the different family members also complicated matters.

Incomplete, overlapping, or clouded titles also complicated the Footes' attempts to secure clear title to Cyril Beardsley's land. While surveying the land,

they had encountered another unique problem. An enterprising gentleman named Hattley had found a small strip of unclaimed land between two land-grant surveys. He placed his bounty warrant there, overlapping with his neighbors, paid taxes on the whole, and waited for the original owners to buy him out in order to clear their titles. Bounty warrants, usually given for service in the Texas revolutionary army, preempted all other grants unless the grant and its boundaries had been surveyed and patented prior to the later claim.¹⁷

The issue with Hattley came to a head in 1886. In 1879, He had placed his warrant grant between Cyril Beardsley's grant and an adjoining survey with the edges overlapping each of the preexisting surveys. When forced off the adjacent survey in 1881, he moved his boundaries farther over the line into the Beardsley's grant. H. H. Harrington, an attorney in New Berlin and Cyril Beardsley's son-in-law, began a relentless campaign to have the Hattley "thrown off" the Beardsley survey as well. When the Bosque County Sheriff served him papers, Hattley stated that he "would shed blood before moving." The project took eight years and only culminated when Hattley's house burned in 1886 and he moved on to another county—probably to try the same maneuver again.¹⁸

The Foote family purchased additional land as it came available. In July, 1882, they purchased the E. A. Blount land in the Burns Survey--2,322 acres, for \$3 an acre. Blount had purchased the land with John Adriance, using a bounty warrant to preempt the title. Blount and Adriance later split the land, each taking ownership of a portion of the original grant. They each had paid the county taxes in their home county or in Austin (which could be done until 1879).

After the new counties of Hamilton, Coryell, and Bosque were formed, the new counties had no records of the tax payments made in Austin. Everyone had to scramble to find decades-old tax receipts. Hamilton County had sold some of the land for nonpayment of taxes, even though the taxes had been paid in Austin. The amount of land claimed by each county had varied over several different years and extra taxes had been paid in one county but not in another. In some cases two persons had paid the same taxes in the same county. In 1884 Blount conveyed his title to Adrian Foote. But it took another eight years to obtain a title clear from all tax encumbrances. For this piece of land, the Foote family paid one-third cash and took notes for the remainder over two years. They later purchased an additional 420 acres in the same survey, leaving the 387 acres owned by another descendent of the original owner undivided until decades later. This allowed the family to graze their sheep free on the extra pasture. In 1883, they purchased the Logan survey from S. J. Chute, 1,476 acres for \$3,500, giving \$1,000 down and taking a note for the rest at 8 percent annually. Adrian Foote borrowed \$650 dollars from “Old Mike” and \$500 from John Foote to finance the new purchases and to buy 600 additional sheep to place on the new grazing land.¹⁹

By 1888, Fred Foote and his family had accumulated 6,729 acres by ownership or lease. On this land they grazed 4,000 sheep and assorted other livestock. The land spread over three counties—Bosque, Hamilton, and Coryell--with taxes that amounted to \$124 annually, part paid to each of the three different legal entities. By 1895, the ranch covered 7,590 acres.²⁰

Consolidating the Business

In 1882 the Foote family made a series of decisions that solidified their future investments in Texas and in the sheep industry. First they purchased additional land, the 2,300 acres adjacent to their survey. Next they invested in sheds, water wells, and fences for their sheep. And finally, they agreed to purchase enough sheep to maximize the herd's size at about 2,000 head. In addition, they solidified their finances when Uncle John invested in the sheep herds as did sister Francis, father Adrian, and great uncle Cyril. Fred Foote was now committed to raising sheep in Texas.

In 1882, Fred Foote was thirty-one years- old and had spent nine years on the land but still did not have a permanent residence. That year he began to make a permanent residence on the ranch. While settling in, Fred built a house, shed, and wooden fence at the headquarters for \$1,185. He bought four thousand feet of lumber costing \$100, part of which was used to build sheds for the sheep. He purchased furniture for \$100 and hardware for the doors costing \$23.70. He now had a permanent home.²¹

As the size of the herds increased, obtaining sufficient water for the animals in semiarid western Coryell County became an urgent problem. Because his neighbors had fenced off his access to surrounding waterways, Foote needed a year-round water supply. In 1882, he drilled two shallow water wells close to the main house. He drilled the wells for \$33 and \$20 each, providing a stable water supply at the main headquarters for both humans and animals. Wells at that time

cost between fifty cents to two dollars a foot to drill, with the windmills an additional expense. A pump for one windmill cost \$31, pipe \$12, and freight from Henry Stowe, Blacksmith, Boston, \$13. The arrival of the Santa Fe Railroad at Crawford in 1882 and the Cotton Belt Railroad in Gatesville in 1883 facilitated the shipping of supplies and lowered the transportation costs as well.²²

In 1884, as the Footes enclosed their pastures, the family continued to recognize the need for a more dependable water supply for their animals. They began to drill additional wells, which they located around their holdings. As they increased their land over the next two decades, the Footes continued to ensure that their flocks had access to adequate water by the placement of windmills. The new wells cost \$100 to \$250 each, depending on the depth. But the wells paid off after a series of dry years from 1885-1888 made water a precious local commodity. Further improvements in 1898 included three wells costing \$42, \$37, and \$44 each.²³

This practice paid off during the drought of 1888-1890. Weather has always been the bane of the rancher and farmer's fortunes. In 1889 the drought became so severe that Hugh Springs near Turnersville on the Young property became one of the few sources of water. William Young had to fence his springs, post a guard, and allot only two gallons a day to each person. But Foote had little trouble since he no longer depended on surface-water supplies. While the losses to the other herds were severe, Foote did not have to reduce his flocks significantly.²⁴

Between 1881-1884, a fierce range war had raged between the Pancake/Babb and the Standefer interests for control of the open range. The result

was a great deal of fence cutting. Pancake, who had settled in the county in 1852, had at one time operated a ranch fourteen miles across. Although he considered the land his property, he actually owned only a small portion. When the actual landowners fenced their property, Pancake began to lose control of his empire. He fought back vigorously by hiring a notorious outlaw named Bill Babb and his gang. In 1878, Babb killed Deputy U.S. Marshall John Stull. At trial he promised to leave the county if acquitted. Yet when the jury freed him, Babb did not depart. The next week, over five hundred citizens gathered and told him he had ten days to leave or they would burn out him and his family. Babb moved out, only to be replaced by another outlaw, John Boob and his gang. In 1883, when Boob was finally driven from the county, Pancake gave him a trusted blue-gray horse named Grayback to help his getaway. Pancake's fortunes continued to deteriorate; he began to drink heavily, and when he died a decade later, his passing was neither mourned, nor his estate enlarged. Fortunately the Foote fences escaped Pancakes deprecations.²⁵

In 1883, the family had begun to fence their own property at great cost; and they used six-wire fences of plain wire at 31 cents a rod or five strands of the new barbed wire, which cost 52 cents a rod. The plain wire cost 65 cents a pound while barbed wire cost \$7.45 a pound. They spread the cost of the new barbed wire over the next decade, but the cost of fencing was tremendous for the day, with the cost of labor reaching \$15 per mile, and posts, labor, and wire totaling \$150 a mile. Fences in 2001 cost \$3 a running foot—about \$15,000 a mile—a similar price in 2001 dollars.

During 1885, Frederick Foote continued to increase the ranch's infrastructure

with sheep sheds, out-buildings, and fences. That fall the family invested in an eight-strand barbed-wire fence for the lambing fields close to headquarters, shipping the wire from mills in Indiana. The extra wires were added to prevent the small lambs from slipping between the strands. Other purchases included a harrow for \$49, a Sulky plow for \$100, a chain for surveying, a Fort Scott planting drill, trunks, clothing, and connections for windmills.²⁶

By 1886 the basic infrastructure for the ranch was in place. The Foote family, particularly father Adrian, had kept a careful watch over the ranch, supervising the building of sheds, the cultivation of fodder, and the placement of windmills. Unsure of local quality, they continued to purchase New England equipment for their holdings including another water pump costing \$64.44 (shipping cost more than the pump) made by Henry Stowe in Boston. Later Fred Foote had to send for replacement rubber gaskets for the pumps. In his typical manner, Adrian chastised Fred for sending the actual gasket but later noted he had needed to have the exact size to order the replacement. The family's foresight paid off when a prolonged drought hit the area in the summer of 1887. The Foote ranch fared much better than the surrounding area.²⁷

Life on a Sheep Ranch

Life was not always easy on the isolated sheep ranch. Fire, drought, disease, predators, and low prices took a heavy toll on the herds. Wool prices fluctuated. And the herders disappeared without warning—often with part of the flock. Fred Foote had difficulty obtaining tenants, herders, and families who would cook and wash the hands' clothes.

Initially he had lived with a Mr. and Mrs. Lee and their three children in the small ranch headquarters. Lee labored as a herder while his wife cooked, cleaned, and laundered for the men. But the crowded quarters forced Fred to camp out in the sheds most of the time. Family lore relates that he lived in a piano shipping crate for several months.²⁸

Fred eventually became infested with lice, resulting in his mother prescribing “Kerosene, a fine comb . . . and boiling clothes.” The treatment recommended by his mother also included “spreading kerosene over his entire body, then washing himself, all his clothes and all his bed linens.” His hair was to be prepared with a “fine comb and sulphur water applied.” When Fred developed the itch (probably scabies), his mother recommended treatment with sulphur and molasses. Father Foote prescribed “equal parts of cream of tartar and sulphur, mixed in molasses.” As a child Adrian Foote had been given this recipe with a little whiskey “until the sulphur came out the pores.” The mixture was to be taken by mouth nightly for three nights, then applied topically as a salve for several additional weeks.²⁹

Scabies, a common complaint among sheep farmers, began to infest the Foote herd in 1882. Scabies (scab) is a highly contagious infestation carried by a mite. The insects dig into the skin and damage the wool by infesting and weakening the fibers. The itching caused the animals to scrape their sides on trees and poles, further damaging the wool and leaving bare spots. The next animal rubbing against that pole also became infected. Scab is best countered by dipping the sheep in a vat containing either tobacco or sulphur. Adrian shipped forty gallons (one barrel) of Dr. T.W. Langford's "New Sheep Dip" from Little Chambers Co. in Baltimore, Maryland, for \$76.50 (including \$26.50 shipping costs). Treatment for the scab-infected animals began at once. Father Foote sent a recipe for treating the scab, which suggested using tobacco, sulphur, whiskey, and molasses--a treatment that sheepmen continued to employ for many decades. He also sent a book on diseases of animals and a book of business forms.³⁰

During the brief time he was on the ranch, Henry Foote developed scurvy, caused by a lack of green vegetables and heavy drinking. He was cured with lime juice. In addition, his mother sent oatmeal and dried apples. Henry worked on the place about six months until the spring of 1881 when he left, complaining that the ranch was "too lonely, the weather too cold, and the food too bad." Records indicated that he only managed to shear one or two sheep a day—compared with the twenty to fifty the other herders clipped. Henry came back in the fall of 1881 for nine months but returned home in the summer of 1882. Henry returned to the ranch one more time in 1888 and lasted, once again, about six months before deciding to live in Massachusetts for good.³¹

Marketing Wool

Ranchers trying to market wool from an isolated ranch on the frontiers of Texas late in the nineteenth century found the selling difficult. On the advice of neighbor William Young, Foote sent wool samples from his clip of 1882 to J. R. Franklin who was a wool factor in Waco. Franklin graded the wool as medium/clean and sold the entire clip for twenty-three to twenty-four cents a pound. Franklin continued to market the Foote wool for the next decade.³²

In 1883, Fred sold twelve bags of wool through Franklin at twenty cents a pound, netting \$485 and depositing the funds in the Waco State Bank. He later sold an additional ten bags of wool for eighteen cents a pound.

In 1884, trying to find a steady and reliable market for his clients' wool, Franklin traveled through New England leaving sample fleeces with various woolen factories. The mills were interested. They wanted a clean and dependable source of quality wool and direct selling cut out the Boston middleman, increasing profits both for the mill and the producer. During a return trip in 1885, Franklin stopped in Ashland and visited with Adrian Foote, who was also trying to establish a lasting relationship with one of the New England wool factories. Franklin and Adrian traveled to Stafford Springs, Connecticut, to visit the Riverside Woolen Company owned by Cyril Johnson and Richard Beebe. They attempted to presale their Texas clip to the factory. The owners liked the sample fleeces but were wary of changes in the quality between years and would not completely commit themselves without

examining the wool each year before purchase. They wanted five to six fleeces sent ahead (which they would keep). This arrangement, although good for the factory owners who obtained first right of refusal on quality wool, was not advantageous to the sellers, who had to bear the cost of shipping to a “maybe” market. Instead, they gave Johnson first right of refusal at the Boston market.

Later the next year, in response to Franklin’s inquiries, Riverside Woolen Company sent a Mr. Norton to the ranch. The factories liked to inspect the ranches from which they received their wool. Norton stayed at the Menger Hotel in San Antonio, headquarters for the annual wool sale, and corresponded with Fred Foote, before visiting the ranch. He traveled via railroad and took a sample fleece back with him. Foote and the Eastern wool mills failed to establish a permanent relationship.³³

In 1885, Foote shipped his wool directly to Boston, causing great excitement for Adrian Foote who anticipated managing the marketing process. Ezra Morse, a former resident of Ashland who owned and operated a sheep ranch near Turnersville, had arranged to sell all the local wool through Brown and Williams, Co., a prominent Boston wool agent. Fred Foote’s wool arrived first and Adrian made several trips to Boston to look over the newly arrived wool. He impatiently awaited the arrival of Morse so that all the bags could be opened. Morse and Young’s bags arrived several weeks later.

Adrian and Henry Foote returned on several additional occasions to the Boston market to view the grading and supervise the sale of the clip. The Foote’s wool graded medium and fine. The medium wool paid a premium at twenty-seven

cents a pound because it better fit the machinery currently used in the New England woolen mills. The wool that graded fine sold later for twenty-five cents a pound. The prices in Boston dropped later that year to eighteen cents a pound and eleven bags were stored to wait for a better price in 1886. By comparison, wool at Waco sold at nineteen to twenty-one cents a pound.³⁴

Fred had taken a partial advance payment in Waco for fifteen cents a pound, a fact he neglected to tell his father. Adrian upon discovering that he would not have complete control of the proceeds from the sale was not happy. He took the remaining balance and repaid several personal debts including \$650 borrowed from "Old Mike" for the down payment on the Blount land. Old Mike was off on a trip back to Ireland. Adrian kept the rest of the money, sending Fred small increments over several months.

Fred did not like being treated like brother Henry, with his father controlling every penny. He let Adrian know that quite directly, resulting in strained relations for several months. Still, Fred did not receive the last \$75 of the money until January, 1887. Fred never again allowed any of the income from the ranch to pass through his father's hands.

Again, in 1886, the Footes and the Youngs attempted to sell their wool in Boston. This time Franklin, the wool factor in Waco, visited the ranch and facilitated the shipment to Boston. Foote made arrangements to ship the wool to Boston via Waco and Houston to Brown and Co. (Brown and Williams had split their business). There, in the Boston market, the ranch wool was once again graded under the watchful eye of his father. Medium grade wool, the primary product of the Foote

herd, sold at a slightly higher price than fine wool. This year Fred had arranged for the entire amount to be paid into a Waco bank. His father said nothing.³⁵

Young had joined Foote and they shipped their wool to Boston, a seven-day trip from Galveston. His records indicated that the wool clip for the year 1886 had cost \$165 for shearing, \$43 for the wool sacks, and \$75 for hauling the wool to Houston. Herding for the year cost \$700. The wool sold for 24 1/4 cents a pound, a gross profit on 15,338 pounds of wool of \$3,719.47, and a net, after commissions and storage, of \$2,736. The Foote family records indicated that they experienced similar costs and returns. If they had sold the wool locally, they would have earned \$221 more.

The next year Fred Foote abandoned shipping directly to Eastern markets. Though the Boston wool market offered access to foreign wool merchants and the price was higher, the cost of shipping the wool to Boston was also costlier. After the family paid commissions to the Boston wool factors, the increase to profits was minimal. Paying for hauling the wool to Houston shipping via steamship to Boston, storage in Boston and the insurance to protect from losses consumed any potential profit. The family concluded that the difference in income from selling in Boston was too small to compensate for the increased cost and risk. They decided to sell all future clips in Waco or Houston.³⁶

Wool sacks often were an item of contention for the suppliers. For easier transportation, the producers packed the sheared wool fleeces into large bags of heavy cotton ticking, which cost about \$3 each. Each bag contained 250-500 pounds of wool. The stockmen wanted credit for the bags or to have them returned.

The purchasers could resell the bags and considered them a bit of extra profit on their purchase. To add insult to injury, the purchaser deducted three pounds from the total weight of the fleeces for the weight of each bags. Foote eventually bargained for a 1.5 pound deduction and the return of the bags.³⁷

Breaking Away

During the summer of 1884, Fred Foote finally visited his family in Ashland. His mother Caroline was dying from an “internal cancer” which had been diagnosed by a Dr. Herman, who had traveled from Boston to examine her and to review her case with the local physicians. The doctors concluded that there was little they could do. Though she would live another year, Caroline Foote’s health and ability to care for herself gradually decreased. By the summer of 1885 she was “under the influence of opiates most of the time.” She died in September, 1885. Fred and his mother enjoyed their last visit and Caroline Foote’s letters reflect her contentment with her oldest son’s life. Her death led to the permanent division of the sibling’s property.³⁸

In 1885 other major changes to the Foote family also occurred. Grandmother Beardsley died in New Berlin, New York, in the spring of 1885 where she had been living with her daughter Cornelia (Aunt Carrie) and her son-in-law Augustus. Later that same year Mary Caroline Beardsley Foote died from cancer. Her will left each of the two girls \$500 and half of her Meeker Hill farm and left each of her sons \$500 and half of her Texas land. She left her husband her portion of the house, her \$3,000 life insurance and \$500 cash. He was not pleased. His wife had bypassed his control.³⁹

Francis Foote had remained in Ashland to care for he mother but with her

mother dead, Francis was now free to marry fiancé Will Barstow and start her own life. While waiting for Francis, Will had moved to Ord, Nebraska, where he worked in the wholesale grain and cattle business. Francis had visited Ord at least once to find and furnish a house. The couple finally married on November 30, 1886, “quietly and at home.” She left with her new husband by train for Ord the first week in December. Francis was not overly fond of the prairie, writing to Fred that “the prairie is the loneliest place I ever saw. To see so far and still see nothing. I just longed for a tree.” Although she visited sister Jessie frequently in Ashland, Francis focused on her family and Nebraska, playing little role in her brothers’ sheep business.⁴⁰

Jessie Foote never married and continued to live in the family home, caring for her father Adrian until his death. After her father’s death, Jessie became the trustee for Henry’s portion of the Texas ranch, and continued to play an important role in the long term develop of the property.

Caroline Foote’s will had to be probated in New York, Massachusetts, and Texas, thus delaying its completion. When the family finished legalizing the will in 1886, the land in Texas passed in joint and undivided ownership so that Fred could continue to use the entire area. The girls rented their farm, Meeker Hill, to their uncle John Foote for dairy farming, receiving \$200 annually.

The family sent several trunks of goods to Fred as his share of the personal inheritance. The shipment included several pictures and frames, pillow cases, sheets, quilts, and blankets. Included also were clothes, including hats, stockings, flannel shirts, and a leather coat, among others. The total value of the goods

shipped was less than eighty dollars—that was all the personal goods Fred received from his inheritance and all that he owned when he married the next year.⁴¹

In 1886 a dispute began that is typical of family businesses. It would continue for the next fifty years. Henry Foote wrote his brother Fred that he wanted his half of the “sheep business.” What constituted Henry’s share of the assets became the subject of generational controversy. Fred Foote had moved to Texas and started the sheep ranch on his mother’s 3,200 acres in 1875. He had lived there continuously and had personally built all the buildings, drilled the water wells, shepherded the sheep, and had now married and built his family a house. Henry had worked on the ranch for just six months in 1880 and nine months in 1881, returning home because the work was too hard. Since leaving, he had lived with his father and sisters in the family home. Father Adrian Foote had sent thousands of dollars to pay for capital expenses and helped finance the purchase of an additional 2,300 acres. Adrian had financed the down payment on other acreage. Adrian and each brother had paid an equal share on the notes. Adrian deducted Henry’s share of the note payments from his wages but even then Henry had never paid a full one-third share of the expenses. Henry wanted one half of everything—land, sheep, improvements, and wool. Fred wanted Henry to have a share proportional to the money and work Henry had put into developing the business—an amount considerably less than Henry considered his rightful share.⁴²

Henry wanted to be free from his father’s control, but the family was afraid he would lose his share and wanted to protect both Henry and their own investments. Henry was deaf, drank to excess, and tended to squander his money. He was

continually looking for a better place and moved from job to job every year or so. In 1886, he was working at his father's mill as an independent teamster and managing his father's rental tenements. Father Foote had continued to manage his son's money, deducting living expenses, note payments, and paying the debts Henry acquired while sporting about. He kept the boy on a tight string, which he greatly resented. Now that his mother was dead, Henry felt free to demand his share of the inheritance.

The traditional division of income for such investments, and the contract made with his uncle, stated that Fred, as ranch manager, earned half of the income from the wool and half the increase in the sheep herd. Fred had kept careful records and accounts, reinvesting all his income back into the ranch and living on less than \$200 a year. Unfortunately, Fred had not noted the ownership of the individual sheep that died nor his personal share of the income which he reinvested in the project. Henry's equity was his inheritance of half of his mother's 2,300 acres. The argument centered on the value of Henry's "share" and the value of Fred's "work equity."

Eventually Henry, Fred, and Adrian Foote worked out a division. The nonworking Henry received an overgenerous portion--an annual \$200 allotment of income, no matter what the total income of the rest of the ranch. He was to receive a one-half share in his mother's land and a one-third share in the Blount land. But, as is so often the case, to his dying day Henry, along with his widow, and their children believed that they had been cheated. Each sued at least once for a larger share, but lost every time.⁴³

In 1904, Adrian assigned an additional allotment for Henry Foote and his new wife Cora, placing title to his share from the land the three owned together and his inheritance from his father, about 409 acres, into the trust. Sister Jessie Foote was appointed trustee, a duty which she continued until Henry's death in 1931. The trust provided an additional \$200 annual income to the family (\$400 total). Henry's children assumed control of the land after their father's death in the depths of the Depression, while Fred Foote continued to manage the land. The contract for guaranteed income had expired at their father's death and the children received little income while prices remained so low. There were no purchasers for the isolated properties during the Great Depression and Henry's children finally were able to sell their interests during the 1940s.

Settling In

In the fall of 1885, Fred Foote became engaged to Mary Ann Young and they began to plan their wedding. Fred had told his family of his interest in Mary as early as the spring of 1885 and announced his engagement in August. The exact date of the wedding was not decided until late November of that year. As the wedding plans developed, Mary wrote her brother all the details. She began to accumulate her trousseau during the summer with a calico dress. While she lamented her father's parsimoniousness in not allowing her free reign to buy her clothes and accessories, Mary shopped in Turnersville, Gatesville, and Waco, picking out brown lace trims for her wedding dress, a hat, and matching shoes. Most were shipped via Turnersville and she anxiously awaited each item. When things did not go her way, Mary threatened to run away and get married elsewhere. Fred kept her steady on track. As the money from the wool on her sheep came in, William Young gave his daughter amounts sufficient to purchase a wool dress, gloves, and other accessories.

At last the couple settled on December 31 as their wedding date and Mary began to prepare for the event. For several weeks before the wedding, Mary fussed about her personal goods and clothes and the transfer to her new home. She seems to have tried to take most of the family linen. Her mother gave her ample sheets and blankets but stopped her from obtaining anything else. Next she fussed

over the food. She cooked three cakes. The ranch hands brought her a turkey they had killed. She procured a goose from her mother and her father purchased a barrel of apples. Finally, Dr. McHuccheon officiated at the ceremony held in the Young ranch house near Turnersville with mainly family in attendance. The wedding went off without a hitch.⁴⁴

The couple moved to Fred's ranch house, which he had remodeled to meet Mary's wishes. Fred had first built the house as a one-room structure in 1877 and had added on to it frequently. On arrival at her new home, Mary proceeded to scrub everything. She exalted that she "did like to have clean floors." Fred smiled and endured. He was soon in firm control of Mary. Shortly afterwards every letter noted in several places that "Fred says" and "Fred went." Their married life was to last over fifty years.

Mary Foote's life changed dramatically. Her letters indicate that she was fretful and lonely, often ill, with only the hired hands and a young, somewhat truculent cook as companions. She was no longer invited to single parties but was now in the set of married couples who were burdened with numerous children and too tired or too busy to visit or go to parties. Church became her main source of entertainment. Only occasional visitors came by the Foote ranch house, which was isolated off the main highways. Fred made monthly trips to Waco and Gatesville and went into Turnersville several times a week to purchase goods and tend to business, leaving Mary alone to care for their small children.

Owning and operating a sheep ranch was hard work. Mary's duties including providing meals for the herders and other hired hands living on the ranch. Although

having hired help, Mary had trouble from the beginning with her cooks and maids. Her first maid, Ida, a young, unmarried girl away from home, "would not work but read novels all day." Mary was outraged because the girl was receiving "\$2 a day plus room and board." Fred fired the girl. The next helper was not much better; she also read romance novels instead of cooking for the hands. But Mary needed their help. In January 1888, three herders lived in the bunkhouse back of the main house and needed food and clean clothing. During shearing and lambing many more workers stayed at the headquarters including fourteen workers and three Norwegians. All had to be fed.⁴⁵

Loneliness was a persistent problem along the frontier. Men and women lived many miles from their nearest neighbor and went months without seeing a non-family member. The Young and the Foote families, however, because of the number of hired hands, had a continual human presence on their ranches. The placement of the Young home just off the main highway to the railroad had brought a constant stream of visitors. Prior to her marriage, Mary had welcomed friends almost every week day. But now, at the more remote Foote ranch, she had few visitors. Her letters before marriage had contained a constant summary of events in the area including deaths, marriages, church events, parties, weather, and visiting. She always went into town to attend church and often stayed overnight with friends or other family members. Now, on the more isolated Foote Ranch she seldom learned the news of the neighborhood and infrequently attended church because of the muddy rutted roads.⁴⁶

The winter of 1885-1886 was one of the coldest in American history and the

blizzards swept across the western United States, resulting in disastrous losses of livestock. On the Great Plains, many cattle farms experienced 80-90 percent losses of their herds and faced bankruptcy by spring. Although the winter in Central Texas was also very cold, the losses on the Foote Ranch were not as severe as those in West Texas. The animals had sheltered in the new sheds, and personal supervision by Foote and the herders had averted disaster.

Despite Fred's good work, his father sent scant praise. Instead, Adrian mailed a copy of an article in the Dallas newspaper quoting cattle losses of \$40,000,000 with admonishments to continue to be careful with the livestock.⁴⁷

A severe drought followed the harsh winter and water was in short supply in the Turnersville area. Cattle and horses suffered the most as the grass began to dry up and ranchers had to begin supplemental feeding early in the fall. Fortunately, the Foote and Young ranches had sufficient water wells to survive a prolonged drought, as long as the range provided forage for the animals. By cutting the numbers of animals, they kept the bulk of their herds intact.⁴⁸

That same year, a major depression occurred in New England, shutting down the Ashland mill and throwing most of the town out of work. Adrian Foote, who remained with Jessie and Henry, became lonely and contemplated selling the house but was unable to find a buyer because of the economic downturn. Jessie wrote Fred that "Ashland is dead."

Henry Foote complained and grumbled about just about everything. He continued to work for the mill and his father, operating a teamster business of hauling goods throughout the local area. By this time he enjoyed some success, employing several drivers and owning three teams and rigs. In 1887 he purchased a matched team of bay horses for \$800 and added another wagon. Despite his complaining, Henry was doing all right by himself.

Henry visited the ranches one last time in 1891 for about six months, living with Mary and Fred and their children. He returned to Ashland, convinced that ranching was not for him. In 1892, shortly after his return to Ashland, Henry married Cora Elizabeth Cutter.⁴⁹

Adrian Foote was a good businessman and respected in the community. He ran the mills with an iron hand. And the Jordan Marsh Company paid him well for his efforts--\$5,000 annually. In 1884, local voters chose Adrian Foote as the selectman for Ashland. In 1886, the Cleveland administration appointed Adrian Foote postmaster in Ashland for his longtime support for the Democratic Party. The position paid \$1,000 annually. After he posted bond, Adrian moved the post office to a building which he owned, and subleased the job at half the salary to a friend.⁵⁰

Soon Adrian's energies were focused on finding a new superintendent for the

mill, which he continued to manage until his retirement. His salary was now \$6,000 annually and included managing another business acquired by the Jordan Marsh Company, the Dwight Printing Company. E. D. Jordan served as president and Adrian Foote as manager. Adrian was successful in reviving the mill and in 1887 the mill sold \$200,000 of thread.

After his retirement, Adrian was restless but continued to manage his rental properties in the mill town. Later his brother Andrew retired from his Illinois bank and moved into the Ashland house, living there until his death in 1899. Adrian died in 1910 at eighty-four years of age. Jessie and Henry remained in Ashland until their deaths in 1939 and 1953 respectively.⁵¹

Turnersville

By 1886, Turnersville had grown to be a fairly large hamlet. It contained a population of several hundred people, a gin, several stores, and three homes offering meals and bed for travelers, a school, and five churches. Other businesses included a blacksmith shop run by the Jones brothers, Turnersville Drug Store purchased by James Williams, and hardware stores controlled by R. M. Holder's and C. D. Shriber's. P. R. Hobin owned and operated a grocery store in Turnersville from 1887 to 1910. Records from this store show monthly credit sales averaging twice those of cash sales--\$400 credit and \$200 cash sales. Foote used this store extensively. His purchases show 100 pounds of flour, ten or more pounds of coffee, and fifty pounds of bacon purchased every couple of weeks. The Foote family and the ranch hands consumed large amounts of food.⁵²

As a good businessman, Fred Foote sought the best price for the goods he needed to run his ranch. Generally, the costs of goods at the local merchants in Turnersville were higher than similar goods in the larger towns. Thus, Foote often traveled to Waco and back by wagon to take advantage of the lower prices and where he could buy in bulk.

The Turnersville merchants had higher prices because of lower turnover, larger inventories, credit losses, shipping costs, and commissions. The local retailers in Turnersville had to place small orders with jobbers or wholesalers who demanded a commission and had to stock their stores with a wide assortment of goods which increased overhead. The local merchants also sold on credit, receiving

payment when the crops were sold in the fall. Many farmers failed to pay their debts to the country store. Fred used the local merchant for most small purchases since they sold on credit. The Turnersville stores were much more convenient for small, unexpected needs.⁵³

Church Life

Church became increasingly important to Fred Foote and remained so during his life. Though born and baptized an Episcopalian, he joined the nearest comfortable church and became an elder in the Union Presbyterian Church of Turnersville. Perhaps the greatest influence in his church membership was his wife. The Youngs were strict Presbyterians and all the family members participated in the Union Church. In 1885, Fred sent his sister Jessie to Boston for Sunday school cards. She purchased them at the New England Methodist Book Depository. Since she wrote Fred, "As it is the cards you want and not the faith I thought it would not make any difference." They cost twenty-five cents a package. For the rest of his life Fred Foote sent money to the Presbyterian church and missions. In 1886, his contribution was only \$25 but increased each year, as he could afford. He served as a deacon or elder in the Union Church for forty-five years with long tenures as Sunday School superintendent.⁵⁴

In the Young household religion was taken very seriously. The family did all possible chores and cooking on Saturday, so that Sunday could be a day of rest. Elder Young even considered whistling an unseemly act of "frivolity and levity." He fired one of his herders who persisted in the practice. Church attendance was mandatory for every member of the family and all the hired help. All the Young daughters, at one time or another, served as Sunday school teachers or pianists for the congregation.⁵⁵

The Union Presbyterian Church in Turnersville, established in 1871 by Elder Levi Tenney, was one of the first Presbyterian churches in Coryell County. The Presbyterian church in the much larger town of Gatesville was not built until several decades later. The initial church building, a log cabin, which also served as a school house, was located near Thorp Springs about a mile southeast of Turnersville. The Young children attended school there. A newer building erected in 1877 and rebuilt in 1882, was a simple wooden frame building located in town. It also served as a school. During the rebuilding of the church in 1882, some of the wagons hauling lumber from Waco became mired in muddy roads on Saturday and finished their trip on Sunday. Because they had traveled on the Sabbath, Elder Young refused to allow the lumber that had desecrated the Sabbath to be used in the construction of the church. He bought the lumber and thought it only fit to build pig pens. William Young and later his sons-in-law were the major contributors to each of the new buildings.⁵⁶

The congregation erected the present Union Presbyterian Church building in 1906. Levi Tenney, a prominent figure in the Presbyterian Church of Texas, officiated as moderator and later served as minister. His son, Edward Tenney, later married William Young's daughter. After Pastor Tenney left, the church recruited another preacher--Doctor McHucheeon and his young wife. McHucheeon had first come through the area raising money for a Presbyterian church in Gatesville, obtaining \$70 from the citizens of Turnersville, including \$20 from William Young and \$10 from Fred Foote. He evidently made a favorable impression and later returned to serve the community full time until his death.⁵⁷

In the latter decades of the nineteenth century, the American countryside underwent dramatic changes. As farm income decreased, young people moved into the cities, and an industrialized urban society replaced the dominance of the rural population on the American political scene. To some Americans, the city became a symbol of vice, full of vulgar immigrants who squandered their meager wages on drunken revelry in the saloons and starved their poor wives and children. One reaction gained momentum --a movement to prohibit the selling of alcoholic beverages. Prohibition became part of a rural evangelical movement, pitting the good moral values of small towns against the wickedness and dissipation of industrialized urban centers full of immigrants and other undesirable elements.⁵⁸

But Prohibition was, first and foremost, a movement to abolish the saloon which was associated with lawlessness and vice. Urban reformers worried that saloons bred drunkenness and other vices, which drained economic productivity. As the frontier underwent final settlement, stable rural communities emerged, dominated by a conservative, white Protestant middle-class who viewed the local saloons as congregation centers for lawless "riffraff."

Some politicians came to interpret the movement as an assault on the urban poor and working class by middle-class zealots, others as a proving ground for nascent feminists attempting to influence the new industrial world. Even in the Foote's hometown of Ashton, Massachusetts, the forces of Saloon versus Anti-Saloon fought for votes. Regardless of its source, Prohibition became a major force in the Texas political arena during the mid-1880's.⁵⁹

Dr. James Cranfill, a physician, teacher, and Baptist minister from

Turnersville and Crawford, became a leader of the local prohibition movement. The members of the Coryell County Protestant churches avidly joined his movement. During 1881-1882 Cranfill, who published a newspaper, the *Turnersville Effort*, was quite familiar to local residents and easily recruited them to his cause. He led a coalition of rural religious leaders and urban reformers who pressed for a referendum to outlaw the saloon. Over many years, through the Prohibition movement and Baptist connections, Cranfill continued to fight for Temperance, becoming the founding editor of the *Southern Baptist Standard*. This publication continued to rail against the saloon throughout his tenure as editor.⁶⁰

The members of the Young family were strict Calvinists and actively embraced the Prohibition movement. Mary Ann Young Foote regularly attended the Temperance Council led by Dr. Cranfill. In her correspondence she documented the fervor of the local Temperance meeting held in Turnersville when they expelled several young men for drinking and/or dancing. Such action was entertainment and high drama in this small village on the Texas plains.

Central Texas, particularly in McLennan County, also experienced an unprecedented surge in prohibition activity. With action centered around Waco University (the predecessor of Baylor University), Waco became a hotbed of Prohibitionist activity. The city became a center of white evangelical culture and the headquarters of the state's Prohibition movement. Led by an intensely religious segment of the rural population, the Baptists and other denominations attempted in the election of 1885 to take McLennan County "dry." The plan was to use votes from the rural areas, which the Prohibitionists felt were strongly for the dry cause, to

overpower the wet vote from the cities.

Unfortunately for the Prohibitionists, politicians from the Democratic Party viewed the movement as an attempt to diminish their control of the political process and they denounced the election as an un-American attack on personal liberty. The Democrats deplored the involvement of religious leaders in the political process as “boding no good either to church, or state, or religion, or society.” The Democratic elected officials waged a vigorous and often nasty campaign against the new movement.

The Prohibitionists lost the election of 1885. McLennan County voted overwhelmingly to stay wet and the Prohibitionists lost even the rural areas. After the election, the vigor of the anti-saloon movement receded, reemerging from time to time as individual church leaders championed the movement to increase their membership. Reverend Cranfill had some success, however, since Turnersville voted dry and remains dry to this day.⁶¹

The Business of Raising Sheep

Fred Foote worked hard to increase the number of animals his land would carry and the quality of his wool. He dug ditches and began to dip his sheep in 1885 to control scab. Soon all the surrounding herders dipped their sheep at Fred Foote's trough. In 1886 he purchased a thousand merino-mixed breed ewes from L. W. Chase for three dollars a head and several Merino rams at forty dollars each. He carried an 8 percent loan until the next shear. The increase in the clip paid the entire loan in two years.⁶²

In order to raise more fodder for the animals, Foote purchased Johnson grass, touted as one of the best forage crops available. The dealer lauded the new grass as the best and most profitable forage for the Southern states, even stating enthusiastically that "God said 'let there be grass and Johnson grass came forth.' " Foote planted ninety acres in 1888 and on just thirty-five acres "harvested over ninety wagon loads of hay."

Unfortunately, within a few years after Johnson grass had invaded fields throughout Texas, critics noted that it had become the areas greatest pest. It invaded fields, was impossible to eradicate, and choked out any other crop. Its reputation continues until today with almost every farmer lamenting the day it was introduced into the country. Adrian Foote ordered a *Texas Almanac* delivered to Fred which advised planting Hungarian oats for cattle feed. He also recommended looking into buying the local cotton gin to provide cottonseed for feed.⁶³

Raising sheep was not without difficulty at times. Predators and disease

frequently attacked Foote's flocks. Before the pastures were fenced, herders had to follow the herds to protect the animals from wolves and other carnivorous predators. A serious set back had occurred in 1881 when wolves attacked the herd, killing a number of animals. Unlike coyotes which ate what they killed, wolves killed more than they could eat and a pack of wolves could decimate a flock of sheep.

Sheepmen relentlessly tried to exterminate such animals. In 1885, just before her marriage, Mary Ann Young awoke one night to hear a frightening howling from the sheep pens. The men rushed out but could find no animals. The next day they located tracks thought to be those of a wolf pack. That weekend Fred Foote organized a mounted wolf hunt with his neighbors. The men were gone for a week and returned with no pelts. They said they killed six animals the first night but gave the valuable pelts away.

Predators continued to be a major problem on the sheep ranches and in 1898 Young paid a bounty of \$5 per wolf pelt. As late as 1914, Texas paid bounty on 8,521 wolf pelts. As the wolf populations fell, the coyote moved into their ecological niche. Wily predators, coyotes avoid poisoning, traps, and hunting. Even to the present day, coyotes continue to plague the sheepmen.⁶⁴

Disease was not as great a predicament as predators for the local sheepmen. Scab was a continuing problem and was treated with dipping. Individual animals suffered from infections and puperal fevers and had to be treated. An occasional epidemic of hoof and mouth disease swept the area, but Foote records no other major epidemic.

Fred Foote began to diversify and raise livestock other than sheep on his

land. In 1889, he branded thirty-three calves and his herds increased as he added pure-bred Herefords to his stock. He eventually included horses and mules in his herds. His fencing now expanded to fence cattle away from the sheep and to protect the spring grass from his neighbors. To accomplish this goal, Fred sent to Gatesville for wire and hired several men to dig holes and string the wire. The accelerated fencing by Foote, Young, and others caused a commotion in Turnersville. Some of the local farmers ran a small number of cattle and wanted free access to the remaining range and open grazing. By 1891, Foote had 365 head of cattle, primarily Herefords, eight horses, two mules, and two oxen on his ranch.⁶⁵

A critical period for sheepmen was the lambing season. A good lamb crop ensured a profitable year. Lambing usually began early in the spring—February or March. Because of the care needed by the animals, the Footes brought the herds close to the homestead during lambing season. The new lambs had to be protected from the weather and predators. A sudden cold snap could kill the newborn animals. Ewes, having difficulty delivering or those having twins, needed extra care. The exhausted mother ewes often had to be hand fed.

Sheep have a feeble mothering instinct; hence the lambs and their mothers were kept close together to facilitate the mother accepting her newborn for suckling. Because most ewes accepted only one lamb, when a ewe gave birth to twins, which was a common occurrence with sheep, a surrogate mother had to be quickly located and the new mothers trained to accept the newborns. The herdsmen encouraged ewes that had lost their lambs to take an orphan lamb by placing the pelt from the ewe's dead offspring on the orphan. Since the new lamb smelled like her own, the foster mother usually would nurse the new animal. After a few days the pelt could be removed and the ewe would continue to nurse the orphan. With sufficient care, a mild winter, and a successful lambing sheepmen could expect to increase their herds by 80-120 percent annually.⁶⁶

Grazing and herding the sheep followed a predictable path. Once the lambs and their mothers had recovered sufficient strength, the herders led the animals out to new pastures. They gathered the lambs and ewes into small flocks of several dozen, blending the groups with the herd until they were ready to move to new

pasture. After a week or two on the new grass, they castrated the male lambs (now called weathers). By late April or early May, the herders drifted back into the home pastures for shearing. Following shearing, they moved the flocks to higher elevations or pastures farther from the main ranch where they would stay until the next spring.⁶⁷

Shearing was the most important event of the year. The quantity and quality of the fleeces determined the income for the year's operations. Foote gathered his animals in April and May to harvest the wool. For instance, in 1886, shearing began on May 10 and ran to May 22. Seven men sheared each day. One worker, R.O. Leech, sheared 372 sheep, about seventeen each half day over twelve days, for five cents a fleece and \$18.60 pay. The fastest shearer proved to be Lewis Manning who sheared an average of twenty-five sheep each half day for a total of 543 fleeces and a \$27.15 payout. These numbers remained fairly consistent from 1887-1906. Only the names of the workers varied. Pay remained five to ten cents a fleece. As the local youths aged, married, or no longer needed the extra income, Foote turned to traveling teams of migrant Hispanic workers who worked from ranch to ranch, moving north from Texas to Oregon. But family and local workers continued to augment the work force.⁶⁸

Shearing the animals was a difficult process. Workers tied the animals' feet then hoisted them onto an elevated shearing platform. The itinerate workers needed a special proficiency in hand clipping with metal scissors, to produce a continuous fleece without cutting the animal. After the shearers removed the fleece, co-workers cleaned the wool of grease and dirt. Because water was scarce in

Texas, Foote did not routinely scour the fleece with hot water and lye, though the Boston market paid a premium for “clean” wool. Workmen packed and pressed the fleece into seven-foot cotton bags that could contain approximately 500 pounds of wool. They loaded the bags onto three to four wagons attached in tandem for transport to the nearest wool market. After shearing, herders dipped the animals, treated any cuts to prevent screwworm, and drove them back to the pastures.⁶⁹

Foote kept careful records. He noted his expenses in 1886 to include \$687 in supplies for the family and hands. He paid \$285 for farmwork and \$92 for house work. Herders cost \$700. Shearing cost \$165, hauling the wool, \$75, and wool sacks, \$43. Other expenses included a buggy for \$150 and \$180 for new farm implements. Total expenses totaled \$2,668; income from 15,000 pounds of wool was approximately \$3,000--a thin profit margin.⁷⁰

The most complete accounting of the ranch occurred in 1887. The net income came to \$6,166 and net expenses \$5,167 for a cash profit of \$999.46. Combining this cash income with the value of improvements and the increase in land value, the net profit for the year was \$3,529. By this year the ranch was running 2,450 sheep with an annual lamb crop of 700 animals. (Appendix C).⁷¹

A decade later in 1892-1893 a severe depression battered the agricultural sector. The price of wool fell to historic lows. A wool clip of thirty-five sacks--30,970 pounds--sold for fourteen cents a pound, grossing only \$4,335. The sale of some sheep, including 750 weathers, and 1,284 ewes at \$2.88 each, netted \$3,484. Fred Foote also sold 220 sheep for his Uncle John for \$450. These years were lean ones indeed, with low prices and poor crops.

Finding and keeping help was a continual problem. Sheep raising, more than other ranching business required trained, hard-working crews. Herders, shearers, cooks, and handymen needed to be found, trained, and retained. In 1892, Mary Foote paid her maid/cook \$10 monthly, plus room and board, to cook for the hands and to wash their laundry. The cooks usually had five herdsman to feed and wash for, in addition to the growing family and frequent guests. These were usually young girls from the surrounding neighborhood who never quite measured up to Mary's expectations and often stayed for only a few months. During shearing, lambing, and harvest, Mary and the cook often had to prepare meals for fifty or more workers. They usually hired additional help for the kitchen. Mary's only quiet time was smoking a clay pipe by the stove.⁷²

In 1888, to complicate matters further, Henry Foote decided (once again) to move to Texas. He lived in his brother's house with the family for about a year before returning to Massachusetts. Uncle John Foote also returned to Texas to look over his investments in 1890 and stayed several months. Mary had to provide for each of these guests. Henry returned for another extended visit in 1891 before returning to Ashland, his mind finally made up that the sheep business was too much work.⁷³

Fred Foote carefully noted each herder's annual expenses. For example, in 1888, Keller McGill and his wife lived on the ranch in one of the main houses. They housed and boarded several herders and hands. They received \$160 for feeding the herders, and \$100 annually for boarding additional hands. They received \$27 for washing the workmen's clothes and, for eleven months' work, received \$370 for

a total income of \$657.

The herders also needed clothing and supplies. Foote meticulously recorded every expense in his ledger and deducted them from the herders' final pay. A typical herder's expenses included oiled shoes at 25 cents; an oil suit at \$3 for wet weather; two wool shirts, \$3.50 for cold weather; various food supplies at \$44.62; shoes, \$2; and miscellaneous expenses \$20 for an annual cost of \$76.07. Foote paid the herders \$18/month or \$216/year. He paid the extra hands hired during lambing and shearing an hourly wage of fifty cents with food and lodging included.⁷⁴

The price of wool continued to be depressed during the last decade of the nineteenth century and sheep ranchers began to look for other sources of income, including selling sheep for domestic consumption. By 1886, the wool clip sold for only 14 cents a pound with no prospects for an increase in price. That year Foote sold 750 mutton for about \$3 each and 400 ewes for the same. By the end of the year he had thinned his herd of 3,824 sheep by 1,284 animals. Unfortunately, the prices for sheep had risen very little since he had purchased the herd fifteen years before.

As the price for eatable mutton increased and became a greater source of income, the British sheep lines—Schropshire and Cotswold--began to replace the less palatable Merino. By 1900, Texas sheepmen and Foote had diversified and began to produce both wool and mutton for consumption.

At last, in 1909, American sheepmen began to export large amounts of wool and the prices began to rise. Forty-two million sheep produced 287 million pounds of washed wool which, with 60 percent shrinkage, produced 113 million pounds of

scoured wool suitable for clothing. Prices rose to thirty-four cents a pound and stayed there throughout the next decade.⁷⁵

Expanding into Cotton

Over a forty-year period from 1880 to 1920, mechanization became an important force in American agriculture. Between 1860 and 1890 the United States Patent Office issued more than 10,000 patents for agricultural implements—over 5,000 on milk separators alone. The annual value for American manufactures of agricultural implements rose from twenty-one million to over one hundred million dollars. As a result, the amount of labor and the number of persons needed to plant and harvest commodities fell every decade. The time, work, and labor cost to produce crops decreased by 50 percent during the later part of the nineteenth century. Mechanization had the earliest and greatest effect on the grain crops. The use of disc plows, broadcast seeders, harrows, and combines (combining reapers and thrashers) in the wheat fields made the work of one man eighteen times as effective in 1896 as in 1830. Thus mechanization dramatically reduced the number of people needed to feed and cloth the population of the United States. The wealth and leisure time produced by these advances allowed farmers more time to attend religious, educational, and cultural events--luxuries missing in prior generations. The lower cost of production made the fall in prices that occurred during the last decades of the nineteenth century somewhat more bearable. Unfortunately, the increased cost of land and expense of machinery reduced the percent of farmers who owned land and increased the number of tenants and hired workers.⁷⁶

The Footes embraced mechanization despite occasional difficulties. One of their first purchases for the ranch was a Fort Scott Drill to plant wheat. The

implement cost \$450 plus \$50 shipping from W. A. Hoffman Co., Fort Worth, Texas to Gatesville, a fabulous sum for those days. At this point Foote was raising grain primarily as feed for his animals-- including corn (9,600 bu.), oats (3,000 bu.), and hay (30 tons). He continued to mechanize, purchasing a disc harrow and cultivator from the Warrior Mower Company in New York for \$75 and shipping the implement via St. Louis for \$24.32. When the machine arrived at the ranch, several parts were missing, resulting in a three-month delay before it could be placed in the fields. Other purchases included a Sulky Plow, another grain drill, a reaper, and a harrow. Delivery could be slow. A harrow shipped by the factory on February 8, 1887, from Little Falls, New York took four weeks to reach Gatesville.⁷⁷

With the prices of cotton high and for wool so low, the Footes began to cautiously venture into cotton farming. Because of arid conditions in Coryell County, farmers had begun to raise cotton somewhat later than those elsewhere in Central Texas. This intermittent lack of rainfall made cotton production more risky and by 1890, local farmers produced only 8,800 bales of cotton compared with 20,000 bales in neighboring McLennan County. Foote rented small but increasing portions of his land to tenant farmers for cotton.

Gradually, row crops began to provide a major source of income for the Foote ranch. In 1895, Foote had expanded the farming sector of his operation, building five sharecropper houses at a cost of about \$250 each. He also finished separating his farm land from the sheep pastures, spending \$51 for 550 cedar posts and \$40 for 1,279 pounds of wire. Although Foote sold \$48 of oats and \$191 of corn in 1897, these figures indicate that the ranch was now self-sufficient in livestock feed

and had a surplus to sell. Serious cotton production had begun in 1895, producing \$942 income.⁷⁸

The tenant farmers lived in primitive conditions, even by the standards of the times. Foote's day book contains a detailed description of the house built for the Rylander family of four. The house was constructed entirely of wood, with "board and batten" walls consisting of boards one inch thick and eight inches wide nailed to a two by four frame. The spaces between the boards were covered with a one inch thick, two inch wide "batten" board. The tenants had covered the walls with newspaper to keep out the wind. The house consisted of one room, fifteen feet long, twenty feet wide, and eight feet high with a garret above the beams. The single room served as a combination dining room, kitchen, living room, and bedroom. The two children slept in the attic on straw pallets. The house had front and back doors with windows on each side. A stone fireplace or wood stove served for warmth and cooking. Kerosene lamps furnished light at night. In quarters like these, furniture was crude, books few, and ornaments absent. The housewives added implements for canning, and spinning.

Each house came with an assortment of out buildings. The backyard contained a crude privy and several outbuildings, including a barn for the mules and other domestic animals, and a small shed for tools and storage. Most tenants had a small garden by the house, where it could be watered with waste from the kitchen. A well and/or a nearby windmill pumped the water for humans and animals alike into an elevated storage tank. Some of the better houses contained a cistern to catch rainwater from the roof.

Cooking was a grueling job that had to be performed to provide for the families survival. The wood stove had to be stoked to the appropriate temperature both in freezing winter weather and on blistering hot summer days. Since most goods that could be preserved ripened in the summer, the cook had to endure temperatures indoors that soared into the 100+ degrees. Clothed in cotton shifts, which quickly became plastered to their bodies, the women prepared the food for cooking and canning. But this job was necessary for the family's continued well being. The food the women preserved fed the family through the winter months.

Obtaining water and washing was not easy for the tenant-farmer families. Water had to be pumped from the well by hand and transported into the house in buckets weighing twenty or more pounds. Washing and cleaning were generally done outdoors in large iron pots on wood fires. Water transported from wells or creeks was heated to boiling, soap added and the dirty clothes stirred in the boiling water until clean, hauled out by hand or on wooded spatulas, placed in another kettle of clean boiling water, then rinsed in a final cold water bath before being hung out to dry in the prairie wind. The more fortunate families had a windmill to pump the water into an elevated water tank and indoor plumbing.⁷⁹

By 1890 Foote had built thirty tenant houses with wells, cribs, and sheds. Over two hundred people lived and worked on his land. Each house was located adjacent to the fields the tenant rented. Each tenant rented from fifty to one hundred acres. Over time Foote and his tenants improved the dwellings, attaching additional rooms and providing indoor plumbing. But eventually the buildings had to be abandoned and today the sites can be recognized by a grove of trees on the

edge of a field.⁸⁰

Prosperity

As her family increased in size, Mary Foote continued to manage the house and keep in touch with her friends. Fredrick Foote II was born in January, 1888, Clarence in December, 1888, Ruby in 1890, Hazel in 1892, Adrian in 1895, and Nathaniel in 1901. To accommodate the growing family, the original ranch house was gradually enlarged. Mary needed more help in the kitchen to feed her family and the ranch hands. She gradually began to tolerate her maids' behavior. Yet she continued to be a prolific letter writer, noting in 1891 that she had "fifteen more letters to write that weekend."⁸¹

Farming, particularly cotton, continued to play an important role in the Foote Ranch economic plans. In 1901, Foote farmed 940 acres with twenty-eight tenant farmers. They produced 89 pounds of lint per acre (at fifteen cents a pound or \$9.35 an acre income). By 1904 he had converted 2,000 acres to cotton and row crops. At this point, Foote owned or controlled over 9,000 acres. He still raised sheep and other livestock on the remaining acreage. Foote and his brothers-in-law managed all the land in a ten-mile arc around the town of Turnersville and had become the most prosperous family in the area. Income from cotton, oats, and corn totaled \$3,860. This amount of cotton represented 189 pounds of lint per acre or \$4.10 income per acre (\$410 for a 100 acre farm, half of which belonged to the landowner). Wheat production totaled 1,796 bushels, which sold for \$840.

Despite the increase in farm acreage, most of the land was unusable for row crops. Foote continued to raise sheep and hired four herders for at least six months

each year, keeping one workman/ hauler employed full time. Although cotton and row crops became an important portion of the family business until the Great Depression, drought, low cotton prices, and erosion eventually forced the return of the land to livestock during the 1930s.⁸²

As part of his diversification, Foote converted a large portion of the ranch to cattle as he continued his program of raising purebred Herefords. In 1918, he installed dipping vats large enough for both the cattle and sheep. Foote pushed dipping cattle as well as sheep to eradicate the Texas Fever tick. Although his neighbors resisted at first, they soon joined him in the tick eradication program and the Foote dipping vats became widely used by the local livestock raisers.⁸³

As his prosperity increased, Fred Foote began to invest in ventures outside his ranch. In 1895 he purchased land for the Turnersville school house for \$110 and donated it to the town. Besides his involvement in the Presbyterian Church, he had organized and expanded the cemetery and served both on the school and cemetery boards for decades. In 1907, several local Turnersville businessmen, including Fred Foote, chartered the First State Bank of Turnersville with a capital stock of \$10,000. G. F. Boone served as President. Fred Foote and E. S. "Lige" Wallace were on of the board of directors. When the bank consolidated with the National Bank of Gatesville in 1928, its capitalization was \$50,000. The same three men owned several buildings in town, a cooperative gin, and a hardware store. Finally, Foote and his neighbor E. Humes built and promoted the Turnersville telephone exchange connecting Turnersville, Jonesville, Coryell City, and Cransfill Gap. At one time it contained 250 boxes.⁸⁴

In 1928, after serving as a board trustee for thirty years, Foote led the movement to consolidate the surrounding small one-room schools into a district centered at Turnersville. The consolidated district could support a high school and prepare the children for college. It was a bitter fight. Some communities did not want to lose their school, others did not want their children to ride buses, and some saw no need for the expense of higher education--grade school education was quite good enough, thank you. Foote and his allies won the consolidation fight, but afterwards Foote resigned from the district board.

At their deaths, Mary Ann and Fredrick Foote tried to divide their land between their children as fairly as possible. Foote had continued to manage the ranches until his death in 1940 at 89 years old. Two sons, Nathaniel and Adrian had stayed on the ranch and continued to raise sheep and cattle. Each sibling received a share of the land of equal value--that is, the cotton land, which sold for a premium per acre, was balanced against the less expensive sheep land. The boys took the pastureland and thus inherited more acreage. Ironically, as the value of cotton fell, the once valuable cotton land became worth the same as the pastureland. Some members of the later generations had some hard feelings because their parents did not receive more acreage. The two sons carefully tended their herds and managed their family business. They gradually purchased their siblings', nephews', and cousins' land and, at present, each owns about a thousand acres.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation traces in detail the lives, investments, expenses, and debts of two generations of two related families that prospered and faltered as agriculture and land ownership transitioned from the basis of American wealth to be replaced by urban professionals and manufacturing investments. These data provide the details in a micro-economic framework of how middle-class farmers lived and adapted. These data can provide an important and necessary framework upon which the more general conclusions of macro-economic trends depend.

Mechanization of agriculture began in earnest in the United States about 1880 and continued over the next forty years until it stalled in the 1920s during the agricultural depression that preceded the Great Depression. But, by the early 1950s even cotton production had been completely revolutionized. Mechanization had a tremendous and often devastating effect on the rural population. Millions of American farmers lost their farms and their jobs and migrated to the cities looking for jobs. The exodus of blacks from the cotton fields of the South was particularly dramatic.

The lowering of prices for agricultural products marked a fundamental change in the American economy. Previously, prosperity had been linked to land ownership and increased land values. The United States Department of Agriculture noted that: "The rapid shift from animal power to mechanical power for farm production in the interwar period constituted one of the most important changes that have ever taken

place in American agriculture. It was a cornerstone in the foundation for increased production.” Unfortunately, the increased productivity in agriculture caused by mechanization led to overproduction and permanently lowered commodity prices. Livestock and grain production had advanced more rapidly than consumer demand and glutted markets, and farm surpluses became a standard feature of American markets. The problem continues today, confounded by the ability of underdeveloped countries to produce commodities cheaper than American farmers.⁸⁵

Individual farmers felt the effects of mechanization and of lowered farm prices. Some adapted to the changes and survived with their farms intact while others did not adapt and lost everything. The accounts in this work can be classified as a morality story played out on the Blackland prairie of Central Texas. A brother and sister immigrate to Texas in 1849. Through hard work, thrifty life styles, and the steady accumulation of land and assets, they become some of the largest landowners and taxpayers in their respective counties. Each had a daughter who married an earnest young man with significant wealth of his own. One couple, Frederick and Mary Ann Foote, continued to live modestly and work on their ranch throughout their life and successfully weathered the agricultural depression of 1920-1930 with their land and wealth intact. Another couple Josephus and Mollie Cavitt moved to the neighboring town where the husband engaged in a number of enterprises, borrowing money to finance their lifestyle of big houses, fancy trips, and small town ‘boosterism.’ When the price of the commodity on which his debt payments were based fell, this son-in-law went bankrupt and lost both his wealth but

also his wife's. The moral for Americans that is still potent today is the danger of borrowing money to live a life style beyond your means.

Raising sheep never had the romantic attractions of cattle, cowboys, and trail drives. Satisfaction had to come from economic gain or from the pride of caring for animals that depended on constant human care. The Foote family made this commitment and by careful husbandry of their land and resources, they survived the depression with their ranch intact. The Caufields and Cavitts moved to town and concentrated their efforts on agricultural businesses. They borrowed money to finance their new endeavors and made poor business decisions. Eventually, they lost their businesses and land. But both families recognized that agriculture as a road to prosperity was now limited and encouraged their children and grandchildren to go to college, obtain an education, and enter the urban professional class.

	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886	1886	1887
Sheep	1946	2050	1737	2320	1880	1746				2200
Lambs	550	612		870						
Wool(lb)	7642	7643	2274	9476	8696	4218 80 bags				2313 +
Profit(\$)	923	1788	2099	1647	2153		2551	4604	2127	3257
Other income	c- \$180						Total 3617		\$1925 577- sheep	Total 4475

	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896
Sheep	2200	2235	1867	2655	2700	2501	2655	1847	Sold Out
Lambs	659	302			800		302		Rented
Wool(lb)			8150	4635	13790	12245 55bag			
Profit(\$)	2406				1441				
Other income			416 sheep						Stock \$1817

Appendix B

FOOTE RANCH

SHEEP AND WOOL PRODUCTION

	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884	1885	1886
Sheep						583	600	1088	1856	2790	2694
Lambs									793	496	874
Wool(lb)									66bag	20,000	15,338
Profit(\$)											
Herding for Morse	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$480					Ewes- 1000	1000	1050
Mutton sold											
Other livestock sold											
Land rent											
Expenses						343	123				3402
Improvem ents						1496					1179

	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1893	1894	1895	1896
Sheep	2450	3038	3596	3433	4391	3824	3563	3412	2807	3295
Lambs	700		1034	625	1025	1002	616		986	674
Wool(lb)	26,664			90bags 20321 @21c	2055@ 21.5c 77bags	30970	19525	24494	29305 108bag	25530 @8.5c
Wool Profit(\$)	4916			4289	4626	4444	2005	1896	1863	1914
Mutton sold	550- \$990		1161- \$2243	\$534	1284- \$3456	1500- \$3284	\$620	620- \$550	59	1522- \$1440
Other livestock sold (\$)	990	500		2243	534	1100	1269	2027	1023	2458
Land rent (\$)	671		1350	320	193	307	316 c-196	64	Corn- 498	856
Expenses (\$)	3402		1331	824	814	1276	1298	1997	770	1657
Improvements (\$)	1179						391	585	844	1520

Profit \$999

	1897	1898	1899	1900		
Sheep	1698		2598			
Lambs	607		750			
Wool(lb)		12141 @13.75	14197 @15	17122 @16		
Profit(\$)		1669	2074	2739		
Mutton sold	151-- \$378	409 @\$2.25 \$912	100	1190 head		
Other livestock sold(\$)	1620	1812	258	1860		
Land rent (\$)	o-81	o-214 c-113		w-840 c-3860		
Expenses (\$)	2345	2566	2585	570		
Improvements(\$)	1047	791	1027	278		

w-Wheat; o-Oats, c-cotton

Foote Ranch—1886-1887

EXPENSES		INCOME	
Herding	700.75	Increase in stock	
House help	91.86	Ewes-300 head	525.00
Farm help	285.69	Lambs-120 head	180.00
	<u>1078.36</u>	wethers-130 head	130.00
			<u>965.00</u>
Hauling wool	178.50	Wool Clip-26640	
Shearing	68.91	(net 23280 pounds)	4916.70
Wool Sacks	42.80		
	<u>282.50</u>	Mutton Sold(550 head)	990.00
Feed			
1052 bu. Seed	178.50	Total income	<u>6166.70</u>
1250 bu oats	322.50		
374 bu corn	183.75	Raising expense	3402.24
15000 bu	452.00		
	<u>1134.75</u>	Improvements	1178.70
		Loans, interest	586.00
Taxes	126.94	Total Expenses	<u>5166.94</u>
Equipment	46.37		
General supplies, doctor bills	717.88	Net Cash Income	999.46
	<u>3402.24</u>		
Total Expenses to raise sheep			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL AND FAMILY COLLECTIONS OF PAPERS

Caufield Papers. Ledgers, letters, receipts, and accounts held by the Caufield family at the Caufield Ranch, McGregor, Texas.

Cavitt Papers. Several file boxes containing the personal papers of Josephus Cavitt and George Caufield held by Cavitt Caufield in McGregor, Texas.

Foote Papers. Annual account books, letters, receipts, and ledgers held by the Foote family at the Foote Ranch, Turnersville, Texas.

Young Papers. Family papers, letters, and farm ledgers held by Frankie Glaze, Gatesville, Texas.

INTERVIEWS

George Caufield, Jr, interview by W. C. Arnold, December 9, 1995, Amarillo, Texas.

Cavitt Caufield, interview by W. C. Arnold, May, 1995, McGregor, Texas.

Watson Caufield Arnold, interview by W. C. Arnold, April, 2001, Waco, Texas.

Nathaniel (Sonny) Foote, Jr., interview by W. C. Arnold, April 30, 2005, Foote Ranch, Turnersville, Texas.

ARTICLES AND CHAPTERS

- Arnold, W. C. "Shetland Ponies on the Blackland Prairie." *Waco Heritage and History*. Vol. 26, no. 1 (Fall), 1996.
- Conger, Roger N. "Fencing in McLennan County," *Waco's Champion: Selections from the Papers of Roger Norman Conger*. Edited by Marion Travis. Waco: Waco Historical Foundation, 1990.
- Conger, Roger N. "Waco: Cotton and Culture on the Brazos." *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*. Vol. LXXV, no. 1. (July), 1971.
- Hicks, John D. "The Significance of the Small Town in American History," *Reflections of Western Historians*. Edited by John Alexander Carroll. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969.
- Lang, Aldon Socrates. "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas." *The Baylor Bulletin*, Vol. XXXV, No. 3, (July), 1932.
- Laws, Derby and Benny J. Simpson, "A Farming Systems for Cotton Production in the Blacklands," *Agricultural Research at Renner 1944-1966*. Edited by Cyrus Longworth Lundell. Renner: Texas Research Foundation, 1967.
- Lang, Aldon S. "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas." *The Baylor Bulletin*, vol. XXXV (July), 1932.
- McLean, Malcolm D. "Sarahville de Viesca," in *The New Handbook of Texas*. Edited by Ron Tyler, vol. 5. Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996,
- Roberts, Jim. "A Shetland--The Most Remarkable of All," *The Pony Journal* (Jan-Feb), 1995.

- Sturtevant, G. "Old Circus Days in Texas," *Frontier Times*, vol. 9 (August), 1932.
- Syers, William Edward. "Molly Bailey and the Circus," *Off The Beaten Path*. Waco: Texian Press, 1971
- Thayer, Waldo. "Back in the Quiet Days Ponies Were Not Mean Like the One That Nipped Judge's Granddaughter." *El Paso Herald Post*. May 2, 1957.
- Trowbridge, E. A. "Corn Versus Oats for Work Mules." University of Missouri, Agricultural Experimental Station, Columbia, Missouri: Circular 125 (July) 1924.
- . "Local Pioneer Dies." *Waco Times Herald*. June 10, 1908.
- Williamson, M. N., Q. M. Morgan, and Ralph H. Rogers. "Economics of Mechanical Cotton Harvesting in the High Plains Cotton Area of Texas." *Texas Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin*, 1951.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

- Bureau of Business Research. *Natural Fibers and Food Protein Production in Texas. An Economic Profile*. Austin: Texas Food and Fibers Commission, 1990.
- McPhae, H. C. and D. A. Spencer. "Breeding Problems with Sheep." *Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1936*. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1937.
- National Fibers Information Center. *The History of Cotton in Texas*. Austin: Bureau of Business Research, 1989.

Second Annual Report of the Agricultural Bureau, 1888-1889. Austin: State Printing Office, 1890.

Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture. 1895, 1898, 1900, 1901, 1903, 1909. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1896, 1899, 1901, 1904, 1910.

BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS

Almaraz, Felix D. *The San Antonio Missions and Their System of Land Tenure.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989.

Agee, James, Walker Evans. *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939.

Ayers, Edward L. *The Promise of the New South: Life After Reconstruction.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Baker, D. C. *A Texas Scrapbook—1875.* Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1991.

Block, W. T. *Cotton Bales, Keelboats and Sternwheelers: A History of the Sabine River and Trinity River Cotton Trades, 1837-1900.* Woodville, Texas: Dogwood Press, 1995.

Bolton, Charles C. *Poor Whites of the Antebellum South: Tenants and Laborers in Central North Carolina and Northeast Mississippi.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.

- Brandton, Robert L. *Cotton Kingdom of the New South: A History of the Yazoo Mississippi Delta From Reconstruction to the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Britton, Karen Gerhardt. *Bale o' Cotton: The Mechanical Art of Cotton Ginning*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1992.
- Carlson, Paul H. *Texas Woollybacks: The Range Sheep and Goat Industry*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1982.
- Caro, Robert A. *The Years of Lyndon Johnson: The Path to Power*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.
- Caufield, Henry J. *Caufield Heritage*. Waco: n.p., 1976.
- Cavitt, Ellen Burnett. *Some Tracings of Cavett-Cavitt Family History*. Waco: n.p. 1965.
- Clegg, Luther Bryan. *The Empty School House: Memories of One-Room Texas Schools*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997.
- Conger, Rodger. *Pictorial History of Waco*. Waco: Texian Press, 1968.
- Corder, Jim W. *Chronicle of a Small Town*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1989.
- Cox, A. B. *Cottonseed Crushing Industry of Texas in its Natural Setting*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1949.
- Crawford, M. D. C. *The Heritage of Cotton: The Fiber of Two Worlds and Many Ages*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924.
- Crenshaw, Troy C. *Texas Blackland Heritage*. Waco: Texian Press, 1983.
- Dale, Edward E. *The Range Cattle Industry: Ranching in the Great Plains From*

- 1865-1925. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960.
- De Loach, R. J. and H. A. Phillips. *Progressive Sheep Raising*. Chicago: Armour's Bureau of Agricultural Research and Economics, 1948.
- DeLoach, William G. *Plains Farmer The Diary of William G. DeLoach, 1914-1964*. Edited by Janet N. Neugebauer. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991.
- Dobie, J. Frank. *The Longhorns*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Dodge, Bertha S. *Cotton: The Plant that Would be King*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1984.
- Dusenberry, William H. *The Mexican Mesta: The Administration of Ranching in Colonial Mexico*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963
- Erath, George Bernard. *Memoirs of Major George Bernard Erath*. Edited by Lucy Erath. Waco: n.p., 1885.
- Ezall, John Samuel. *The South Since 1865*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Faulk, Odie B. *Fort Hood: The First Fifty Years*. Temple: Frank W. Mayborn Foundation, 1990
- Fergus, E. N., Carsie Hammonds, and Hayden Rogers. *Southern Field Crop Management*. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1944.
- Fite, Gilbert C. *Cotton Fields No More: Southern Agriculture 1865-1980*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1984.
- Flannery, Brendon. *The Irish Texans*. San Antonio: The University of Texas Institute of Texan Cultures, 1980.

- Foley, Neil. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in the Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Galloway, Mary Katherine Thompson, Mary Kathryn Spiller Briggs, and Marjorie de Maret Hicks. "The Irish of Staggers Point." *Robertson County, Texas*. n.p., 1973(?)
- Goldfield, David. *Promised Land: The South Since 1945*. Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1987.
- Gould, Lewis L. *Progressives and Prohibitionists: Texas Democrats in the Wilson Era*. Austin: Texas State Historical Society, 1992.
- Green, Ben. *Horse Trading*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1977.
- Haney, Robert L. *Milestones. Marking Ten Decades of Research. Texas Agriculture Experiment Station*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1988.
- Harris, Charles H. *A Mexican Family Empire: The Latifundia of the Sanchez-Navarros, 1765-1867*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1975.
- Herbert, Henry William. *Horses, Mules, and Ponies and How to Keep Them*. New York: Lyons Press, 2000.
- Hollon, W. Eugene. *The Southwest: Old and New*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Howard, Robert West. *The Horse in America*. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1965.
- Ivy, James D. *No Saloon in the Valley: The Southern Strategy of the Texas Prohibitionists in the 1880s*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003.

- Johnson, Charles S., Edwin R. Embree, and W. W. Alexander. *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.
- Jordan, Terry G. *Trails to Texas: Southern Roots of Western Cattle Ranching*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.
- Kelly, Dayton, ed. *The Handbook of Waco and McLennan County, Texas*. Waco: Texian Press, 1972.
- Kelton, Steve. *Renderbrook: A Century Under the Spade Brand*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1989.
- Kendall, George Wilkins. *Letters from a Texas Sheep Ranch*. Edited by Harry James Brown. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959.
- Krupper, Winifred. *The Golden Hoof: The Story of the Sheep of the Southwest*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1945.
- Lehman, V. W. *Forgotten Legions: Sheep in the Rio Grande Plain of Texas*. El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1969.
- Lemann, Nicholas. *The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How it Changed America*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Leyburn, James G. *The Scotch-Irish: A Social History*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1962.
- Lichtenstein, Jack. *Field to Fabric: The Story of American Cotton Growers*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1990.
- Long, William G. *Donkeys of the West*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1974.
- Maharidge, Dale, and Michael Williamson. *And Their Children After Them*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1989.

- Manning, Diane. *Hill County Teacher: Oral Histories from the One-Room School and Beyond*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- Marshall, James. *Sante Fe: The Railroad That Built An Empire*. New York: Random House, 1945.
- McBride, Alma McKethan. *The "Filosofer" of "Kukel-bur" Flat*. Waco: Texian Press, 1975
- McCallum, H. D. *The Wire That Fenced the West*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956.
- McGregor, Alexander Campbell. *Counting Sheep: From Open Range to Agribusiness on the Columbia Plateau*. Seattle: University of Washington, 1982.
- McKay, Seth Shepard. *Texas and The Fair Deal, 1945-1952*. San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1954.
- McLennan, Falls, Bell, and Coryell Counties, Texas*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1893.
- McLean, Malcolm, ed. *Robertson's Colony*. 8 volumes, Arlington: University of Texas at Arlington Press, 1975-1995.
- Maudsley, Robert. *Texas Sheepman: The Reminiscences of Robert Maudsley*. Edited by Winifred Kupper. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951.
- Morgan, James Oscar. *Field Crops for the Cotton-Belt*. New York: The McMillan Company, 1918.
- Myres, S. D. Jr. ed. *The Cotton Crisis*. Proceedings of the Second Conference, Institute of Public Affairs, 1935. Southern Methodist University. Dallas:

- George F. and Ora Nixon Arnold Foundation, 1935.
- Nordyke, Lewis. *Cattle Empire*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1949.
- O'Neal, Bill. *Cattlemen vs. Shepherders*. Austin: Eakin Press, 1989.
- Osgood, Ernest Staples. *The Day of the Cattleman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Parker, Richard Denny. *Historical Recollections of Robertson County, Texas*. Salado, Texas: Anson Jones Press, 1955.
- Perry, Garland. *An American Saga: William George Hughes, 1859-1902*. Boerne, Texas: LEBCO Graphics, 1994.
- Poage, W. R. (Bob). *McLennan County--Before 1980*. Waco: Texian Press, 1981.
_____. *After The Pioneers*. Waco: Texian Press, 1969.
- Porter, Glenn, and Harold C. Livesay. *Merchants and Manufacturers: Studies in Changing Structure of Nineteenth-Century Marketing*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Powell, Roberta Blair. *A History of the Unity Presbyterian Church*. Turnersville: n.p, 1972.
- Provence, Harry. *The Citizens National Bank of Waco*. Waco: Republic Bank, 1982.
- Rainbolt, Jo. *The Last Cowboys*. Helena: American and World Geographic Publishing, 1992.
- Reeve, Agnesa. *My Dear Mollie: Love Letters of A Texas Sheep Rancher*. Dallas: Hendrick-Long Publishing Co., 1990.

- Rosengarten, Theodore. *Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1986.
- Sage, Wayne. *Harris Creek Baptist Church*. Waco: N.P., 1979.
- Schmitz, Joseph William. *Texas Culture In the Days of the Republic*. San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1960.
- Self, Margaret Cabell. *Horses of Today*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pierce, 1964.
- Shannon, Fred A. *The Farmer's Last Frontier: Agriculture, 1860-1897*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1945.
- Sharpless, Rebecca. *Fertile Ground, Narrow Choices: Women on Texas Cotton Farms, 1900-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Silver, James W. *Mississippi: The Closed Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1963.
- Silverthorne, Elizabeth. *Plantation Life in Texas*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1986.
- Simmons, Frank E. *History of Coryell County*. Belton: Coryell County News, 1936.
- Sitton, Thad, and Dan Utley. *From Can See to Can't*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997.
- _____. *Backwoodsmen. Stockmen and Hunters Along a Big Thicket River Valley*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
- Sleeper, John, and J. C. Hutchins. *Waco and McLennan County, Texas*. Waco: J. W. Gollledge, 1876.
- Smith, David Paul. *Frontier Defense in the Civil War*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1992.

- Smith, Frank E. *The Yazoo River*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1954.
- Smith, W. Broadus. *Pioneers of Brazos County, Texas. 1800-1850*. Brazos County: W. Broadus Smith, 1962.
- Spratt, John Stickling. *The Road to Spindletop*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1955.
- Stearns, Monyene. *McGregor, Texas: Jewel of the Prairie*. McGregor: Monyene Stearns, 2000.
- Street, James H. *The New Revolution in the Cotton Economy: Mechanization and Its Consequences*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957.
- Strapac, Joseph A. *Cotton Belt Locomotives*. Huntington Beach, Ca: Shade Tree Books, 1977.
- Syers, William Edward. *Off the Beaten Track*. Waco: Texian Press, 1971.
- Texas Almanac*. Galveston: Richardson and Co., 1856.
- Thorp, Laura A. *Facts and Anecdotes of Turnersville, Texas*. Waco: Texian Press, 1973.
- Wallace, Patricia Ward. *Our Land Our Lives*. Norfolk, Virginia: Donning Company, 1986.
- Waters, L. L. *Steel Trails to Sante Fe*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1950.
- Watkins, James L. *King Cotton. A Historical and Statistical Review, 1790-1908*. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1908.
- Webb, Walter Prescott. *The Great Plains*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1931.
- Wentworth, Edward Norris. *America's Sheep Trails*. Ames: The Iowa State College

Press, 1948.

Whayne, Jeannie. *Shadows over Sunnyside: An Arkansas Plantation in Transition 1830-1945*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1993.

Williams, J. W. *Old Texas Trails*. Burnet, Texas: Eakin Press, 1979.

Woodman, Harold D. *King Cotton and His Retainers. Financing and Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800-1925*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968.

Woolfolk, George Ruble. *The Cotton Regency: The Northern Merchants and Reconstruction 1865-1880*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1958.

Worcester, Don. *The Chisholm Trail: High Road of the Cattle Kingdom*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

Worster, Donald. *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Wright, Gavin. *Old South New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986.

Yafa, Stephen. *Big Cotton: How a Humble Fiber Created Fortunes, Wrecked Civilizations and Put America on the Map*. New York: Viking, 2005.

END NOTES

- ¹ James G. Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish A Social History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), p. 173.
- ² Galloway, Mary Katherine Thompson, Mary Katheryn Spiller Briggs, and Marjorie de Maret Hicks. "The Irish of Staggers Point" *Robertson County, Texas*. n.p., 1973(?), pp. 6-12; Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish*, p. 175.
- ³ Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish*, p. 173; Galloway, Briggs and Hicks, *Staggers Point*, p. 12.
- ⁴ Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish*, pp. 200-216ff.
- ⁵ List of Sunday school students, Bethlehem Presbyterian Church, Boligee, Alabama, 1840, CP. Cavitt Caufield holds a large file of the correspondence of Henry Caufield, and his son George Caufield located at the Caufield Ranch, McGregor, Texas (hereafter cited as the Caufield Papers, CP). These have been copied and amalgamated with copies of correspondence to other family members, transcripts of interviews, and various ledgers, trail logs, receipts, and wills and have been stored at the Caufield Ranch. An additional seven file boxes containing the correspondence of Henry Caufield's son-in-law, Josephus Cavitt and his family, including ledgers, tax records, and wills have been gathered by Cavitt Caufield and are kept at his home in McGregor Texas (hereafter cited as the Cavitt papers, CvP).
- ⁶ Leyburn, *The Scotch-Irish*, pp. 117-120, 127, 181.
- ⁷ Ellen B. Cavitt, *Some Tracings of Cavett-Cavitt Family History* (Waco: n. p., 1965), p. 97; Joseph William Schmitz, *Texas Culture In the Days of the Republic* (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1960), p. 94.
- ⁸ WC to Thomas Caufield, June 29, 1857; HJC to WC, October 1, 1858; brand registration, receipt for purchase from McClelland Company, 1866; recorded marks and brand record, McLennan Co., Texas, book 232, no. 13, June 13, 1885; cattle shipping records, 1889, in CP; W. R. Poage, *McLennan County--Before 1980*, (Waco: Texian Press, 1961), p. 64.
- ⁹ Thad Sitton and Dan Utley, *From Can See to Can't* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997), pp. 90-92; HJC to GC, January 22, 1856; HJC to W.C., January 30, May 30, 1858, July 15, 1859; Taped interview with George Caufield, Jr. (GC) by Watson Caufield Arnold, Jr., December 9, 1995, Amarillo, Texas, in CP.
- ¹⁰ HJC to WC, April 8, 1858, October 1, 1858; taped interview with Cavitt Caufield (CC) by Watson Caufield Arnold Jr., McGregor, Texas, May 1995; trail logs in small leather book, Watson Caufield, 1856-1870; HJC to WC, August 1868; power of attorney from HJC to WEY, November 10, 1874, in CP.
- ¹¹ HJC to WC, May 15, 1858, in CP; Roger Norman Conger, "Fencing in McLennan County," *Waco's Champion: Selections from the Papers of Roger Norman Conger*, ed. by Marion Travis (Waco: Waco Historical Foundation, 1990), pp. 129-137; GC, interview, in CP; Walter Prescott Webb,

The Great Plains (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1985), pp. 229, 317; John Sleeper and J. C. Hutchins, *Waco and McLennan County*, (Waco: J. W. Gulledge, 1876) pp. 108-109.

¹² GC, interview, in CP: W. R. Poage, *McLennan County--Before 1980* (Waco: Texian Press, 1961), p. 151; CC, interview; "Local Pioneer Dies," *Waco Times Herald*, June 10, 1908, in CP; Conger, "Fencing," pp. 129-137ff; Webb, *Great Plains*, p. 247.

¹³ Terry G. Jordan, *Trails to Texas: Southern Roots of Western Cattle Ranching* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), pp. 125-157ff; John Stickling Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1955), pp. 38-39; Steve Kelton, *Renderbrook-A Century Under the Spade Brand* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1989), pp. viii, 45; Edward E. Dale, *The Range Cattle Industry: Ranching in the Great Plains From 1865-1925* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960), p. 101; W. Eugene Hollon, *The Southwest: Old and New* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 254-255.

¹⁴ Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 82-84; Conger, "Fencing," pp. 127-129.

¹⁵ Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 146-153; WC, Wheelock, Texas to TC, Boligee, Alabama, June 29, 1857, CP; HJC to WC, Boligee, January 30, 1858, in CP. A table of the rainfall at Austin, Texas shows 1860-1863 as dry years with 1863 having the lowest precipitation in several decades. See D. W. C. Baker, *A Texas Scrapbook--1875* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1991), p. 358; David Paul Smith, *Frontier Defense in the Civil War* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1992), pp. 124, 147.

¹⁶ Hollon, *The Southwest*, pp. 242-258ff; J. Frank Dobie, *The Longhorns* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990), pp. 240-246ff. In a series of interviews, Jo Rainbolt, *The Last Cowboys* (Helena: American and World Geographic Publishing, 1992) relates the eventual fate of the Western cowboys. Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, pp. 56-57; Webb, *Great Plains*, pp. 395-396; Lewis Nordyke, *Cattle Empire* (New York: Morrow, 1949), p. 241; H. D. McCallum, *The Wire That Fenced the West* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), pp. 14-28ff.

¹⁷ Hollon, *The Southwest*, pp. 242-267ff; Dayton Kelly, ed., *The Handbook of Waco and McLennan County, Texas* (Waco: Texian Press, 1972), pp. 52; HJC to WC, May 15, September 25, 1860, in CP; Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 65, 69-72; Webb, *Great Plains*, p. 317. A well dug at the Watt Caufield house about 1888 has been in continuous use for more than 100 years and is typical for those of the time and region. It is about fifty feet deep, lined with limestone and connected to a windmill. It supplies water to an elevated metal water tank for indoor consumption and provides water pressure to indoor plumbing. The windmill also fills another stone tank for the animals. GC, interview, in CP.

¹⁸ Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 69-72, 75-85ff; National Fibers Information Center, *The History of Cotton in Texas* (Austin: Bureau of Business Research, 1989), pp. 5-12ff; Charles S. Johnson, Edwin R. Embree, and W. W. Alexander. *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935), pp. 20-43ff; Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, p. 66; Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 20-54ff.

¹⁹ James Marshall, *Santa Fe. The Railroad That Built An Empire*, (New York: Random House, 1945), pp. 224-233ff; L. L. Waters, *Steel Trails to Santa Fe*, (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1950), pp. 76-83ff.

²⁰ Ernest Staples Osgood, *The Day of the Cattleman* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929),

pp. 216-257ff; Donald E. Worcester, *The Chisholm Trail: High Road of the Cattle Kingdom* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1985), pp. 153-175ff; Henry John Caufield (HJC) to Watson Caufield (WC), November 23, 1878, in CP.

²¹ Receipts, H. J. Caufield, July 28, August 3, 1885, August 31, 1886; receipts Neil McLennan, August 17, December 17, 1887; bank transfer notes, August 18, 1887, in CP; receipt, J. F. Cavitt (JFC), November 19, 1904, in CvP.

²² John Sleeper and J. C. Hutchins, *Waco and McLennan County, Texas* (Waco: J. W. Golledge, 1876), pp. 108-109; *McLennan, Falls, Bell, and Coryell Counties, Texas* (Chicago: Lewis Publishing Company, 1893), pp. 831-832; CC, interview; shipping receipts and payment vouchers, 1885, 1886, in CP; Glenn Porter and Harold Livesay, *Merchants and Manufactures. Studies in the Changing Structure of Nineteenth-Century Marketing* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), pp. 172-175ff. The rail lines allowed ranchers a free roundtrip ticket for each three to four cattle cars. The men sent made certain that the cattle were watered and fed during the trip and that cattle that had fallen in the rail cars got back to their feet, else the other animals would trample them. Neff particularly liked to make the trip and accompanied most of the shipments.

²³ Shackelford County records, deeds, grantor book, Volume 26, 24, pp. 340-341; Aldon Socrates Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas," *The Baylor Bulletin*, Vol. XXXV, No. 3 (July), 1932.

²⁴ Tom Caufield (TC), Tombstone, Arizona Territory to H. C. Clifton, November 28, 1886; HJC to WEY, August 10, 1883, FP; TC, Ochoaville, Arizona Territory to Martha Caufield, September 11, 1886, in CP. The letter relates a trip for supplies into Tombstone where "the Earp brothers have things quiet now." Caufield was grateful that "Arizona and Sonora once more breathe freely from terror, Geronimo has at last surrendered." L. B. Hood, Tombstone, to HJC, February 9, 1889, in CP.

²⁵ Webb, *Great Plains*, p. 425; GC, interview, in CP; Poage, *Before the Pioneers*, p. 151; CC, interview, in CP; "Local Pioneer Dies," *Waco Times Herald*, June 10, 1908, in CP; Conger, "Fencing," pp. 129-137ff.

¹ Kathleen Caufield to Watson Caufield Arnold, June 11, 1973; GC, interview; Mollie Caufield Cavitt to Mary Ann Young Foote (MAYF), January 4, 1904. The Foote family at the Foote Ranch holds a collection of annual account books, letters, receipts, and ledgers, Turnersville, Texas, hereafter cited as Foote Papers, (FP).

² Kathleen Caufield to Watson Caufield Arnold, June 11, 1973; Henry Clifton to JFC, May 23, 1921, in CP.

³ TC to JFC, September 19, 1919; Mrs. J. B. Rodgers to Mrs. Thomas Caufield, December 7, 1919; J. H. Caufield to Kathleen Caufield, June 11, 1973, in CP. J. H. Caufield, *Caufield Heritage*, p. 109.

⁴ TC to JFC, January 14, 1910, in CP.

CHAPTER TWO: CAVITT

⁵ Ellen Burnett Cavitt, *Some Tracings of Cavett-Cavitt Family History* (Waco: n.p., 1965), pp. 33-40ff; H. J. Caufield, *Caufield Heritage* (Waco: n.p., 1976), pp. 57, 98, 125.

⁶ Ellen Burnett Cavitt, *Some Tracings of Cavett-Cavitt Family History* (Waco: n.p., 1965), pp. 33-40ff.

⁷ Mollie Cavitt to JFC, June 26, 1911; certificate, Knights Templar to Andrew Sheridan Cavitt, March 24, 1911 by George Caufield; M. C. Lilly & Co., Military and Society Goods to GC, 1911, in CvP; CC, interview, in CP.

⁸ John Cavitt to JFC, December 12, 1911; receipt, McGregor Milling and Grain Company, 1911; receipt, Oglesby Roller Mill, 1911, in CvP.

⁹ One dollar of value in 1914 is worth about fifty dollars in 2004. Thus, Cavitt's net worth was equivalent to about \$7,860,000 in today's money. JFC to Wright and Harris, August 15, 1919, in CvP.

¹⁰ Gavin Wright, *Old South New South Revolutions in the Southern Economy Since the Civil War* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986) p. 120. In 1866, Texas contained sixty-six thousand mules worth \$52 per head compared to 430,000 horses worth \$25 each. In 1909, Texas contained 700,000 mules--twice as many as any other state. By 1926, Texas contained 1,240,000 mules worth an average of \$144 each and about 1,000,000 horses worth \$100 each. See Robert L. Haney, *Milestones Marking Ten Decades of Research* (College Station: Texas Agricultural Experimental Station, 1989), pp. 77-79 and *The Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1909*, p. 578.

¹¹ Ben K. Green, *Horse Trading* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977), pp. v-vii; Robert West Howard, *The Horse in America* (Chicago: Follett Publishing Company, 1965), pp. 93-102ff; E. A. Trowbridge, "Corn Versus Oats for Work Mules," *University of Missouri, Agricultural Experimental Station*, Columbia, Missouri: (Circular 125), July, 1924.

¹² William G. Long, *Donkeys of the West* (New York, Ballantine Books, 1974), pp. 74-76; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 108.

¹³ Howard, *The Horse in America*, pp. 93-102ff; HJC to WC, June 24, 1855, May 16, 1960; bill of sale for brand and registration for brand, 1866; leather trail book, in CP; McBride, . Alma McKethan McBride, *The "Filosofer" of "Kukel-bur" Flat* (Waco: Texian Press, 1975), pp. 64-65.

¹⁴ Trail notes in leather notebook, in CP; Howard, *The Horse in America*, pp. 93-102ff; Green, *Horse Trading*, pp. v-xi; HJC to WC, June 24, 1855; January 29, 1917; GC, interview; Milton Wallace to Cavitt, April 19, 1917, in CP; Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, p. 95; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 108. Bill, F. R. Wingrove to JFC, July 1, 1911, in CvP.

-
- ¹⁵ Henry William Herbert, *Horses, Mules, and Ponies and How to Keep Them* (New York: Lyons Press, 2000), pp. 81-93ff; *The "Filosofer,"* pp. 64-65; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 113.
- ¹⁶ McBride, *Filospher*, p. 63; Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 107-110.
- ¹⁷ Invoice from *Texas Farm and Ranch Publishing Company* to JFC, January 21, 1917, January 24, 1918; Karl F. Tate to JFC, January 20, 1917; C. W. Tyson to JFC, January 29, 1917; W. T. Black, Athens, Texas to JFC, January 15, 1916, in CvP.
- ¹⁸ J. J. Blackwell to JFC, June 26, 1911; JFC to J. W. Jones, January 4, 1911, in CvP.
- ¹⁹ Herbert, *Horses, Mules, and Ponies*, pp. 81-93ff; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 108.
- ²⁰ J. H. Thompson, Sheriff of Gila County, Arizona to JFC, March 17, 1904; R. E. Bryant, Moody, Texas, to JFC, February 19, 1908; J. N. Davis to JFC, January 29, 1913; Norman Cavitt to JFC, January 2, February 25, 1916; Milton Wallace to JFC, March 20, April 14, May 15, 1916, in CvP.
- ²¹ Registration certificates, 1890; bill of sale, 1890, in CP; Margaret Cabell Self, *Horses of Today* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pierce, 1964), p. 74; Jim Roberts, "A Shetland--The Most Remarkable of All," *The Pony Journal* (Jan-Feb, 1995), p. 5.
- ²² Copy of advertisement in *Farm and Ranch Magazine*, 1917, GC, interview, in CP; J. G. Rowe to JFC, February 27, 1917; S. McManus to JFC, February 26, 1917; O. R. Parkman to JFC, February 18, 1917, in CvP; Howard, *The Horse in America*, pp. 93-102ff; Green, *Horse Trading*, pp. v-xi; C. W. Tyson to JFC, January 29, 1917; Milton Wallace to JFC, April 19, 1917; Mrs. J. P. Kisir to JFC January 19, 1914, in CvP. W. C. Arnold, "Shetland Ponies on the Blackland Prairie," *Waco Heritage and History*, vol. 26, no. 1, (Fall, 1996), pp.15-19.
- ²³ John Honeycutt to Mart Caufield, March 22, 1912, in CP; D. G. Adair to JFC, February 15, 1916, in CvP.
- ²⁴ RA to JFC, February 19, 1907; J. C. Bryant to JFC, April 6, 1916; D. G. Adair to JFC, September 16, 1916, in CvP.
- ²⁵ Thayer Waldo, "Back in the Quiet Days Ponies Were Not Mean Like One That Nipped Judge's Granddaughter," *El Paso Herald Post*, May 2, 1957, p. 3; CC, interview, in CP.
- ²⁶ Roger Conger, *Pictorial History of Waco* (Waco: Texian Press, 1968), p. 82; photographs; CC, interview, in CP; J. V. Cavitt to JFC, August 11, 1912, in CvP.
- ²⁷ Patricia Ward Wallace, *Our Land Our Lives: A Pictorial History of McLennan County* (Virginia Beach: Donning Company, 1986), p. 102; newspaper photograph, *Waco Tribune*, 1910(?); CC, interview, CP.
- ²⁸ Arnold, "Shetland Ponies on the Blackland Prairie," pp. 15-19; William Edward Syers, "Molly Bailey and the Circus," *Off The Beaten Path* (Waco: Texian Press, 1971), pp. 207-210; receipts, Mollie Bailey to JFC, CvP.

²⁹ G. G. Sturtevant, "Old Circus Days in Texas," *Frontier Times*, vol. IX (August, 1932), pp. 481-488; Kathleen Caufield to Watson Caufield Arnold, (1955?); CC, interview; photographs, in CP.

³⁰ Receipt and registration papers, October 19, 1905; Henry Mitchell to JFC, April 30, 1906; Receipt, Great Northern Railroad, June 15, 1906; Receipt, Evans-Snider Commission Agents to JFC, February 10, 1915, receipt, J. D. Mitchell, Commission Agent, Fort Worth Stockyards to JFC, December 13, 1918, February 3, 1919, December 21, 1919, in CvP.

³¹ J. Mitchell to JFC May 29, June 15, June 17, 1906; French Webb Commission Company, Fort Worth Stockyards to JFC, April 14, 1910; J. Burns, Professor, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas to JFC, January 29, 1912, in CvP.

³² Cypers Incubator Company to JFC, September 25, 1912; Invoice, M. Johnson to JFC, April, 1916; Cypers Incubator Company to JFC, April 11, 1916; Trinity Valley Farms to JFC, April 15, 1916, Oak Grove Farms to JFC, April 11, 1916; R. Guy Davis to JFC, March, 1917, A. T. Ezell to JFC, February 13, 1917, in CvP.

³³ John D. Hicks, "The Significance of the Small Town in American History," *Reflections of Western Historians*, ed. by John Alexander Carroll (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969), pp. 155-167.

³⁴ For discussion of the transition of rural towns into urban cities see Hicks, "The Significance of the Small Town," pp. 155-167; Edward L. Ayers, *The Promise of the New South: Life after Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); and Robert L. Brandton, *Cotton Kingdom of the New South. A History of the Yazoo Mississippi Delta From Reconstruction to the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967).

³⁵ Gilbert C. Fite, *Cotton Fields No More. Southern Agriculture 1865-1980* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1984).

³⁶ Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, p. 66; Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 69-72. The building of these railroads is discussed in Joseph A. Strapac, *Cotton Belt Locomotives* (Huntington Beach Ca: Shade Tree Books, 1977), p. 2; L. L. Waters, *Steel Trails to Santa Fe* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1950).

³⁷ Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, pp. 246-248; Jim W. Corder, *Chronicle of a Small Town* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1989); *Texas State Gazetteer*, 1884, 1890, 1893; Wright, *New South*, pp. 39-43ff.

³⁸ Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 69-72; Kelley, *Handbook of Waco and McLennan County*, pp. 171-172; Monyene Stearns, *McGregor, Texas. The Jewel of the Prairie*, (McGregor: Monyene Stearns, 2000), pp. 6-12ff.

³⁹ Worster, *Dust Bowl*, p. 168; Stearns, *McGregor*, pp. 6-12ff.

⁴⁰ McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, pp. 156-163ff., Worster, *Dust Bowl*, p. 168.

⁴¹ Loan notes from J. B. Russ to JFC, August, 1918; W. Robert Smith to JFC, July 31, 1918; Ruth Cavitt (RC) to JFC, June 2, 1907, June 29, 1921, in CvP; Cavitt, *Cavett-Cavitt Family History*, p. 111; Schmitz, *Texas Culture*, p. 40. The cost of food was a minor expense. Most families, living well,

spent less than \$100 annually on food. The cost of travel—transportation, hotels, restaurants was another matter and quite expensive.

⁴² Deed of sale, to Clara Cavitt, November 11, 1904; JFC to estate of Harold Westcoff, November 10, 1904; deed of trust for A. S. (Sid) Cavitt from Clara Cavitt to J. V. Cavitt, February 21, 1905; Will Hickman, Tax Collector, San Angelo to JFC, December 8, 1909, in CvP.

⁴³ Jesse Scargile to JFC, October 29, 1917, in CvP.

⁴⁴ John Cavitt to JFC, September 9, 1910; Clara Cavitt to JFC, January 27, 1916, in CvP.

⁴⁵ Receipt, Peterson Wool Merchants to JFC, July 22, 1909; receipt, George Richardson Wool Merchant, San Angelo to JFC, April 14, 1915; Norman Cavitt to JFC, December 7, 1911; Jesse Scargile to JFC, October 29, 1917, in CvP.

⁴⁶ Depositions, Mary Cavitt Washington, J. F. Cavitt, and John B. Cavitt, 1916; John B. Cavitt to J. J. Gallher, Bank of Romney, October 26, 1920; Prescott Huidekoper to John B. Cavitt, August 10, 1920, in CvP.

⁴⁷ John B. Cavitt to JFC, July 2, 1910, in CvP.

⁴⁸ J. V. Cavitt to JFC, June 17, 1906; J. Cavitt, Jr. to JFC, November 21, 1911; Henry Mitchell to JFC, February 13, 1913; J. R. Case Company to JFC, October 10, 1911, in CvP.

⁴⁹ Advertisement, *McGregor Mirror*, 1915 (?); William Goode to JFC, April 13, 1906; Lizzie Cavitt Goode to JFC, October 11, 1907; account statements, First National Bank of McGregor for C. J. Cavitt, 1909 to 1911; JFC to W. T. Goode, April 25, 1907, in CvP.

⁵⁰ Statement, B. U. Sims MD for Mrs. Volney Cavitt, December 15, 1920; JFC to Clara Cavitt, December 28, 1907; estate estimate for Clara J. Cavitt (Mrs. Volney Cavitt), July 29, 1921; JFC to S. E. Cavitt, January 4, 1924, in CvP.

⁵¹ JFC to RA, March 11, 1905; RA to JFC, December 24, 1906, January 25, 1907, March 2, 1910; JFC to RA, March 31, 1910; W. T. Taliaferro to JFC, April 27, June 27, 1916, in CvP.

⁵² RA to JFC, January 28, 1907, February 19, 1908; JFC to Sattler and Arnold, attorneys, February 10, 1906, May 25, 1906, January 10, 1908; John Cavitt to Clara Cavitt, November 3, 1909, in CvP.

⁵³ Claim JFC to St. Louis Southwestern Railroad, March 7, 1907; handwritten ledger statement, 1918; St. Louis Southwestern Railroad, to JFC, April 19, 1911, in CvP.

⁵⁴ C. E. Stockburger, Tax Collector, Coryell County to JFC, April, 30, 1916, in CvP; deed, dated February, 1865, p. 477, McLennan County, in CP.

⁵⁵ JFC to Turner and Dinger, December 17, 1909; Sam Cavitt to JFK May 11, 1908, in CvP.

⁵⁶ Porter and Livesay, *Merchants and Manufactures*, pp. 215-220ff.

-
- ⁵⁷ Clara Cavitt to JFC, January 1, 1916, CvP; Mollie Caufield Cavitt to Mary Ann Foote, January 4, 1906, in FP; Porter and Livesay, *Merchants and Manufactures*, pp. 224-226; Donald Worster, *Dust Bowl*, p. 168.
- ⁵⁸ James Cavitt to JFC, October 21, 1912; E. R. Barton to JFC, February 15, 1910; District Court, Coryell County to JFC, September 14, 1914; Henry Hanover to JFC, March 9, 1908, June 25, 1912; JFC to J. V. Cavitt, September 16, 1914, in CvP.
- ⁵⁹ J. Frank Cavitt to JFC, June 1, 1910. JFC to John Deere Company, June 13, September 23, November 16, 1910, in CvP.
- ⁶⁰ JFC to Charles F. Smith, May 5, 1913; receipt Gulledege Dry Goods to JFC, January 1910, in CvP.
- ⁶¹ JFC to GC, May 18, 1914, in CvP.
- ⁶² A. B. Cox, *Cottonseed Crushing Industry of Texas in its Natural Setting* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1949), pp. 2, 8, 15, 34; William G. DeLoach, ed. by Janet N. Neugebauer, *Plains Farmer The Diary of William G. DeLoach, 1914-1964* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991), p. 128. In 1931, DeLoach picked 1,790 pounds of cotton, the bale of lint weighed 515 pounds and the seed 880 pounds. His cottonseed sold for \$10 a ton. The gin charged \$2.83 to process a bale. The lint sold for 4.7 cents a pound.
- ⁶³ JFC to Bud Cavitt, February 13, 1915, in CvP.
- ⁶⁴ Jack Lichtenstein, *Field to Fabric. The Story of American Cotton Growers* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1990), p. 32. That amount of cottonseed came from 120,000 pounds of cotton or 224 bales and represented about \$50,000 in cotton sales and about \$5,000 in income from cottonseed by-products. Roger N. Conger, "Waco: Cotton and Culture on the Brazos," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, vol. LXXV, no. 1, (July, 1971), pp. 54-76; JFC to S. A. (Bud) Cavitt, February 13, 1917; Sam Amsler to Internal Revenue Service, March 5, 1919, in CvP.
- ⁶⁵ Receipt, McGregor Milling and Grain Co. to JFC, January 24, 1910, in CvP.
- ⁶⁶ J. H. Rainy to JFC, November, 1917; advertisement, Cavitt Cotton Chopper and Scrieb Star Washing Machine; M. A. Jones to JFC, April 14, June 27, 1921; GC to JFC January 11, 1911, in CvP; Amsler, *McGregor*, pp. 13-14.
- ⁶⁷ Agreement letter, January 2, 1911; list of expenses for G. Caufield, 1905-1908; entry, December 22, 1906, in CP; Charles Smith to JFC, February 4, 1915, in CvP; Harry Provence, *The Citizens National Bank of Waco* (Waco: Republic Bank, 1982), p. 35.
- ⁶⁸ R. L. Bewdley to G. Caufield, October 25, 1904; G. Caufield to JFC, October 30, November 16, 25, 1904, in CP.
- ⁶⁹ Lizzie Cavitt (LC) to JFC, March 10, April 3, 5, May 24, June 24, 1909; JFC to LC, April 1, June 9, June 22, 1909; JFC to Jim Cavitt (JC), June 24, July 22, 1909; JC to LC, July 2, 1909; MC Cavitt to JFC, April 6, 1920, in CvP. Johnson grass had been imported from Africa and introduced into the Southern agricultural economy for rapid growing animal fodder. It soon

became a pest, spreading widely and becoming difficult to eradicate once established.

⁷⁰ Neil Foley, *The White Scourge. Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in the Texas Cotton Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. 90; Rebecca Sharpless, *Fertile Ground Narrow Choices. Women on Texas Cotton Farms, 1900-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), pp. 3-15ff; Troy C. Crenshaw, *Texas Blackland Heritage* (Waco: Texian Press, 1983), pp. xi, 22; Poage, *McLennan County*, p. 148.

⁷¹ Foley, *White Scourge*, pp. 33; Sharpless, *Fertile Ground*, pp. 8-12; Poage, *Pioneers*, p. 148, Wright, *Old South*, p. 122; James Oscar Morgan, *Field Crops for the Cotton-Belt* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918), p. 30; *Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1896*, p. 509. The closest relative to cotton is okra, also in the Marrow family, see, E. N. Fergus, Carsie Hammonds, and Hayden Rogers, *Southern Field Crop Management* (Chicago: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1944), pp. 583-604ff.

⁷² RA to JFC, January 28, 1907, June 30, 1908, January 27, 1916; C. G. Wood to JFC, March 18, August 8, 1905, C. G. Wood to RA, January 25, 1916, in CvP.

⁷³ RA to JFC, August 7, 1905, January 27, 1906, November 2, 1909; Edwin Wilson to JFC, August 9, September 21, 27, 1905; C. G. Wood to JFC, September 7, 1905, in CvP.

⁷⁴ Thad Sitton and Dan K. Utley, *From Can See to Can't*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997), pp. 90-98; Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 115-116.

⁷⁵ Foley, *White Scourge*, p. 10. Tenants farmed on 'thirds and fourths' and sharecroppers farmed on 'halves'; Odie B. Faulk, Laura E. Faulk, *Fort Hood The First Fifty Years*, (Temple: Frank W. Mayborn Foundation, 1990), pp. 10-11; Wright, *New South*, pp. 97-100ff. The WPA supported a book of pictures and text that document the hopelessness of the white sharecropper better than any other. See James Agee and Walker Evans, *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1939). Even more thought provoking is the follow-up story of these same families thirty years later by Dale Maharidge and Michael Williamson, *And Their Children After Them* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989).

⁷⁶ Faulk, *Fort Hood*, p. 12; Sitton, *Can see to Caint*, p. 90; ledgers, in CP.

⁷⁷ W. B. McHarvey to JFC, December, 12, 1907; J. Hoy to JFC, April 5, 1919; Mrs. D. H. Brown to JFC, September 21, 1910, in CvP. Worster, *Dust Bowl*, p. 60; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 93; Wright, *New South*, p. 100; Porter, *Merchants and Manufactures*, pp. 72-85ff.

⁷⁸ Lichtenstein, *Field to Fabric*, p. 69; V. B. McHargot to JFC, December 13, 1917, in CvP; Riley Morris to Tom Caufield, July 13, 1919, in CP.

⁷⁹ Spratt, *The Road to Spindletop*, pp. 56-57; Foley, *White Scourge*, p. 52; Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 90-110ff; Porter, *Merchants and Manufactures*, pp. 118-130ff.

⁸⁰ Ferguson Seed Farms, to JFC, January 24, 1918, February 15, 1918, in CvP; Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 90, 102.

⁸¹ For a discussion of molasses production, see Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 91, 102 and Thad Sitton,

Backwoodsmen. Stockmen and Hunters Along a Big Thicket River Valley, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), pp. 69-70. Sugar cane stalks have special value as they balance the nutrition content of cottonseed hulls for ruminants such as cattle. They are poisonous for swine and horses; see Haney, *Milestones*, pp. 90, 99. Texans produced 15,000 gallons of molasses in 1888 worth \$5,000, see *2nd Annual Report 1888-1889*, p. 280; CC, interview, in CP.

⁸² Silverthorne, Elizabeth, *Plantation life in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1986), pp. 109, 133; Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 91, 102, 122.

⁸³ Luther Bryan Clegg, *The Empty School House* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997), pp. xiv, 206-209; McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, p. 208; Sitton, *Backwoodsmen*, pp. 76-77; Diane Manning, *Hill County Teacher. Oral Histories from the One-Room School and Beyond* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990), pp. 25-26; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 125.

⁸⁴ Clegg, *Empty School House*, pp. xvi-xviii; McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, p. 208; Schmitz, *Texas Culture*, pp. 66-67. The average cost of a schoolhouse was \$276 in Ezell, *The South*, p. 252. Bill for lumber for Harris Creek School, 1889 (?), in CP.

⁸⁵ J. P. Alexander to TC, July, 16, 1919; Annie Webb Blanton, State Superintendent, to TC, July 22, 1919, in CvP; ; McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, p. 176.

⁸⁶ Sitton, *Backwoodsmen*, pp. 35-40ff; Mollie Cavitt to JFC, June 10, 1912, in CvP.

⁸⁷ Clegg, *Empty Schoolhouse*, p. 26. ; McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, pp. 208-209; Mollie Cavitt to JFC, June 10, 1912, in CvP; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 262.

⁸⁸ McBride, *The "Filosofer"*, pp. 208-209; Manning, *Hill County Teacher*, pp. 30-33; CC, interview; picture, in CP.

⁸⁹ Receipt, GC to HJ Caufield, January 17, 1911, in CvP; Wayne Sage, *Harris Creek Baptist Church*, n.p., 1979, p. 3; McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, p. 229.

⁹⁰ James D. Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003), pp. 112-120ff, Poage, *McLennan County*, p. 181; Lewis L. Gould, *Progressives and Prohibitionists* (Austin: Texas State Historical Society, 1992), p. 289.

⁹¹ TC to JFC, January 14, 1910; Bank statement, First National Bank, 1918; telegraph bill, Gulf State Telegraph, October, 1917; Mirror Printing Company, October 1, 1917, in CvP; Gould, *Progressives and Prohibitionists*, pp. 166-167; A. J. Barton to JFC, May 9, 1918, in CvP.

⁹² Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley*, pp. 119-120; Gould, *Progressives and Prohibitionists*, p. 289.

⁹³ CC, interview, CP.

⁹⁴ Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley*, pp. 119-120.

⁹⁵ S. S. Amsler to Tom Caufield, January 3, 1917; Norman Cavitt to JFC, September 20, 1917; Draft notice, Volney Cavitt, July 17, 1918; J. H. Caufield to JFC, December 1918, in CvP.

⁹⁶ McLennan County Chapter American Red Cross to Tom Caufield, October 2, 16, November 6, 20, 1918, August 5, 1919, in CP. *McGregor Mirror*, Friday, May 10, 1918 (vol. 30, #23), pp. 1 and 2, in CvP.

⁹⁷ Hudson Motors to TC, January 24, 1919, in CP; Worster, *Dust Bowl*, p. 168

⁹⁸ Ruby Foote to MAYF, October 26, 1904, FP; MAYF from Lizzie Caufield Clifton, January 23, 1906, in FP.

⁹⁹ Robert Hill to JFC, November 25, 1913; John B. Cavitt to JFC, March 26, 1915; JBC to JFC, February 14, 1916, Receipt, Board of Trustees, Milford College, May 30, 1917, in CvP.

¹⁰⁰ J. W. McKinney to JFC, January 8, 1927; JFC to R.M. Morrill, January 8, 1927, in CvP.

¹⁰¹ Tax receipts, 1919, in CvP.

¹⁰² W. A. Sandervoll to TC, June 24, 1919; McGregor Oil and Drilling Company to JFC, October 20, 1911, in CvP.

¹⁰³ Wright, *Old South*, p. 233; Fred A. Shannon, *The Farmer's Last Frontier. Agriculture, 1860-1897* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1945), pp. 137-138ff, 144.

¹⁰⁴ Worster, *Dust Bowl*, pp. 60-62ff. The combine is, as the name implies, a combination of several machines into one large instrument. A combine harvests the grain, cuts and binds the stalks, and separates the grain from its husk. The whole family participated in the grain harvest, some driving the machine, some driving the mules pulling the binder, others bring water for the engine, fuel for the fires, or food for the workers. The machines were pushed rather than pulled through the fields. A tractor or mules moving in front of the harvesting blades would crush the grain before it could be cut. Once the farmer harvested the grain, long leather belts connected the steam turbine to a thrasher, which separated the grain from the residual stalks and blew the stalks into giant haystacks. Shannon, *Last Frontier*, pp.137-138ff. For an excellent description of wheat farming on a grand scale, see: Alexander Campbell McGregor, *Counting Sheep, From Open Range to Agribusiness on the Columbia Plateau* (Seattle: University of Washington, 1982). McBride, *The "Filosofer,"* pp. 179. CC, interview, 1995, in CP.

¹⁰⁵ Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 10-11; Shannon, *Last Frontier*, pp. 139-144ff. With mechanization, the cost of producing a pound of cotton fell from ten cents a pound to just under five cents a pound. When the price fell below five cents a pound late in the 1920s, with the cost of sale commissions, cotton farmers lost money on their crops. M. D. C. Crawford, *The Heritage of Cotton. The Fiber of Two Worlds and Many Ages* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1924) pp. 213-231ff. For a discussion of the role of the merchant and cotton factor in tenant farming, see Glenn Porter and Harold Livesay. *Merchants and Manufactures. Studies in the Changing Structure of Nineteenth-Century Marketing* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971).

¹⁰⁶ Theodore Rosengarten in *Tombee* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1986), pp. 40-60ff discusses how the overabundance of labor led the South Carolina Sea Island planters to resist mechanization. Harold D. Woodman in *King Cotton and His Retainers* (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1986) discusses the deficiencies in the Southern banking system. S.D. Myres, ed., Institute of Public Affairs, *The Cotton Crisis, Proceedings of the Second Conference* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1935), p. 156; Worster, *Dust Bowl*, pp. 60-62ff.

¹⁰⁷ The process of ginning and transporting cotton is discussed in Karen Britton, *Bale O' Cotton* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1995) and in W. T. Block, *Cotton Bales, Keelboats, and Sternwheelers* (Woodville, Texas: Dogwood Press, 1995). Patricia Ward Wallace, *Our Land Our Lives* (Norfolk, Virginia: Donning Company, 1986); James Watkins, *King Cotton* (New York: Negro Universities Press, 1908), p. 212; Crawford, *Heritage of Cotton*, pp.139, 175; Foley, *White Scourge*, pp. 134, 165; Worster, *Dust Bowl*, pp. 60-62ff; Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 10-11. Annually, a horse required 3,414 pounds of grain, 4,925 pounds of roughage, 147 days of pasture, and 54 hours of man labor per head, for a cost of \$3 per acre. Annual maintenance on a tractor cost \$303 or \$1.74 per acre; see Robert L. Haney, *Milestones Marking Ten Decades of Research* (College Station: Texas Agricultural Experimental Station, 1989), pp. 77-79.

¹⁰⁸ Myres, *Cotton Crisis*, pp. 156; Street, *New Revolution*, pp. 136-143ff; Watkins, *King Cotton*, pp.172; Fergus, in *Southern Field Crops*, calculates the cost of producing cotton in Texas in 1939 as \$21 per acre (p. 588) compared with \$15 an acre for wheat (pp. 228-229). In *Bale O' Cotton*, the cost of picking a bale of cotton was about \$10/bale. Hauling cost \$1.18, ginning cost \$15/ bale, bagging and ties cost \$4.08 for a net cost of \$21.68. A bale of cotton at 5 cents/pound earns \$25.00. Producers considered this the break-even price. There was no profit to pay debts, leases, to purchase new equipment or to buy next year's supplies.

¹⁰⁹ Wallace, *Our Land*, pp. 94-95; James H. Street, *The New Revolution in the Cotton Economy. Mechanization and Its Consequences*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957), pp. 136-143ff; advertisement, in CP; Wright, *Old South*, p. 234. In 1890, breaking land for cotton cost \$11.50 an acre; plowing cost \$.50/acre; chopping cost 25-54 cents/acre; picking cost \$5.00 to 6.50/acre at two bales (1,000 lbs.) per acre; and ginning, baggage, and ties cost \$6.00 per bale, or total costs of about \$25 an acre. For net profit ranged from \$4.50 to \$82 per acre, see Haney, *Milestones*, pp. 90-91. Comparative costs in 1939 of \$2.73 an acre for plowing, \$4.01 for chopping, \$3.73 for harvesting, and \$1.07 for seed and fertilizer, and \$4.86 for a total cost of \$21 an acre are in Fergus, *Southern Field Crops*, p. 588. Mechanization cut the costs of chopping and harvesting dramatically.

¹¹⁰ Sharpless, *Fertile Ground*, p. 236; Worster, *Dust Bowl*, pp. 60-62ff; Lichtenstein, *Field to Fabric*, pp. 68-69.

¹¹¹ Seth Shepard McKay, *Texas and The Fair Deal, 1945-1952* (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1954), pp. 213-215ff; Foley, *White Scourge*, p. 52; Sharpless, *Fertile Ground*, p. 238; Wright, *Old South*, p. 236. For a more complete explanation of the effect of mechanization on blacks, read Nicholas Lemann, *The Promised Land. The Great Black Migration and How it Changed America* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991); David Goldfield, *Promised Land. The South Since 1945* (Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1987).

¹¹² Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 9, 10, 57; Ezall, *The South Since 1865*, pp. 132, 137; WCA interview, in CP; Poage, *McLennan County*, pp. 117-119; Neugebauer, ed. *Plains Farmer*, p. 68. The production of cotton in the Texas Panhandle required 38.9 man-hours per acre or about ten cents a pound for cotton lint. In North Carolina, cotton production required 154 man-hours per acre and cost fifty-four cents per pound to produce. Central Texas costs were closer to those in the Panhandle but still high enough that cotton farmers lost money when the price of cotton fell below ten-fifteen cents a pound. Also see, Fergus, *Southern Field Crops*, pp. 645-646 and Stephen Yafa, *Big Cotton: How a Humble Fiber Created Fortunes, Wrecked Civilizations and put America on the Map* (New York: Viking, 2005), pp. 255-269.

¹¹³ Ezall, *The South Since 1865*, pp. 252, 454, 465; Sitton, *From Can See*, p. 50; Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 10-11; Lichtenstein, *Field to Fabric*, pp. 32-33; Fergus, *Southern Field Crops*, pp. 645-646.

¹¹⁴ McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, p. 243.

¹¹⁵ Partnership agreement, G. Caufield and T. A. Clifton, November 1, 1920, in CP.

116

¹¹⁷ G. W. Lee to JFC, August 20, 1923, in CvP.

¹¹⁸ Dallas Trust Co. to JFC, April 17, 1924; Commerce Farm Credit to JFC, July 28, 1925; Gum Brothers to JFC, November 9, 1926; JFC to Volney Cavitt, October 22, 1928, in CvP.

¹¹⁹ Gum Brothers Company, to JFC, May 27, 1925; J. F. Cavitt to Volney Cavitt, February 12, 1928, in CvP. *Fort Hood*, pp. 10-11.

CHAPTER 3: YOUNGS

¹ For histories of the Texas sheep industries see V. W. Lehman, *Forgotten Legions. Sheep in the Rio Grande Plain of Texas* (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1969); William H. Dusenberry, *The Mexican Mesta. The Administration of Ranching in Colonial Mexico* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963); Charles Wayland Towne and Edward Norris Wentworth, *Shepherds' Empire* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1945); Robert Maudslay, ed. by Winifred Kupper, *Texas Sheepman. The Reminiscences of Robert Maudslay* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1951); Winifred Kupper, *The Golden Hoof. The Story of the Sheep of the Southwest* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945); Garland Perry, *An American Saga. William George Hughes, 1859-1902* (Boerne, Texas: LEBCO Graphics, 1994); George Wilkins Kendall ed. by Harry James Brown, *Letters from a Texas Sheep Ranch* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959); and Felix D. Almaraz, *The San Antonio Missions and Their System of Land Tenure* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989).

² Aldon S. Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas," *The Baylor Bulletin*, XXXV (July, 1932), pp. 25-30ff; Leyburn, *Scotch-Irish*, pp. 170-173ff; Malcolm McLean, ed., *Robertson's Colony* (Arlington: University of Texas at Arlington Press, 1975-1995), XI, pp. 347, 434; IX, pp. 221, 223-227, 234-238, 250, 326, 485-486.

³ Galloway, Briggs, and Hicks, *Staggers Point*, p. 10; Malcolm D. McLean, "Sarahville de Viesca," in *The New Handbook of Texas*, ed. by Ron Tyler, (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 1996), vol. 5, p. 95; Leyburn, *Scotch-Irish*, p. 175.

⁴ Galloway, Briggs, and Hicks, *Staggers Point*, pp. 10, 20; Richard Denny Parker, *Historical Recollections of Robertson County, Texas* (Salado, Texas: Anson Jones Press, 1955), pp. 10-12; Henry G. Caufield, *Caufield Heritage* (n.p., n.p., 1973), p. 44; J. W. Williams, *Old Texas Trails* (Burnet, Texas: Eakin Press, 1979), pp. 128-141ff. W. Broadus Smith, *Pioneers of Brazos County, Texas 1800-1850* (Brazos County: W. Broadus Smith, 1962) contains an alphabetical list of the marriages, births, and deaths for most of these early settlers.

⁵ Jordan, *Trails to Texas*, pp. 20-54ff; Galloway, Briggs, and Hicks, *Staggers Point*, pp. 6, 10, 20; John Brendan Flannery, *The Irish Texans* (San Antonio: The University Of Texas Institute of Texan Cultures, 1980), p. 28.

⁶ Galloway, Briggs, and Hicks, *Staggers Point*, pp. 10, 20; Malcolm McLean, ed., *Robertson's Colony*, XI, pp. 347, 434; IX, pp. 221, 223-227, 234-238, 250, 326, 485-486. The settlers established this church in direct violation of Mexican edicts, which allowed only Catholic churches in Texas. Pictures of the church show a whitewashed wooden frame structure twenty feet wide and forty feet long. Situated on a small knoll, the church was surrounded by trees and a cemetery. The church had tall, plain windows, two rows of wooden pews without cushions, and a podium on the same level as the wooden floor. This building, the Bethsalem Church in Boligee, and the one built later at Harris Creek in McLennan County are almost carbon copies of each other.

⁷ Henry J. Caufield (HJC), Boligee, Alabama, to William E. Young (WEY), Robertson Co., Texas, May 23, August 23, 1847; WEY to HJC, March 5, 1848, in CP.

⁸ Caufield, *Caufield Heritage*, pp. 49, 52; Poage, *McLennan County*, p. 75.

⁹ MJCY to WC, July 29, 1859; bill of sale for 17 bales of cotton, Thomas Caufield, Mobile, Ala, February 16, 1859, in CP. The average income in the United States in 1860 was about \$150 a year. Midwestern farmers made an average of \$96 and Southern farmers an average of \$151 that year. This compares roughly to an average income of \$15,000 today. Thus, each member of these families earned the equivalent of about \$75,000 annually (the conversion factor is about 100 times the prices of 1860). See appendix A for a summary in tabular form of the young family sheep business.

¹⁰ MJY to WC, Spring (?), 1857; WEY to WC, May 16, 1858, in CP; R. J. De Loach, H. A. Phillips. *Progressive Sheep Raising*, (Chicago: Armour's Bureau of Agricultural Research and Economics, 1948), pp. 10-12ff; Paul H. Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks. The Range Sheep and Goat Industry*. (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1982). p. 76.

¹¹ Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 23; Dusenberry, *The Mexican Mesta*, pp. 47, 200; Harris, *A Mexican Family Empire*, p. 134; De Loach, *Progressive Sheep Raising*, p. 12; Alexander Campbell McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982), pp. 29-31.

¹² Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 76; Kendall and Brown, ed., *Letters*; Lehman, *Forgotten Legions*, p. 62; William E. Young (WEY) to WC, May 16, 1858, May 15, 1859; HJC to WC, April 8, 1858, in CP; Josephus Cavitt (JC) to WC, April 5, 1858, in FP. Cavitt discusses his trip to Arkansas and Indian Territory with his brother; JC to WC, July 3, 1859, in CP. Cavitt mentions that he had purchased two Merino rams that cost "two hundred dollars apiece." DeLoach, *Progressive Sheep Raising*, pp. 9-24ff.

¹³ JC to WC, April 5, 1858; WEY to WC, May 15, 1859, in FP. Young ledgers #1, 1856, 1857, 1859. Frankie Glaze holds a collection of family papers, letters, and farm ledgers, Gatesville, Texas (hereafter cited as Young Papers, YP). $(1,000 \text{ head}) \times (5 \text{ lbs/head}) \times (\$0.25/\text{lb}) = \$1,250$ gross income (About \$125,000 today). One dollar in 1860 is roughly equivalent to \$100 dollars today. The ledgers contain expenses and income to the penny. Since the exact amounts were so important to the recorders, those amounts are included as written in this work.

¹⁴ WEY to WC, April 16, May 10, 1860, FP; MJCY to WC, October 5, 1860, in CP, Young ledgers, 1859, 1860, in YP. Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 62; MJCY to WC, October 5, 1860, in CP. Though he kept detailed records of wool income and carefully recorded the increases in the flocks, Young made no accounts of the money made from selling sheep. At a cost of \$6 a head and twenty-pound fleeces selling for 25 cents a pound, Young calculated the new sheep paid their expenses in two years.

¹⁵ HJC to WC, December 9, 1860, in CP; WEY to WC, April 16, May 10, 1860, in FP; Young ranch ledgers, volume III, in YP; HJC to WC, Boligee, April, 8, 1858; MJCY to WC, May 16, October 17, 1858, July 29, 1859, October 5, 1860, in CP; a table of precipitation for Austin, Texas shows 1858, and 1860-1863 as dry years with 1863 having the lowest rainfall in several decades in Baker, *A Texas Scrapbook*, p. 358; Young family ledgers, Volume 1, 1860-1872, Volume 2, 1873-1880, Volume 3, 1881-1892, in YP. Blue Tongue is an infectious viral disease of sheep now effectively controlled by a vaccine, see Robert L. Haney, *Milestones Marking Ten Decades of Research* (College Station: Texas Agricultural Experimental Station, 1989), pp. 69. Carlson, *Texas Woolly Backs*, p. 32; *History of Bell and Coryell Counties*, Smith Publishing Company, pp. 859-860.

¹⁶ WEY to WC, May 26, 1858; MJC to HJC, October 5, 1860, in CP; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, Family history, May 1946, in FP.

-
- ¹⁷ Frank E. Simmons, *History of Coryell County*, Gatesville: *Coryell County News*, (October 1936), pp. 18, 27; *History of Bell and Coryell Counties*, Smith Publishing Company, pp. 859-860.
- ¹⁸ Diary, kept in ledgers books by W. E. Young, account book #1, 1859-1872, in YP; David Paul Smith, *Frontier Defense in the Civil War* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1992), pp. 124, 147.
- ¹⁹ George Bernard Erath, ed. by Lucy A. Erath, *Memoirs of Major George Bernard Erath* (Waco: n.p., 1885), pp.106-108; Diary, WEY, in YP; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ²⁰ Young ledgers, Book #1, pp. 36, 70-93.
- ²¹ *Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture, 1895*, pp. 533, 548; 1898, pp. 702-704; *ibid.*, 1900, pp. 830-834; *ibid.*, 1901, p. 116-117, and *ibid.*, 1903 (Washington DC: Government Printing Office), pp. 548- 551, 702-704, 831-834, 776-782; Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 46.
- ²² Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 69.
- ²³ Power of Attorney to sell cattle, H. J. Caufield to W. E. Young, November 10, 1874; WEY and John Hurst, contract for sale, July 12, 1881; WEY to J. W. Brummett, contract to herd and deliver cattle, June 28, 1880, in YP; Poage, *After the Pioneers*, pp. 18-19.
- ²⁴ This child is of note because Family lore says that he died of 'brain fever', probably meningitis. While he was delirious and dying, a neighbor brought him a bag of pecans. The child played with these constantly during his last week and the family buried him with a pecan in each pocket of his coat. Because it is unlikely that a pecan would sprout buried six feet deep, a more likely story is that the pecans were planted on each side of his grave. Another family story says that Willie drowned and his grieving mother planted the pecans. Whether this as an apocryphal story or not, two pecan trees have grown on each side of the child's grave and today the child's tombstone has been embraced by the trees. As they grew, the trees lifted the child's tombstone until it is several feet above the ground and nearly encased in the trees' trunk.
- ²⁵ MAY to WTY, October 15, 1885, in FP.
- ²⁶ Young ledgers, book #2, p. 27, YP; MAY to WTY, October 15, 1885; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ²⁷ Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ²⁸ Article cut from the Gatesville *Mirror*, n.d., in YP; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ²⁹ Young ledgers, book #2, pp. 72-78ff, in YP.
- ³⁰ MAY to WTY, September 12, December 4, 1885, in FP.
- ³¹ Lizzie Freeland to WTY, April 8, 1888; MYF to WTY, April 5, 1888, in YP.

³² MYF to WTY, August 26, 1888, in FP.

³³ MYF to WTY, July 31, 1888; Lizzie Freeland to WTY, March 23, 1888, in FP.

³⁴ Hand written document by W. E. Young, spring, 1888; MYF to WTY, September 31, 1888, in FP. From the tone of this letter and others, Young was wise to prevent his children from suing each other.

³⁵ MYF to WTY, November 11, 1888; MYF to WYT, November 11, 1891, in FP.

³⁶ MYF to WTY, July 31, 1888, in FP. Daniel Baker College, founded by Presbyterians, merged with Hardin-Simmons University in the 1950s. Interview with Nathaniel 'Sonny' Foote by W. C. Arnold, May 2003.

CHAPTER 4
FOOTES

¹ M. Caroline Foote (MCF) to Henry Foote (HF), August 4, 1882, Adrian Foote (AF) to Frederick Foote (FF), September 19, 1885, in FP.

² MCF to FF, December 19, 1880, in FP.

³ Interview with Nathaniel (Sonny) Foote, Jr. by W. C. Arnold, April 30, 2005.

⁴ *Second Annual Report of The Texas Agricultural Bureau 1888-1889* (Austin: State Printing Office, 1890), p. 55.

⁵ *Second Annual Report of the Texas Agricultural Bureau, 1888-1889* (Austin: State Printing Office, 1890), p. 306. Robert Maudsley, *Texas Sheepman*, p. 69.

⁶ Francis Foote to FF, in FP.

⁷ John Foote (JF) to FF, 1882, in FP.

⁸ CMF to FF, November 29, 1883, Francis Foote to FF, March 29, 1883, in FP.

⁹ Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 43. This newspaper was probably the *Galveston News*, which featured frequent articles by William Kendall, a Texas sheepman and former editor of the New Orleans *Times Picayune*. AF to FF, December 20, 22, 24, 1886; January 6, 13, 24, February 8, 15, 1887, in FP.

¹⁰ AF to HF, November 20, 1881; Frank Randlett to FF, in FP.

¹¹ J. R. Franklin to FF, May 1880; CMF to FF, November 8, December 19, 1880, in FP.

¹² CM Foote, Ashland Mass. to FF, Coryell Co. Texas, April 9, 1882, CMF to HF, May 23, 1882, in FP.

¹³ AF to HF, December 7, 22, 26, 1881; AF to FF, January 10, 1882, in FP.

¹⁴ Jessie Foote to HF, November 27, 1881; John Foote to FF, December 12, 20, 1881; AF to HF, January 31, 1882. in FP.

¹⁵ MCF to HF, May 18, 1882; J. H. Shepard to AF, June 18, 1883, in FP.

¹⁶ Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 8-9, AF to FF, May 4, 1885, in FP.

¹⁷ Aldon Socrates Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands in Texas," *The Baylor Bulletin*, XXXV, No. 3, (July), 1932.

¹⁸ MYF to WTY, December 11, 1886 in FP.

¹⁹ E. A. Blount, San Augustine, Texas to AF, Ashtown, Mass., June 7, 1882; JF to FF, October 15, 1882; AF to FF, October 3, 1884; AF to FF, October 11, 1886; AF to FF, February 10, 1887, in FP. Bounty warrants given by the Republic of Texas in lieu of pay to soldiers who fought at San Jacinto or elsewhere, were purchased on the speculators' market. The State of Texas allowed bounty warrants placed anywhere and they preempted title any unfilled and unpaid titles (for example homestead squatters working through their first year before paying for title.) See Lang, "Financial History of the Public Lands," for many examples of the difficulty determining who had first and primary title on the Texas frontier. E. A. Blount, San Augustine, Texas to AF, Ashtown, Mass., June 7, 1882; J. H. Shepard, land agent, Columbia, Brazos County to AF, May 30, 1883, in FP.

²⁰ AF to FF, April 11, July 10, 1882; E. A. Blount to AF, June 7, 1882; abstract for land title, Coryell County, Texas, June 7, 1882, in FP.

²¹ CMF to HF, March 28, 1882; CMF to FF, May 23, 1882, in FP.

²² Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 10-12ff. p. 8; Simmons, *History of Coryell County*, p. 24.

²³ Maudsley, *Texas Sheepman*. p. 59.

²⁴ Laura Thorp, *Facts and Anecdotes of Turnersville, Texas* (Waco: Texian Press, 1973), p. 2.

²⁵ Shannon, *Last Frontier*, p. 206. A rod is about 5.5 yards or 467 rods to a mile. Most cattle fences are three or four wire fences. The extra six-wire sheep fences kept the smaller lambs from climbing through. The cost of the Foote's initial fence was \$247 a mile. Simmons, *Coryell County*, pp. 68-69; Thorp, *Turnersville*, p. 180.

²⁶ Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 116.

²⁷ AF to FF, February 10, 1887; AF to FF, April 13, 1887, in FP.

²⁸ MCF to HF, May 18, 1882, in FP; SF, interview, in CP.

²⁹ MCF to FF, April 22, 1883, February 27, 1885, in FP. The stories of these two brothers are quite similar to those told to Winifred Kupper by her uncle, Robert Maudsley in *Texas Sheepman* and in Winifred Kupper, *The Golden Hoof. The Story of the Sheep of the Southwest* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945).

³⁰ AF to FF, January 10, 1882; receipt from T. S. Stanford to AF, April 20, 1882; AF to FF, January 31, 1882, in FP; *Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1903*, pp. 496-503ff; Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 45; Maudsley, *Texas Sheepman*, p. 121; McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, p. 35.

-
- ³¹ CMF to HF, March, 28, 1882; CMF to FF, April 9, 1882; AHF to HF, May 21, 1882; JF to FF, February 12, 1888, in FP.
- ³² J. R. Franklin to FF, May 24, 1884, in FP.
- ³³ J. R. Franklin to FF, May 24, 1884; HF to FF, May 4, 1885; AF to FF, May 27, 1885, Cyril Johnson to AF, April 3, 1886, in FP. Each fleece weighed about 15 pounds and was worth about \$30. The Footes calculated that was too many free samples (\$180 or \$9,000 in 2006 dollars).
- ³⁴ AF to FF, July 28, August 15, August 22, 1886; HF to FF, September 1, 1886, in FP.
- ³⁵ The Weekly Wool Report from Fenno Brothers, Commission Merchants in Boston noted that the "market was uneven and unsettled," quoting prices for Texas wools "at 20 to 23c." while Ohio wool brought "33 to 35c.," broadsheet, FP; *Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture, 1900*, pp. 830-835. AF to FF, July 28, August 15, 1886; MYF to WTY, March 17, 1886, in FP.
- ³⁶ Cyril Johnson, Stafford Connecticut, to FF, April 3, 1886; H. Norton, Menger Hotel, San Antonio, to FF, April 24, 1886, in FP.
- ³⁷ AF to FF, January 28, 1887, in FP.
- ³⁸ CMF to FF, October 12, 1884; HF to FF, September 14, 1884, Francis Foote to FF, August 17, 1885, FP.
- ³⁹ Francis Foote to FF, June 17, 1885; AF to FF, September 19, 1885, in FP.
- ⁴⁰ AF to FF, November 30, 1886; Andrew Foote to FF, December 12, 1886, Francis Foote to FF, December 5, 1887, in FP.
- ⁴¹ JF to FF, October 12, 1885, in FP.
- ⁴² HF to FF, 1886, in FP.
- ⁴³ Will, AF, 1906; Raymond Foote to FF, in FP.
- ⁴⁴ Francis Foote to FF, May 10, August 17, 1885, MAY to WTY, November 4, November 18, December 30, 1885, in FP.
- ⁴⁵ MYF to WTY, March 17, April 28, 1886, in FP.
- ⁴⁶ MAY to WTY, September 12, December 4, 1885, in FP.
- ⁴⁷ AF to FF, January 25, 1885, in FP.
- ⁴⁸ MAY to WTY, November 11, 16, December 30, 1886, in FP.

-
- ⁴⁹ AF to FF, April 13, 1887, in FP.
- ⁵⁰ Andrew Foote to FF, September 23, 1885, in FP.
- ⁵¹ AF to FF, January 25, 1885, in FP.
- ⁵² Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP; Ledger, Hobin store, 1887-1889, in YP; Centennial edition of *Gatesville Times*, dates not showed on pages, 1953(?).
- ⁵³ Carlson, *Texas Woolybacks*, p. 183; Porter, *Merchants and Manufacturers*, p. 7.
- ⁵⁴ MCF to FF August 4, 1882; JF to FF, October 12, 1883. Foote sent \$25 to the Foreign Missionary Synod on June 14, 1886 and continued annual contributions for the rest of his life. See Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May 1946, in FP; Thorp, *Turnersville*; and Roberta Blair Powell, *A History of the Unity Presbyterian Church* (Turnersville: n.p., 1972).
- ⁵⁵ Thorp, *Turnersville*, pp. 40-46ff; Powell, *Unity Presbyterian Church*, pp. 10-20ff; MYF to WTY, September 12, 1885; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ⁵⁶ Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ⁵⁷ Thorp, *Turnersville*, pp. 40-46ff; Powell, *Unity Presbyterian Church*, pp. 10-16ff.
- ⁵⁸ For a discussion of prohibition, see James D. Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley. The Southern Strategy of the Texas Prohibitionists in the 1880s.* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2003). The role of the local church is discussed in Thorp, *Turnersville* and Powell, *A History of the Unity Presbyterian Church*.
- ⁵⁹ Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley*, pp. 25-43ff; AF to FF, March 6, 1887, in FP.
- ⁶⁰ Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley*, pp. 25-43ff; Simmons, *History of Coryell County*, pp. 69-71ff.
- ⁶¹ Ivy, *No Saloon in the Valley*, pp. 25-43ff.
- ⁶² L. W. Chase to FF, June 14, 1886, in FP.
- ⁶³ William Little, Johnson Grass Seed and Hay Farm, Hutchins, Texas to FF, January 27, 1885; MYK to WTY, November 23, 1888, in FP.
- ⁶⁴ MYF to WTY, April 10, 1888, in FP. Young ranch ledgers, book #3, in YP; Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 8-9; Carlson, *Texas Woolybacks*, p. 116; Maudsley, *Texas Sheepman*, p. 117.
- ⁶⁵ MYF to WTY, March 1, 1888, in FP.
- ⁶⁶ McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, p. 31.

-
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 31.
- ⁶⁹ Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 31; *Yearbook 1909*, p. 578; Maudsley, *Texas Sheepman*, p. 118.
- ⁷⁰ Foote expense daybook and annual expense summary ledger, 1886, in FP.
- ⁷¹ Foote record book, 1887, in FP. See detailed accounting in appendix C.
- ⁷² MYF to WTY, March 1, 18, 1888, in FP.
- ⁷³ MYF to WTY, March 18, 1888; MYF to WTY, May 11, 1889, April 13, 1890, in FP.
- ⁷⁴ Foote Ranch ledger, 1887-1888ff, in FP.
- ⁷⁵ Shannon, *Farmer's Last Frontier*, pp. 349-356ff.; Carlson, *Texas Woollybacks*, p. 114; *Texas Agricultural Bureau 1888-1889*, p. 277.
- ⁷⁶ Shannon, *Last Frontier*, p. 215.
- ⁷⁷ Haney, *Milestones*, p. 123 ;Shannon, *Last Frontier*, p. 140; AF to FF, February 1, 1887; Warrior Mower Company to FF, April 28, 1887, in FP.
- ⁷⁸ Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May 1946, FP; McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, p. 155.
- ⁷⁹ Caro, *Path to Power*, pp. 505-508.
- ⁸⁰ Sitton, *From Can See*, pp. 66-69. Robert A. Caro, *The Years of Lyndon Johnson. The Path to Power*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), pp. 505-509ff; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May 1946, in FP.
- ⁸¹ MYF to WTY, February 29, 1891; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May 1946, in FP.
- ⁸² Faulk, *Fort Hood*, pp. 8-9; Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May 1946, in FP. See E. N. Fergus, Carsie Hammonds, and Hayden Rogers, *Southern Field Crop Management*, (Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1944).
- ⁸³ Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ⁸⁴ Fred Foote, Jr. to Zelma Scott, family history, May, 1946, in FP.
- ⁸⁵ McGregor, *Counting Sheep*, pp. 243, 299; Washington, D. C. *AES Bulletin* 341, (December 1936), p. 4.