

The Aultman & Taylor Co

By Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

Edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode



RHODE'S

The Aultman & Taylor Company was famous for its Vibrator thresher. On the cover is a trade card photograph of such a machine in the factory yard in Mansfield, Ohio. Courtesy Dr. Robert T. Rhode

The Aultman & Taylor Company

By Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

Edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode

Note by Dr. Robert T. Rhode: This book was serialized beginning in *The Iron-Men Album Magazine* in 2000 and continuing in what became *Steam Traction* from 2001 through 2003. To improve readability, my ellipses (. . .) and other editing marks were deleted starting in 2001. This document is provided for readers who want a source of the entire book in one document, not spread across many issues of a magazine, and who desire to see where I edited Dr. Lorin E. Bixler's typescript.

Introduction by Dr. Robert T. Rhode

For years, I'd heard about Dr. Lorin Bixler's book on the history of the C. Aultman Company. It was published by the STEMGAS Publishing Company in 1967. Long out of print, the book had all but vanished. Linda Weidman, managing editor of *The Iron-Men Album Magazine*, kindly provided a photocopy for me from her files. I was struck by Professor Bixler's conscientious research and his ability to tell a story. I also envied his having lived at a time when he could interview many people having firsthand knowledge of now distant events. The book with the ungainly title *Cornelius Aultman, C. Aultman & Co., and the Aultman Co.* adroitly portrayed an old-time manufacturer of farm engines. I could see why Dr. Bixler's book on C. Aultman prompted Elmer L. Ritzman, founding editor of the *Album*, to write, "We are quite proud of this book and recommend it very highly to you" (*Album* for July/August 1967, page 27).

I'd also heard rumors about a second Bixler manuscript, the history of the Aultman & Taylor Company. Some said Dr. Bixler had planned to write the book but quit midway in his research. Others claimed he had begun composing the manuscript but hadn't finished it. I asked many steam hobbyists if they knew anything about the manuscript. No one did. No one, that is, until George W. Richey of Norwich, Ohio, wrote to me out of the blue: "I saw your request in the *IMA* for the history of Cornelius Aultman written by Lorin Bixler. . . . I would make you a copy at cost. 'Bix,' as we all called him, had quite a time with that old 16 HP Russell engine. It was in bad state when he purchased it. He was no mechanic, and I think every one in our club . . . sometime or other worked on that engine. After his death it was sold to somebody in western Pennsylvania. I have since lost knowledge of it. What most people do not know is that 'Bix' had searched and traveled extensively compiling a history of the Aultman Taylor company. He was ready to publish, but his health failed and it was never completed. I was told by his son that

the manuscripts were given to the Mansfield Public Library, Mansfield, Ohio. I never checked it out for certain. . . . I personally would like to see it published. He worked long and hard on documenting material.”

This was exciting news! At my earliest opportunity, I drove to Mansfield. Boyd Addlesperger, Reference Librarian, and Karen Furlong, Sherman Room Assistant, welcomed me to the special collections area of the library. Waiting for me on a table were four large three-ring binders. To a steam enthusiast, paging through Dr. Bixler’s manuscript was like discovering a lost city of gold.

In 1977, Dr. Bixler completed his manuscript. Twenty-three years later, it was time to publish it. I called Linda and asked her permission to serialize Dr. Bixler’s work in *The Iron-Men Album Magazine*. She enthusiastically supported the idea.

With this issue, then, the *Album* begins the project of publishing bi-monthly installments of Dr. Bixler’s book on the Aultman & Taylor Company. One of Dr. Bixler’s strengths was his ability to put a face on a factory. When you’ve finished reading his book, you’ll feel well acquainted with Aultman & Taylor. Even though Dr. Bixler had printed excerpts of one or two of the chapters in magazines, most of his book will be new to readers—and there are plenty of surprises along the way!

Lorin Bixler was born in Louisville, Ohio, on October 2, 1892. In 1921, he graduated from Mount Union College. He received his master’s degree from Columbia University and his PhD degree from The Ohio State University, where he served as an instructor. He taught briefly in the Ohio public schools. In 1929 he was appointed to the faculty of Muskingum College, eventually to be astronaut John Glenn’s alma mater, located in New Concord, Ohio. It takes most faculty members a minimum of fourteen years to rise to the rank of full professor. Dr. Bixler accomplished that feat in three years. From 1948 to 1962, he chaired the Department of Education at Muskingum. He also directed the college’s placement bureau and summer school. In 1961, he accepted the invitation to serve on the Ohio State Board of Education. Dr. Bixler passed away on August 22, 1987.

Dr. Bixler published numerous articles on education, but I suspect that he derived his greatest pleasure from researching and writing about the manufacturers of agricultural steam engines. His history of the Aultman & Taylor Company was his *magnum opus*—his great work.

I’ve edited and prepared Dr. Bixler’s manuscript for publication in the *Album*. I condensed it to make it more readable. While doing so, I tried to stay true to the spirit of Dr. Bixler’s prose.

I combined chapters to create installments of the right length for serializing. When I cut words or passages from the manuscript, I used an ellipsis (. . .). Periodically I inserted capital letters in brackets [] to show where new sentences begin. When I needed to add words or phrases for clarification, I enclosed them in brackets. At one point in its history, the original Aultman & Taylor company evolved into a different firm, and Dr. Bixler referred to the Aultman & Taylor “companies” to emphasize this fact. Finding the repeated use of the plural noun confusing, I changed it to the singular “company.” Any major factual discrepancies that I could not remedy I acknowledged in the notes. Dr. Bixler’s citations to sources were not always as complete or as understandable as I might wish, but I did my best to present them accurately. While I’m certain that several errors have escaped me, I’m equally confident that my edited version has fewer mistakes than the original manuscript.

When Dr. Bixler was writing the final chapter of his book, the present time was 1977; he alluded to facts that were true in the 1970s that are no longer true today. Preferring to retain as

much of Dr. Bixler's perception as possible, I made no effort to update such statements.

Seldom is it possible to present an industrial history as complete as Dr. Bixler's treatment of the Aultman & Taylor Company. Readers of the *Album* are indebted to Linda Weidman for her willingness to make this book available. I want to thank Karen Furlong and Boyd Addlesperger of the Mansfield/Richland County Public library for answering my frequent questions and for granting ready access to so many one-of-a-kind documents. I also want to express my appreciation to Kerry S. Stahovec, Benefits Manager at Muskingum College, for providing biographical information on Dr. Bixler.

By serializing this manuscript, the *Album* not only pays tribute to America's agricultural legacy but also posthumously honors the book's author.

– Dr. Robert T. Rhode, June 28, 2000

Contents

[Chapter 1 Henry Hobart Taylor](#)

[Chapter 2 The Founding of the Aultman & Taylor Company](#)

[Chapter 3 \(Darling, as well as blacksmith shop\) The Original Personnel and Organization of the Aultman & Taylor Company](#)

[Chapter 4 \(Elizabeth and Michael\) The Harter Family](#)

[Chapter 5 The Harter Family, Continued](#)

[Chapter 6 \(paint shop\) The Starved Rooster and Havoc Wrought by Fires](#)

[Chapter 7 \(Cahall\) A New Company and Water-Tube Boilers](#)

[Chapter 8 The Separators](#)

[Chapter 9 \(clover hulling attachment, as well as Whiting\) Separator Attachments, Painting, Clover Hullers, and Sawmills](#)

[Chapter 10 \(tractors\) The Debut of the Steam Engine and the Aultman & Taylor Tractors](#)

[Chapter 11 Output of Machinery](#)

[Chapter 12 \(big engine, as well as Rynda, as well as small thresher\) The \[45-120 HP\] Engine and Unique Machines](#)

[Chapter 13 \(plant in 1920s\) Enlargement of the Plant and Labor Relations](#)

[Chapter 14 \(the dialogue\) Advertising the Machinery](#)

[Chapter 15 \(James Brown\) Litigation and Personnel in the Aultman & Taylor Company's Later Years](#)

[Chapter 16 \(Baldwin\) Aultman & Taylor Financial Status and Liquidation of the Company](#)
[Dr. Lorin E. Bixler's Preface](#)

. . . On numerous occasions this writer wandered over the old plant [of the Aultman & Taylor Company] and lingered awhile to view the old buildings still remaining on the grounds . . . as well as to meditate upon the events that transpired on those premises. One evening when the twilight dimmed and the busy streets became hushed, there was created an atmosphere or mood that cast an aura of sublimity upon the environs. Immediately there came to mind the ancient admonition to Moses: “Put off your shoes from your feet for the place where you are standing is holy ground.” Perhaps it is not inappropriate to suggest that the men who toiled in that place made it hallowed ground. . . . [O]ne may envision those who labored there and earned their daily bread by the sweat of their brows. They wrought well—built machinery that was superb and used in many parts of the world.

It is a truism that institutions are but the lengthened shadows of men. This statement is amply illustrated by the history of the Aultman & Taylor Company. In fact they are so intertwined with the lives of people that it would be a disservice to them and the total image presented would be grossly incomplete if brief biographical sketches were omitted. From time to time then material . . . is included portraying the lives of certain individuals [and] pointing out the contributions that they made to the ongoing business of the Company. . . . [I]t must be recognized that the leadership [ran] from good to excellent, yet even so it left much to be desired.

A previous publication is devoted in part to the biography of Cornelius Aultman so reference will be made to him only in passing, when facts or information are pertinent to the discussion at hand. For more complete information concerning Cornelius Aultman the reader is referred to [Lorin E. Bixler’s *Cornelius Aultman, C. Aultman & Co. and The Aultman Co.*, published by STEMGAS in 1967, now out of print].

. . . . There are a goodly number of people today who either worked at the Aultman & Taylor plant or who had relatives employed by the company. The information provided and the experiences related to the author by these people have been of incalculable value in the preparation of this chronicle. . . .

Special recognition is due to persons whose help was particularly notable: to Walter L. Blakely, who used Aultman & Taylor machinery for more than forty years, for sharing with the author his knowledge and experience with the company as well as providing catalogs, pictures, and other materials; to Samuel Yater for loaning the record book of the company that contains the minutes of the meetings of the directors and stockholders; to Argile Treisch for loaning copies of *The Rooster*, an employee publication; to Virgil Stanfield of the *Mansfield News Journal* for publishing articles seeking the assistance of Mansfield citizens; to A. T. Dickson, Jr., Librarian of the Mansfield Public Library and members of his staff including Miss Maribelle Brehman, Miss Stella Reed, Mrs. Helen Hayes, and Mrs. MayLou Altvater for their . . . help; to Marian Bates, Assistant Librarian of the Ohio Historical Society, and Mrs. John Armstrong, Assistant Librarian, Muskingum College, for their help; to Quintin Alexander, a grandson of Mr. and Mrs. George D. Harter and a great grandson of Cornelius Aultman, for permission to draw heavily from his thesis written at the University of Pennsylvania; to Miss Elizabeth Fogle, a granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. George D. Harter and a great granddaughter of Cornelius Aultman, whose father was the last president of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, for contributions drawn from her superior knowledge of family relations that have been of inestimable value particularly with reference to the roles of the members of the Harter family in the affairs of the companies. The writer is especially grateful for her abiding interest, patience, and help.

Altogether then, friends have given the author such generous assistance that he is reminded of Lincoln's words, "The better part of life consists of one's friends."

Chapter 1

Henry Hobart Taylor

Next to Cornelius Aultman the most important personage in the founding of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company, located in Mansfield, Ohio, was Henry Hobart Taylor. . . . [H]e is usually recognized as having been an agent for C. Aultman & Company and [the Nichols & Shepard Company]. While this is [a] fact . . . he was involved in numerous other areas of business and industry. Little has been written about him, and unfortunately much of it is erroneous [F]or this reason he is not as well known as is Aultman and many of the other men who were engaged in the manufacture and sale of threshing machinery. Consequently it is all the more important . . . that a more accurate and complete biographical sketch of this illustrious man . . . be presented.¹

Henry Hobart Taylor was born in Durhamsville near Oneida Creek, New York, in the year of 1835. His father and family moved to Chicago in 1845 and engaged in merchandising. Henry . . . entered the public schools of that city. However, at an early age he became a clerk in his father's store where [he] received a business education and was initiated into the mercantile experience of the growing . . . city of Chicago.

In 1854 the family moved to Freeport, Illinois. At that time Taylor was eighteen years of age and launched out for himself. He began his self support, although he had only one dollar in his pocket. He journeyed to Cincinnati, Ohio, where he was employed by a druggist for the purpose of learning pharmacy. . . . Taylor spent two years . . . to become a pharmacist and mastered the art but made no further use of his knowledge of pharmacy during the remainder of his life.

In 1856 he returned to Freeport, Illinois, and at that time took out an agency for C. Aultman & Co. of Canton, Ohio. Thus . . . began an association with Aultman that endured for a period of nineteen years. This could well be termed the turning point in his career for, with the cultivation of the prairies, his business increased rapidly.

In 1864 he became associated with Nichols, Shepard and Company of Battlecreek, Michigan, and also became a stockholder in that company. To handle the increase in his business he established an agency in Chicago for the distribution of machinery manufactured by C. Aultman & Company and Nichols, Shepard and Company. His business was extended throughout the northwestern states as well as the Pacific coast and grew to large proportions.²

He was a remarkable businessman begin active in several . . . enterprises in Chicago and its environs. Typical of this interest was his affiliation with the Elgin National Watch Company of Elgin, Illinois. He was one of the founders of that company and was a member of the board of directors from 1867 until his death on November 8, 1875. It was he who placed the Elgin watch on the London market within one month's time.³

. . . In this connection an interesting sidelight is provided in a personal letter written by one of the present officials of the Elgin Watch Company. This official states that, during the early years, the Elgin Company manufactured models that were given the name of "Taylor." It was a practice in those days to name watches in honor of important people who were associated with the company. This official is of the opinion that those early models were named in honor of

Taylor, who was at that time a member of the board of directors.⁴

. . . In 1860 [Chicago] was . . . growing more rapidly than it could care for its needs. It became known as the city of enterprise and already had become [a] great railroad center of the country. The northwest was opening up, and thousands of immigrants were moving in to claim the land. Hogs, cattle, corn, and wheat [began] pouring into the city . . . Steamboats on the lakes and freight cars standing on the rails were filled to overflowing with products from the farms and ranches. Chicago shipped 31,108,769 bushels of grain in 1860. Due in part to the War Between the States prices [became] greatly inflated. . . . In brief, Chicago was in the midst of unprecedented, phenomenal, and rapid growth.⁵ . . .

Possessed as he was with unusual business acumen and foresight . . . [Taylor] made investments in real estate at comparatively low prices. With the rapid growth of the city already depicted real estate prices skyrocketed, and Taylor was able to realize enormous profits from those investments, which in the end brought him a fortune. One must remember, too, that the period under discussion was long before the day of income and inheritance taxes so that his fortune was not thereby reduced.

. . . With the augmentation of his financial resources he joined in the establishment of the Commercial National Bank of which he was a director for many years. He was also one of the directors of the American Insurance company with offices in the city of Chicago. Small wonder, then, that his total accumulated assets [were] excelled by few men of his day.⁶

In at least one respect he was unlike Aultman, Nichols, Shepard, and others who were associated with him. While those men were knowledgeable in the affairs of business, . . . at the same time they were competent mechanics and inventors. . . . Taylor was primarily an astute, shrewd, and competent businessman who was able to make important decisions at opportune times. He was uncanny in his sensitiveness to the appropriateness of a product for a given time. Thus he was interested in the vibrator separator not primarily as an inventor but rather as a significant business opportunity. . . . to be [a] successful businessman and salesman required a thorough understanding and knowledge of the machines that were manufactured. To this end he devoted his energies with great zeal and devotion.

Even though it is true that he was a most successful salesman, which enabled him to accumulate . . . capital, yet it is a fact that this fortune was not acquired primarily as an agent for C. Aultman & Company and Nichols, Shepard and Company nor as the co-founder of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company but rather as a result of wise investments in real estate in the city of Chicago of which he was able to dispose at an opportune time. Upon his death he left to his only son, [Hobart Chatfield] Taylor, an inheritance of approximately two million dollars.⁷

In 1864, Taylor was married to Adelaide Chatfield, . . . a native of Oriskany, New York. To that union was born [the] son who became a well-known literateur in . . . Chicago. [Henry Hobart] did not enjoy the advantages of higher education, but he was a great reader of books and became a most versatile person in the several fields of literature. [He] also became knowledgeable in the various areas of science of that day. Through diligent study he acquired great precision in the use of language and was extremely refined in the use of words. He was particular and meticulous in his demeanor and in every respect a modest and unassuming person. All in all he was a learned, cultured, and refined gentleman . . .

[Taylor] maintained numerous interests outside of the area of business. He was a Republican . . . , although he was not a narrow partisan. He was a member of the Masonic fraternity and had attained the rank of Knight Templar. He made several trips to Europe

doubtless for business purposes as well as for social and cultural pursuits. He was generous in his gifts to charitable organizations, and his contributions were made without regard to creed. His gifts went to the Bethel Home, Chicago Relief Society, Old Ladies Home, and other similar charities. His contributions were always large but were never made with ostentation, and he never permitted his name to go before the public as a giver. . . .

According to the Chicago directories of 1872 and 1873 the family residence was located at 226 W. Washington Street The address today is 800 Washington Boulevard. The directories list Taylor's occupation as "Agricultural Machinery."

For three years prior to his death Taylor suffered from a complication of diseases and during the last month of his life became totally blind. . . . with indomitable courage and energy he attended to his business until the day of his death. The cause . . . was . . . kidney [failure] and Bright's disease. Interment was made in the Graceland Cemetery in Chicago.⁸ As already mentioned Taylor's death occurred on November 9, 1875. He was forty years of age, and his death preceded that of Aultman by nine years, he having died at the age of fifty-seven. So both were relatively young men when compared with today's lengthened span of life. . . .

Two writers have described the grief of the citizens of Chicago . . . : "He had only reached the age of forty years when men are usually at the meridian of their powers. Why men so gifted with such natural endowments, and possessing so many accomplishments fitting them for years of usefulness and honor, should be cut off in their early prime is one of the inscrutable mysteries of life! It is certain that in the early death of Mr. Taylor Chicago lost a most worthy and estimable citizen who contributed not a little to her growth."

. . . This then is a sketch of the life of Henry Hobart Taylor. Viewed in retrospect it was all too brief, yet his accomplishments as well as his contributions were many . . .

Taylor's will provided that his son was to receive \$50,000.00, and the remainder of his estate was to go to charities. However, the son was not satisfied with his father's will and so in the quietest and most gentlemanly manner possible importuned the other legatees [to view] this father's disposition of his wealth [as unfair]. . . . without a lawsuit or even a vigorous protest they acceded to his request and permitted Hobart to take the entire estate.

. . . His uncle Wayne [Chatfield's] will provided that Hobart . . . receive his fortune of \$2,500.00 with the proviso that he would take his uncle's name. This he did, and his name became Hobart Chatfield-Taylor. He was one of the first Americans to acquire a hyphenated name. At that time he was twenty-eight He graduated from Cornell University in 1886 and later married the youngest daughter of ex-Senator and millionaire Charles B. Farwell. The two fortunes that he inherited amounted to around four and a half million dollars, . . . exclusive of his wife's inheritance. . . .

In addition to being a well-known literateur . . . he was for several years the Spanish consul *The Chicago Herald* described his specialty as follows: "Consul Chatfield-Taylor's strongest point is his strict observance of the proprieties. He would sooner die than be seen in a costume not in consonance with the time of day or the event then transpiring. Since he has been his own master there has not been a day when mortal man has seen him in other than evening dress after 6 o'clock p.m. . . . So keen is his sense of [the] fitness of things that he has his own coach fitted up as a dressing room, and there he keeps several suits of clothes, cuffs and collars and other articles of apparel. Under one seat is a wash-bowl, with a water can nearby. In case he is out calling in the afternoon and has not time to get home in season to dress at 6 o'clock he simply lets down the curtains of his carriage, disrobes, . . . and, arraying himself in evening dress, is ready when the bells chime 6 to sit down to dinner."

By the sheer fortuitous circumstance of birth those huge fortunes were lavished upon one individual who made no contribution whatsoever to their accumulation. While Henry H. Taylor did not acquire the bulk of his fortune through the sale of threshing machinery, yet in truth it was the beginning and one source of his wealth. Here is a case . . . where one individual . . . was the beneficiary of the toil of thousands of threshermen, farmers, as well as those who labored in the factories, which . . . made possible the accumulation of that huge fortune.

Following the death of Taylor, Aultman purchased his holdings in the company. That transaction gave to Aultman the controlling interest in the [firm]. Then when he died his daughter Elizabeth inherited the bulk of her father's interest in the company, which made her the largest stockholder and gave her the controlling interest in the [firm]. She held that interest in the company until it was liquidated in 1923.¹¹

Notes

1. Moses, John, and Joseph Kirkland. *The History of Illinois*. 1895. 651-52.
2. Ibid.
3. *The Watch-Word*. Elgin, Illinois: 1921.
4. Letter to the author, March 11, 1968, by D. W. Levere, Director Technical Trade Relations, Elgin National Watch Co., Elgin, Illinois.
5. Lewis, Lloyd, and Henry Justin Smith. *Chicago: The History of Its Reputation*. Part I. New York: Blue Ribbon Books. 79.
6. *The Chicago Tribune*, November 11, 1875.
7. Baughman, A. J., ed. *Centennial Biographical History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1901. 609.
8. Report of Death. County Clerk's Office, Vital Statistics Dept., 130 North Wells St., Chicago, Edward J. Barrett, County Clerk. October 22, 1968.
9. *The Chicago Tribune*, November 11, 1875.
10. *The Sunday Shield*, Mansfield, Ohio, July 2, 1893.
11. Alexander, Quintin. Unpublished thesis. U of Pennsylvania.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the second installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. During his lifetime, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, published a few of his chapters as separate articles in this magazine and others, but the bulk of his book remained unpublished until now. Dr. Bixler's thoroughly documented manuscript offers rare insights into a major manufacturing firm and the people who made it famous.

Chapter 2

The Founding of the Aultman & Taylor Company

. . . [M]en of similar tastes and interests often associate themselves with each other to achieve common goals. So . . . an appropriate inquiry arises as to what were the basic . . . reasons which impelled . . . two men [Cornelius Aultman and Henry Taylor] to join in the founding of [a] new company. Even though there is a dearth of information upon which to base a firm and altogether satisfactory answer to such an inquiry, yet on the basis of the evidence that is available several apparently plausible inferences may be drawn. To begin with, there are those who claim that Aultman persuaded Taylor to join him in that venture, while others assert that Taylor did the persuading. Be that as it may, for the purposes at hand the question [of] who did the persuading is immaterial. What is significant is that there were common interests held by [the] two men that led them to undertake the [enterprise].

As already observed, the two men had been [well] acquainted through business associations extending over a period of many years, and so it is not surprising that they became partners in the founding of the company. Moreover, [they] were closely associated with John Nichols and David Shepard and company. At the time of his death Cornelius Aultman was president of [Nichols & Shepard]. . . . Taylor accumulated an enormous reservoir of invaluable information, and he became one of the most experienced, competent, and knowledgeable salesmen in the field.

. . . As closely associated as were . . . Aultman, Taylor, Nichols, and Shepard, it is not unreasonable to surmise that they shared many of their ideas and problems with each other. . . . The history of inventions shows that they usually [do] not occur overnight, but rather . . . a prolonged period of time [is] required for the testing of a machine followed by modifications and trials prior to the time when an application [is] made for a patent. Like most innovations, the fulfillment of the need [is] not met by one man but by many usually working independently of each other. Available evidence indicates that this was in truth the situation with respect to the vibrator thresher.

A recital of the issuance of patents by the United States Patent Office makes this point crystal clear, and it has special relevance to the particular events that [culminated] in the founding of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. The Pitts brothers, Hiram and John of Winthrop, Maine, built the first practical thresher in 1834 and had it patented in 1837. It was the original of a long line of “endless apron” threshers. One of the most popular of those threshers was the “Sweepstakes” manufactured by C. Aultman & Co. of Canton, Ohio.¹ At about the same time Jacob W. A. Temple built a combined bull-thresher with a fanning device and secured a patent on it. He then went into partnership with George Westinghouse for the purpose of building those machines.

During 1848 John Cox and Cyrus Roberts founded a company and began building “groundhog” threshers. It was during the period from 1850 to 1856 that they experimented with, developed, and built a vibrator thresher. Roberts was granted patent #9140 dated July 20, 1852.

. . .

The main features of the machine may be outlined briefly as follows. [It] had a set of adjustable tracks, as shown in the drawings, that acted in connection with a jumping roller. The separator trough, or pan, rested upon that roller. That device set up a longitudinal vibration, and that was one of the first instances where the term “vibrator” was used. The second aspect of

[the] invention consisted of a series of adjustable angular rails. [They] were arranged in the separating trough so as to facilitate the movement of the grain and insure its separation from the straw. The cleaning apparatus was located beneath the back end of the trough. The important features of this part of the machine consisted of a fine screen, fan, and fan shaft, all of which were connected with belts and pulleys.

When the grain was fed into the thresher, it passed into the separating trough and over the rails. Here it was tossed up and down by means of the jump trough. The grain and other materials passed through the rails and fell to the bottom of the pan while the straw moved toward the back of the thresher to the cleaning apparatus. It should be observed that the cleaned grain passed into a hopper at the side of the machine.²

One may rest assured that both Aultman and Taylor were in on the ground floor of [these] developments. At any rate all of them possessed firsthand information and knowledge, as well as the foresight to envision the opportunities and possibilities for manufacturing the new vibrator separator.

A final reason that Aultman may have been interested in joining with Taylor in establishing the new company may well have been a financial one. The country had not yet recovered from a depleted currency and was in the midst of the reconstruction period. Under those conditions, money was scarce and difficult to obtain. The founding of the company during 1867 required a sizable outlay of funds. [Also] involved [were] the acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, [and] the purchase of machinery and equipment essential to the building of threshing machinery. While at that time Aultman was well on the way to becoming a wealthy man, yet in view of [his] substantial interests in C. Aultman & Co., Aultman, Miller and Company, and Nichols, Shepard and Company, as well as a number of other companies, it may well be that he did not choose to undergo the risk of jeopardizing the financial stability of his other companies . . . [A]t that particular time he sought additional capital. Biographical information on Taylor implies that he accumulated a . . . fortune and no doubt was in such an advantageous financial position that he was able to assist in the conjectured undertaking. . . .

[T]he great Civil War had recently come to an end, and the uncertainty of the economic conditions . . . was not propitious for such an exploit. . . . [O]nly men with stout hearts would even have contemplated such an undertaking. . . . Aultman and Taylor . . . envisioned the opening of the West then underway—that it would bring opportunities for expansion and growth that would require threshing machinery to meet the demands unprecedented in the . . . history of the nation. . . . [T]he times indeed required men undaunted and endowed with an abiding faith in the future of this country and its latent possibilities.

At that time the bulk of the small grains such as wheat and oats were grown almost entirely in the states east of the Mississippi River. The West consisted largely of territories since only a few of those territories had been organized as states and admitted into the union. [The territories] were sparsely settled due in part to the prevailing financial conditions, as well as to continuous crop failures caused by drought and grasshoppers. . . . [T]he company's prospective customers were in no . . . mood to purchase machinery except on extended credit.

. . . [D]espite [such] adverse conditions, there was another side to the picture that gave encouragement to those men to go forward with their plans to establish a new company. Two laws of momentous significance were enacted by the United States Congress that accelerated the opening of the West. One of them gave impetus to the building of the railroads. Abraham Lincoln signed the Pacific Railway Bill into law on July 1, 1862. That law provided that, with government assistance, the Union Pacific and [the] Central Pacific railroad companies were to

build a railroad from the western Iowa line to the Francisco Bay. That made possible the transportation of machinery to the far West.

Still another event of even greater importance . . . was the Homestead Bill, which was signed into law by President Lincoln on May 20, 1862. It provided that the federal government would deed a farm of 160 acres, or a quarter section of land, to any man who would plow the unbroken sod. When a man took up such a tract of land, he agreed to pay a fee of ten dollars and was required to live on the same place for five years. At the end of that time the government gave him title papers and made him owner of the land. Thousands of [British], Irish, Germans, and Scandinavians came exclaiming, “What a good country where they give away farms!”³

. . . Aultman and Taylor believed that the vibrator thresher would prevent wasteful threshing and that their adventure in the end would be crowned with success.⁴ The preceding discussion leaves little doubt that those two were extraordinary men. . . . [They] . . . had built an enviable reputation for the “endless apron” thresher, or the Pitts style of machine. As previously noted C. Aultman & Co. had enjoyed phenomenal success with their “Sweepstakes” apron threshers. Those two men were also keenly aware of its deficiencies And so, dissatisfied as they were with the current threshing machines, . . . beginning in 1860, they . . . set about the building of a vibrator style of threshing machine.

By now it should be . . . understandable that the [enterprise] was not a sudden impulse. As a matter of fact there are compelling reasons to warrant the belief that the founders of [the] company had been contemplating such an adventure for some years prior to its establishment. That is borne out by the fact that Huntington Brown and William Ackerman were the first representatives of the company. . . . [B]y horseback, buggy, and railroad they traveled all over the West. Everywhere they went they sought to introduce the new company to agents and prospective customers. Those people were informed that a new company was soon to come into being that would build a vibrator thresher, . . . an entirely new type of machine. . . .

Beginning [in] 1859 and 1860, other events . . . were taking place in Battlecreek, Michigan, [that] exerted a tremendous influence on the establishment of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. . . . John Nichols and David Shepard . . . brought the new thresher to full fruition by making the changes that radically improved its operation. The vibrator thresher that Nichols and Shepard built differed in several respects from those that preceded it, and those differences are apparent from the following [explanation of the thresher’s construction]: “. . . two shakers [extended] from the cylinder to practically the rear of the thresher, the upper one open so as to permit the grain to fall through it upon the lower shaker, which upper shaker was provided with fingers which tossed the beat straw as the shakers swung back and forth. The grain and fine chaff fell through the shaker or grain pan, as more commonly called, which vibrated lengthwise of the machine carrying the grain and chaff to the fanning or cleaning mill, to which it was delivered for the purpose of thoroughly cleaning from dust and chaff. This machine was such an innovation that it met the aggressive opposition of the old builders. But notwithstanding that fact it became rapidly popular.”⁵

To distinguish the new machine from the old “endless apron” type, Nichols coined the term “Vibrator,” by which Nichols and Shepard machines were known. The Nichols and Shepard Company copyrighted that term and was the first to use it.

Nichols and Shepard began [testing] the Vibrator thresher in 1859 During 1860 they built five of [the] machines, the second year they built ten, and the third year twenty-five were built. The success . . . was so remarkable that Nichols in 1863 made the following prediction in substantially these words: “If we continue to manage our business with diligence and care and to

build and improve the Vibrator in its construction, here a little and there a little as may be necessary, the time will come when Nichols and Shepard will build and sell one hundred of these Vibrator threshing machines in one year.”⁶ He did not have to wait long, for within three years the prediction that he made had been realized. It is a matter of record that . . . the Nichols and Shepard Company enjoyed a rapid growth in the production of Vibrator threshers.⁷

The invention and introduction of the Vibrator thresher marked the dawn of a new era in the threshing of . . . grain. . . . With the “apron” thresher variation in speed and power did not materially alter the efficiency of threshing, but with the Vibrator thresher that was no longer true. To accomplish satisfactory threshing the new type of threshing machine required even, steady power. That was difficult and well nigh impossible to achieve with horse powers.

Consequently, with a strong insistence on the part of the threshermen and farmers for a more satisfactory type of power, the threshing machine companies were under pressure and impelled to search for a more reliable source of power. . . . [T]here arose an insistent demand for steam engines. The first steam engines used for threshing were portable and drawn by a team of horses, but within a few years [of] their introduction traction engines were built and, for the most part, replaced the horse-drawn portable engines.

. . . [I]n spite of the meritorious qualities . . . of the Vibrator thresher, it was met with determined opposition. . . . [M]any of the threshermen and farmers were reluctant . . . to change to the new type of machine. . . . Being conservative men who lived close to the soil, they were . . . in no mood to purchase a machine that had been so recently invented and placed on the market.

. . . [T]hey were men who had to be convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the new separator would function as the inventors and manufacturers claimed. . . . [A] number of years passed before . . . the threshermen and farmers were assured of the validity of the claims made for the Vibrator separator and that their money would not be wasted on impractical machinery. . . . [O]pposition also emerged from many of the [rival] companies who viewed the new machine with disdain and considered it to be a threat to their business. Their advertisements portrayed the new machine as a hoax and warned the farmers against buying one of those new-fangled machines.⁸

Notwithstanding the strong opposition that came from competitors and others, within twenty years of the advent of the Vibrator, the “endless apron” type of machine became obsolete and [was] abandoned. Only a few of them are left today, and they have become very valuable antiques. . . .

Out of the stream of historical events presented in the preceding pages at least one conclusion is inescapable. The avowed purpose for . . . establishing the new company in Mansfield, Ohio, was to build a separator embodying the features peculiar to the vibrator type of threshers. One of the crucial problems that confronted the new company at its outset was that of securing patent rights. Aultman was a . . . master in securing patent rights, buying and altering them to satisfy his own needs and purposes. Accordingly he assumed the responsibility of completing that task. Prior to and during the founding of the company he pursued those ends with a vengeance, and it became one of his major contributions to the initial success of the company. . . . [H]e bought [and] reissued . . . the entire series of patents involving the vibrator system. Those efforts resulted in substantial improvements over previous machines and made the Aultman & Taylor separator unique, as well as a success at the very beginning. . . . [I]t should be observed . . . that . . . those efforts entailed considerable expense. Apparently the contributions to the improvement of the vibrator [thresher] were recognized by other companies,

for . . . Aultman granted the privilege to use that line of patents to several companies in Michigan, one in Missouri, and one in Illinois.

As already indicated, Nichols granted to the new company certain patent rights, . . . yet it was not all one-sided. A few years later the Nichols, Shepard and Company paid the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company a sum of money and became half owner in the patent rights as they existed at that time. That is to say there was an interchange of ideas and patent rights between the two companies.⁹

Still another concern that required the attention of the founders . . . was to discover a suitable location for their factory. Careful consideration was given to several [places] including Mansfield, Ohio, all of which gave . . . promise of fulfilling their needs. In due time, however, all were eliminated except Mansfield, which became the choice for [situating] the company's plant.

The decision to locate the factory in Mansfield was influenced largely by two factors. First of all [was] the desire of the founders to [place] their factory where there was an abundant supply of the best material obtainable. One of the foremost assets of Mansfield was its location in a geographic area where there was some of the best hardwood in the country. In that vicinity there was available an abundance of ash, oak, poplar, and red elm. If one item were to be selected that contributed most to the wide and favorable reputation of the Aultman & Taylor thresher, it was the excellent quality of lumber that was utilized in its construction. The company bought only the choicest . . . lumber, which was sawed out in the nearby forests. . . .

A second factor . . . of even greater influence in the selection of Mansfield for the location of their plant was the availability of splendid railroad facilities. At that time a large proportion of the business between the East and [the] West, the great prairie regions of the West and Northwest, [and] Europe passed through Mansfield. The city was traversed by three important railroad trunk lines: . . . the Baltimore and the Ohio, the Pennsylvania, and the Erie. In addition to those three, two other railroads within close proximity north of the city were also available for the shipment of their machinery. Those railroads provided ample facilities for the shipment of their machinery to all parts of the world where grain was grown. . . . The . . . growth of the company during the succeeding years constitutes positive . . . proof of the wisdom, as well as the foresight, in the selection of that locale for the new factory.

In 1867 Mansfield was a small community with a population numbering 1,715. With the coming of the new factory the community began to grow immediately, and there was a steady increase in the population. By 1876 it had grown to 2,700, and in 1880 it was 3,500. During [a] period of thirteen years the population of Mansfield had almost doubled. That . . . was due in large measure to the enormous growth of the most important industry of the community, which was none other than the Aultman & Taylor Company. By 1920 the population of Mansfield stood at 27,224. In the meantime other industries grew up; . . . nevertheless, the Aultman & Taylor Company continued to occupy first place as the outstanding industry in the city.¹⁰

Once the decision was reached to build the factory in Mansfield, one of the most important items in the chain of events was to purchase lands conveniently located to the railroad facilities. It was also essential that . . . the shops . . . be arranged [so] that the manufactured machinery could be loaded on each of the railroads previously mentioned. It was likewise imperative that this should be accomplished without leaving the grounds of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. The lands ultimately acquired met those requirements.

The deeds to the lands, which are recorded in the Richland County courthouse, show that at least thirteen persons owned parcels . . . that were needed by the company. In addition to

deeding tracts of land to the company, another interesting deed was concerned with a race, or canal. The legal document pertaining thereto was executed by John and Margaret Ann Sherry and provided that the company was to have the use of the waterway. That the . . . canal might be kept in good repair, the company was permitted to take stones and clay from the adjoining land to make the necessary repairs to the waterway. Acquisition of the tracts of land occurred at intermittent occasions between 1861 and 1867. When all of the parcels of land had been purchased and deeds executed, the total amount of land in the possession of the company was approximately seven acres.¹¹

There are several instances in the deeds where mention is made of Toby's Run as a line of demarcation. The name of that stream, which still flows through the grounds of the old plant, had its origin in Indian lore. A warrior whose name was Toby attempted to escape an encampment of soldiers stationed in Mansfield. He was shot and wounded, after which he made his way to the stream and lay down in it. Later the soldiers returned, found the warrior still alive, and killed him with a tomahawk. Thereafter, the stream was known as Toby's Run.¹²

Construction of the buildings began in 1861, but the first buildings were erected during 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868. . . . [T]he warehouse was not built until 1869 and . . . was said to have been the largest frame building of its kind in the country. It was 252 feet in length, 90 feet in width, and 4 stories in height. It contained 90,720 square feet of storage space and stood on the north line of the company's property. An elevator was placed in the building that was used to hoist the threshing machines from the ground floor to the other floors of the building. Within a few years following its [construction] the production of the company outgrew . . . the capacity of the building, and so it became necessary to secure additional improvised storage space.

Regretfully that huge building fell upon evil days and had a most . . . tragic demise. During Monday night of May 26, 1896, . . . Mansfield was engulfed by a severe electric storm. It was accompanied by strong winds and a blinding downpour of rain. At approximately eleven o'clock that night a bolt of lightning struck the gigantic warehouse of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. The building was [hit] about six feet from the west end, and, within minutes, the [structure] became a mass of flames By the end of an hour the roof and walls collapsed. It was all over, and the warehouse . . . with the starved rooster [logo] appearing at each end of the building was forever gone.¹³ . . .

A picture of that huge building reveals . . . that the warehouse may have been equipped with lightning rods. Why did the rods fail to prevent the fire? . . . [N]o firm answer can be given to that question. Ten rods pointing skyward are visible to the naked eye. . . . [W]ith the aid of a magnifying glass [one can see] two additional rods

As the business of the company continued to grow it began the building of steam engines, and so it became necessary to enlarge the engine shops. With the erection of those shops the company had one of the most complete and modern facilities to be found in the country All of the work on their engines from the bending and rolling of the boiler plates to the painting of the finished engine was done under one roof.

To construct additional buildings [required that] new lands . . . be purchased, . . . [including] a large brick residence on the hill opposite the old office that was known as the McComb residence. Mr. McComb was a brother-in-law of John Sherman, who served as a United States Senator from Ohio and later as Secretary of State during the McKinley administration. [The] residence was built by Mr. Hickox, who was an early resident of Mansfield and a banker in that community. [The] building was altered and became the office of the company. . . . That building and hill have long since been removed, and new buildings,

including a church, now occupy the area where the old building and office stood.

. . . [B]y 1880 the plant, including warehouses, additional shops, yards, etc., occupied thirty-five acres of land.

. . . [T]he preliminaries to the founding of the company extended over a period of seven to eight years. In fact it is reasonably clear that the founding of the company began as early as 1859 and 1860. . . . [C]areful thought and meticulous consideration with respect to every detail . . . distinguished every step . . . on the journey toward . . . incorporation. . . .

The incorporation papers, which are on file . . . in the office of the Secretary of State of Ohio, contain . . . pertinent . . . facts that merit attention. The company was incorporated for the purpose of “engaging in the manufacture and sale of agricultural and mechanical implements, machinery, wood work, castings, and iron work, including repairing of machinery.”

The company was capitalized at \$150,000.00. The number of shares was 1,500, and the value of each share was fixed at \$100.00. . . .

[T]he document was written in longhand [and] is somewhat faded, yet the signatures are quite clear The incorporation papers were signed in the following order: Henry Taylor, C. Aultman, John Turner, H. C. Taylor, E. Aultman, J. H. Wiggle. This then became the legal date of the founding of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. Thus was launched on that auspicious day of November 9, 1867, a great and significant enterprise that continued to build machinery for a period of fifty-six years, being liquidated in 1923.¹⁴

Notes

1. Bixler, Lorin E. *Cornelius Aultman, C. Aultman & Co., and the Aultman Co.* Enola, Pennsylvania: STEMGAS Publishing, 1967. 25, 27, 77.
2. *The Mansfield Shield*, October 25, 1909. Baughman, A. J., ed. *Centennial Biographical History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1901. 609.
3. Sandburg, Carl. *Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and the War years*. New York: Harcourt, Brace. 300.
4. Brown, J. E. “The History of the Company and its Predecessors.” *The Rooster*, April 1909. 3, 8.
5. Gardner, Washington. *History of Calhoun County, Michigan*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1913. 354-57.
6. Nichols, John. *Battlecreek Scrapbook*, no date. Brown, J. H. “Battlecreek’s Wheat History.” *Battlecreek Scrapbook*, no date. Collier, Ron. *Battlecreek Enquirer and News*, 1959. 52.
7. Ibid.
8. Graham, Albert Alexander. *History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: A. A. Graham, 1880. 501-502.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Office of the Clerk of Courts, Richland County courthouse, Mansfield, Ohio.
12. For a complete report of this incident, see Graham.
13. *Mansfield Daily News*, May 26, 1896.
14. Office of the Secretary of State, Columbus, Ohio.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

In this issue of the *Album* appears the third installment of Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, as edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, passed away before he could publish the manuscript on which he had labored. His well-researched book affords rare glimpses into the lives of key figures who established Aultman & Taylor's reputation for excellence. Manuscripts belonging to Dr. Bixler are in the Sherman Room of the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library in Mansfield, Ohio.

Chapter 3

The Original Personnel and Organization of the Aultman & Taylor Company

The first board of directors of the [Aultman & Taylor Company, founded in 1867,] was composed of the following members: Cornelius Aultman, Canton, Ohio; Elizabeth Aultman Harter, Canton, Ohio; John Tonner, Canton, Ohio; Henry H. Taylor, Chicago, Illinois; H. Chatfield Taylor, Chicago, Illinois, and J. C. Wiggle, Mansfield, Ohio.

Three of the original directors came from Canton having been associated with Aultman in his enterprise in that city. John Tonner was the secretary of C. Aultman & Co. for a number of years and was a competent businessman. It should be observed that H. Chatfield Taylor was the son of Henry H. Taylor and one of the original directors. Elizabeth, the daughter of Cornelius Aultman, at the age of nineteen was also one of the original directors.

For a woman to have been a member of the board of directors in that day is particularly noteworthy. That was in 1867 and 1868, long before the day of [women's suffrage]. . . . Elizabeth Aultman Harter . . . grew up with the company. Moreover, she was the only member to serve in that capacity during the fifty-six years that the company was in business. Her leadership and influence [were] of great significance in the affairs of the company.

Subsequent to Taylor's death, Aultman purchased his holdings in the company and thus acquired the controlling interest in the [firm], most of which was inherited by Mrs. Harter. Following the death of her father she became the largest stockholder in the company and held the controlling interest until its dissolution.

At the outset, the company's organization consisted of the following personnel: Joseph Allonas, Superintendent; William Ackerman, Foreman, Thresher and Power Shop; Andrew Burneson, Foreman, [Wrought-Iron and Blacksmith Department]; [Joseph Edwin Smith, Foreman, Paint Shop], [and] John A. Moore, Foreman, Machine Shop.¹

All of [the] men had been employees of C. Aultman & Co. of Canton. It is probably fair to assume that Aultman selected [the] men to assist him in opening the new factory because he knew them personally and . . . was well acquainted [with] their talents, skills, or abilities essential [in] assuming the responsibilities to which he had called them. Many years of experience with C. Aultman & Co. placed them in good stead in the launching of the new venture. . . . [A]t the outset there was a tenuous link between the two companies Even though [the] men had been the employees of the Canton firm, . . . the machinery that they built

for the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company was in all respects quite dissimilar to that built in Canton, and that continued to be true during the . . . life of the two companies.

The above point deserves more than passing attention . . . in view of the fact that articles have appeared . . . containing statements that tend to leave readers [with] the impression that those two companies were under the same leadership and management or that there was only one company. Statements made to that effect are erroneous . . . Each company had its own [board of directors] and stockholders. It was about 1875 that Aultman sold his holdings in C. Aultman & Co., withdrew from active management, and soon thereafter severed all of his relationships with C. Aultman & Co. There was no crisscrossing of either directors or stockholders of [the] two companies. . . . Aultman took men from the Canton plant to assist him in the inauguration of the new enterprise in Mansfield, and that is . . . the extent of the relationship that obtained between the two companies. . . .

In 1865 Aultman went to Mansfield, where he resided for four years. His residence in that city was for the purpose of supervising the erection of the buildings, installing machinery, and placing the factory [in] operation. At the end of four years, having gotten the factory underway, he returned to Canton and lived there until his death in 1884.

The year following the founding of the company marked a period of transition. While Taylor was the treasurer and continued to hold his interest in the company until his death, yet at no time during those years was he active in the management of the company. . . . Wiggle was the first secretary, who served in that capacity for two years and withdrew from the company at the close of 1869. Under these circumstances the company found itself without a competent person in charge of the management.

Confronted with the need amounting to a precarious situation . . . Aultman turned to Michael D. Harter and persuaded him to become manager of the company. That his choice was a prudent one is evidenced by the company's record during the ensuing years. Harter grew in stature, and the notable success that the company achieved was due in large measure to his sagacious leadership. . . .

William Ackerman

William Ackerman was born in Esslingham, Germany. When quite [a] young man, he came to New York City and there obtained a good practical education by attending night school. He came to Ohio in 1857 and located in Canton, where he was employed by the Ball Machinery Company with which Aultman had been associated. Upon Aultman's invitation he went to Mansfield in 1861 and lived there during the remainder of his life. He was one of the first men to go to Mansfield to prepare for the opening of the new factory. . . . [T]he first buildings were under construction, and he helped to install the machinery for the [manufacture] of the new separators and horse powers. He was a foreman for twenty-six years, retiring in 1897 because of ill health. His co-workers knew him as a man of integrity and honor. . . .

Ackerman was once involved in a serious accident that almost cost his life. He was caught in a fifteen-foot flywheel that was revolving at the rate of thirty-five miles per hour. It made two revolutions before he was released. For nine days he was under the care of three physicians. At the end of five weeks he was able to move around. . . .

Ackerman was responsible for an exhibit of the Aultman & Taylor machinery that was held at the World's Fair during 1893 in the city of Chicago. Ackerman also designed and built the threshing machine that won the prize at the Nebraska State Fair held in Omaha during 1893.

Aultman & Taylor was popular in that state [Ackerman] was married to Mary Bankoff, who was born in Switzerland and died in Canton, Ohio. Five children were born to that union.²

Joseph Allonas

Joseph Allonas was born in Alsace, Prussia, and at an early age came to America with his parents. They located near New Berlin in Stark County, which is now the city of North Canton having changed its name during the fanaticism of Word War One. During many years it has been the home of the Hoover sweeper company. It was in the village of New Berlin where Allonas grew to manhood and followed the trade of a machinist in Nodel's shop, which was a jobbing, blacksmithing, and repair shop Subsequently he went to Canton during the early years of C. Aultman & Co. and . . . was one of the leading mechanics of that firm.

. . . [H]e [was not only] a skilled person in the management of the plant, as well as a competent mechanic, but . . . also a fertile and successful inventor. He had to his credit patents on several attachments [to] machines manufactured by the company

In the community he was highly esteemed by all who knew him, being an important and respected citizen. He died on May 8, 1879, at fifty years of age. He was a member of St. Peter's Catholic Church in Mansfield Interment was . . . in the Catholic cemetery on North Market Street in Canton . . . about two miles north of the old C. Aultman & Co. plant. . . .

A large contingent of the employees of . . . Aultman & Taylor . . . accompanied the body to the city of Canton. It is interesting to observe that the railroad company provided special round-trip tickets to all of those who made the journey to Canton.

A prominent representative of C. Aultman & Co. at the . . . funeral remarked . . . , "He was to Aultman, Taylor & Company and to Mansfield's manufacturing interests what the late George Cook was to C. Aultman & Company and to the city of Canton."³

. . . A modest tombstone marks his grave . . .

Andrew Burneson

Andrew Burneson was born in Beaver County, Pennsylvania, . . . and was educated in his native county. During 1835 he went to Wellsville, Ohio, where he learned the machinist trade from P. E. Guice, who was a steam engine builder. Following that experience he worked as a steamboat builder and helped to [construct] the New Brighton car factory, in which he owned stock.

He moved to Canton during 1859 where he was employed by C. Aultman & Co. in the building of threshers, mowers, and reapers. After working for that company seven years he devoted two years to the commission business in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1866 he went to Mansfield, where he engaged in merchandising for a brief period of time but soon sold out his stock. On January 12, 1867, he was employed by the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company as their first foreman in their wrought-iron and blacksmith department. He held that position for twenty-two years

At that time he and William Ackerman, along with others, organized the Ohio Thresher and Engine company, which was located in Upper Sandusky, Ohio. They erected a plant and built threshing machines and engines . . . during 1889 and 1890 employing about forty men. Burneson was Vice-President and Ackerman was . . . Superintendent.

In 1893 they sold their interest in the company and returned to Mansfield. Burneson then became engaged in the real estate business and erected seventeen buildings, including residence and business blocks⁴

He was a man of considerable ability. While he was with the Aultman & Taylor Company he made many improvements in their wrought-iron department . . . , [increasing] the speed and accuracy in the manufacturing process.

He began life as a poor man but, being ambitious and industrious, prospered throughout his life. . . .

Joseph Edwin Smith

Another member of the original shop organization was Joseph Edwin Smith, who was born in Canton in 1846. His father [was] a native of Alsace, Germany. In 1868 Mr. Smith moved to Bucyrus, Ohio, and during the following year became associated with the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. He was made Foreman of the Paint Shop, which position he held for thirty years. During the latter years of his employment he had thirty men under his supervision. He was a most dependable workman and . . . was absent from work only one week due to illness.

In 1874 he was married to [Mansfield resident] Minnie R. Allonas . . . , who was born in his native city of Canton. They were the parents of four children.

Smith was . . . an active, intelligent citizen interested in public affairs He died January 19, 1924, at the age of seventy-eight.⁵

Factory [Operations]

Each of the [Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing] Company's catalogs states the number of years for each current year that the factory [has] been in operation beginning with 1865; thus, 1904 [is] their thirty-ninth year, 1916 their fifty-first year, etc. When those dates are compared [to] the date of incorporation, there appears to be an inconsistency, but that would be an unwarranted conclusion. Was 1865 indeed the year when operations began?

It all depends upon what is meant by "beginning operations." If this [phrase] alludes to the beginning of the manufacturing of machinery, the answer is "no," but, on the other hand, if it refers to the construction of buildings and the installation of machinery, then the answer is "yes." It may be recalled that Aultman went to Mansfield in 1865 for the . . . purpose of overseeing and assisting in the installation of the machinery, as well as placing the factory in operation. There were numerous tasks in such an undertaking that had to be performed [I]nstalling the machinery and placing it [in] operation were foremost, yet in addition to those responsibilities was the procurement and stockpiling of raw materials. In other words it was essential that inventories be built.

. . . [T]he factory came into operation gradually While . . . the company was incorporated in November of 1867, yet operations were underway prior to that time.

Because of the essential preliminary work . . . manufacturing did not [begin] until the fall [of] 1868. At that time, [when the firm's] first separator was sold, other machines were in the process of manufacture, some nearing completion and a number . . . ready for sale

During 1869 there were employed in the factory between 150 and 200 men. [In] that year they built 400 threshing machines and horse powers. There are those who would maintain

that this was not a large output nor an auspicious beginning. Nonetheless, it did indeed mark the [advent] of a notable industrial firm that existed for a span of 56 years and developed a reputation for building excellent machinery

[The firm's] first separator was . . . sold . . . to [Nicholas] R. Darling of Fredericktown, Knox County, Ohio. Attention is called to the picture of that separator along with Darling which was taken in 1879 by J. A. Watkins of Mansfield. The following [testimonial letter dated June 20, 1876,] was written in response to an inquiry from the company concerning the merits of their first machine: . . .

“Gentlemen: In answer to your wish to know how I like my machine and what I think of its durability, I am happy to say, I bought the first Aultman & Taylor thresher ever built; I bought it in 1868, and this will be the ninth season; I have run it each season, doing a very large business in wheat, oats, barley, flax, and timothy, and, while worn a good deal, I believe it will last a number of years yet. I can't answer you how long it will last, but I believe it will be running when all the endless-apron Pitts threshers sold this year will have broken down, worn out, and played out. Not a single endless apron sold in my section the year I got my Aultman & Taylor or the year after . . . is now of any account, all of them worn out altogether, or so much racked that they can't do any fair amount of work. Our machine saves the farmers' grain so well, and cleans it so nice, that I have every season had from one-third to one-half more, and sometimes double the work for my old machine than any endless apron could get. So, you see, an Aultman & Taylor thresher, if you count the number of bushels threshed, will outlast three or four endless-apron or Pitts threshers. I am well acquainted with the R——, S——, F——, and C—— threshers and do not hesitate to say that I think my old Aultman & Taylor has more life left in it yet than a new machine . . . of these makes.

“I don't think that any of the machines just named, or any other endless-apron machine, will be sold here this season, for all our best farmers say they waste such a terrible amount of grain that they will not have any of them do a bushel's threshing, if they can help it; and I don't think anybody down this way is fool enough now to buy a new one, for so many farmers get mad when a man says endless-apron thresher to them, that they get only a small amount of work, and that the poorest pay, generally; besides this the repairs of their machines is an awful big item. When I first got my machine from you, the farmer's wouldn't believe how much I could save them; if I want to make any of them swear, I can do it by saying that I intend threshing with an endless-apron machine next year. If you want more information about my thresher, let me know. Considering the time I have run my machine, and the amount of grain I have threshed, I don't think it cost me more than one-half for repairs as other kinds, perhaps not over one-third as much.”⁶

Three years after this letter was written, Darling reiterated his sentiments about the Aultman & Taylor machinery. In the meantime he purchased an Allonas clover-huller attachment, an engine, and other improvements. In his second letter he states that he was well pleased with all of his purchases⁷

Darling used that separator for eleven seasons. At the end of that time it was bought by the Aultman & Taylor Company and returned to the factory. It was stored on the top floor of their warehouse already described and used for exhibition purposes. In May of 1896 a fire . . . completely destroyed the warehouse, and the separator was lost in that conflagration. A full account of that disastrous fire is presented in Chapter 6 of this treatise.

Nicholas R. Darling

On Friday morning, August 23, 1969, the author met and visited with a good and genial friend, Lewis Hyatt, to whom he is indebted for firsthand information concerning N. R. Darling, who was born in 1830 and died May 25, 1908.⁸ He was survived by his wife and one adopted son. Hyatt is one of the very few men living today who knew Darling and whose memory of him is most vivid. The farm that Hyatt possesses and on which he resides adjoins the one owned by Darling, so they were close neighbors. Then, too, Darling was an uncle of Hyatt's. Those farms are located about two miles south of Fredericktown . . . in a rich agricultural region.

It was a . . . perfect August morning with a clear azure sky . . . that contributed to a never-to-be-forgotten experience as the writer and Hyatt stood on a high plateau on his farm overlooking the old Darling homestead and the valley below. As far as the eye could see . . . loomed . . . acres and acres of . . . corn in tassel. The scene was . . . one of unsurpassing beauty . . .

Here it was, in this, one of the rich agricultural valleys of Ohio, that Darling moved among his neighbors and threshed their grain with that first separator, the "Pioneer," built by the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. . . .

The old [Darling] house, built in 1875, still stands . . . and is in excellent condition. The barn was struck by lightning twenty years ago and burned to the ground; . . . all that remains of it are the walls. The water from the spring still flows to the old stone watering trough and to the spring house

What manner of man was Darling? Facts concerning his early life are few. . . . [A] brief presentation of informational and anecdotal material may suffice to give a . . . glimpse of his personality. Pertinent information comes from his peers, who were well acquainted with him and knew his admirable characteristics, as well as his eccentricities. . . . [S]ome of the tales associated with him are unprintable, so they must forever remain within the confidence of his friends and neighbors

Darling . . . displayed a type of wit seldom encountered Apparently he was one of strong beliefs, as well as firm opinions, and was uninhibited in giving expression to them. . . . While he was not a heavy drinker, yet on occasion he did imbibe somewhat freely.

One November evening when it was raining, snowing, and sleeting, a miserable evening, he and his hired men were leading the horses to the watering trough They had to make five trips with the teams. . . . [F]inally Darling brought the bull to the trough, but he would not drink. All he would do was to sniff at the water, while his master stood in the cold. Being somewhat inebriated, wobbling back and forth, he . . . admonished the bull . . . : "D__n it to h__l, I brought you out here to drink, and now you keep me standing here in the snow just because it's raining."

Darling was not affiliated with any church, but he had certain ethical standards to which he adhered. When someone inquired as to which church he belonged [to], his reply was, "I belong to the 'Do Right Church.'" His [dedication] to [doing right] is illustrated in the following incident.

[Darling's wife] was a loyal member of the Baptist Church and was pleased that the man who tended their orchard was also a member of that denomination. . . . [T]he conversation at the dinner table on a particular occasion drifted . . . to . . . the topic of wheat. In that day wheat was usually taken to the mill in two-bushel sacks. Darling stated that the miller would inquire as to the number of sacks in the load, and the weigh slip would show a few pounds over the average of two bushels per sack. This prompted one of the group to wonder if the weighing [were]

absolutely on the level. The orchard man suggested that he would give the miller a number that would be a few more than the true number of sacks so as to test the miller's honesty. To this suggestion, Darling replied, "Perhaps you would, but in our church we would not do such a thing"—meaning . . . the "Do Right Church."

Horse Powers

Prior to 1869, the horse powers were unmounted. To move them required the expenditure of much time and labor. They were also difficult to maintain in good running order. After building them for a brief period . . . the company became convinced that improvements were imperative

[T]he Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company bought or leased all of the valid patents in existence at that time and began building horse powers on an extensive scale. The first powers of this type . . . were the "Climax" triple gear and the "Woodbury" double gear. The latter became a popular horse power, and it was claimed that [Aultman & Taylor was] the first company to build a comparatively large number [of them].

After . . . much . . . experimentation and invention they developed a horse power of their own that apparently satisfied the needs of the threshermen It was named the Aultman & Taylor double-gear horse power, and reference was sometimes made to it as "the horse power of the century." From all accounts it was an excellent horse power and became a favorite among the threshermen It was advertised as having three necessary qualities: . . . strength, light draft, and durability. . . . Despite the fact that by 1890 the steam traction engine was in general use, yet . . . figures . . . show that [the firm] built . . . horse powers during those . . . years. It is not unreasonable to assume that [the company manufactured] between 1400 and 1600 horse powers.

At least two factors in part accounted for the continued demand for horse powers until the turn of the century. First, there were those conservative threshermen who, having used horse powers for many years, were unwilling to try a new source of power. Their attitudes were often supported by what appeared to them plausible reasons. One common reason given for their reluctance to use steam engines was . . . the . . . danger of explosions and fire. Whatever merit there may have been in this reason, enough examples . . . were to be found in the newspapers and farm journals to give . . . credence to their fears.

A second factor was perhaps of even greater significance. There were conditions of terrain, such as hilly country and swamp lands, which limited the use of traction and portable engines. Under [these] circumstances the horse powers were more useful than was the traction engine of 1890. Eventually, however, with improvement of country roads and bridges, portable and traction engines gradually replaced the horse powers even in the most [forbidding] terrain.

Notes

1. Brown, James E. "The History of This Company and Its Predecessors." *The Rooster*, April 1920. 3, 8.
2. *Mansfield Shield*, October 25, 1909. Baughman, A. J., ed. *Centennial Biographical History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1901. 609.
3. *The Canton Repository*, May 10, 1879. *Mansfield Shield*, May 15, 1879.
4. Baughman. 472.

5. Baughman. 374.
6. Graham, Albert Alexander. *History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: A. A. Graham, 1880.
7. Ibid.
8. Records of the Forest Cemetery, Fredericktown, Ohio. *Knox County Republican News* (Mount Vernon, Ohio), Tuesday, May 26, 1908. *The Democratic Banner* (Mount Vernon, Ohio), May 26, 1908.
9. Interview with Lewis Hyatt, August 23, 1969.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* presents the fourth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. Upon his death, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, left his major work unpublished. The manuscript found its way to the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library. George W. Richey of Norwich, Ohio, alerted Dr. Robert T. Rhode to the book's whereabouts. Dr. Rhode edited the manuscript and prepared it for publication in the *Album*. Now, Dr. Bixler's painstaking research and lively writing are being shared with *Album* readers. In this installment, Dr. Bixler begins a series of biographical narratives depicting the people who helped to make the Aultman & Taylor Company one of the foremost manufacturers of agricultural equipment in the United States.

Chapter 4

The Harter Family

To convey a true and altogether accurate portrait of the Aultman & Taylor Company requires . . . due recognition . . . to the Harters, since their participation and influence were preeminent in the affairs of the [firm]. In many respects it was truly a notable family imbued with those attributes of character and personality that make for greatness. Six members of that distinguished family were active in the business All of the family presented here at one time or another held official positions in the company [I]f all of their years of association with the [firm] were combined, [they would] total . . . approximately 165 years. . . . Biographical sketches are presented in the chronological order in which each became affiliated with the [company].

Elizabeth Aultman Harter

Elizabeth Aultman was born on May 14, 1847, in Greentown, Ohio, where her father began his business of manufacturing water wheels and harvesting machinery. Her education was acquired in the public schools of Canton.

She was united in marriage to George D. Harter on March 3, 1869, when the family was

residing in Mansfield. Immediately following their marriage, they went to Canton and [lived] on South Cleveland Avenue near where the Canton Public Library is now located. After living [there] for several years, they moved to the home that was later . . . occupied by President McKinley. Following [Cornelius] Aultman's death in 1884 they moved into the mansion that he had built. There they lived for the remainder of their lives, and this dwelling became familiarly known as the George D. Harter residence.¹

None of [Elizabeth's] business interests did she regard more highly than that of the Aultman & Taylor [Company]. She became a stockholder and a director in [Aultman & Taylor] at the age of nineteen, when it was founded.² As pointed out earlier, [it] was almost unheard of in that day for . . . a person so young and a woman at that [to] become connected with a business enterprise. Moreover, she held the distinction of being the only stockholder and director who was with the [firm] during the fifty-six years that [it was] in business. The minutes of the directors and stockholders indicate that she was regular in her attendance at . . . meetings and was an influential participant. Her advice . . . was always sought, when action of any significance was about to be taken. Following the death of her father she became the largest stockholder in the company, and so her votes in large part determined the policies and course of the company. Whenever it was impossible for her to attend meetings, she usually appointed as her proxy Henry W. Harter and occasionally Isaac Harter, Jr. . . . [F]rom 1908 to 1923, [Elizabeth] served as Vice-President without salary.³

[Elizabeth] . . . maintained . . . concern [for the] employees. This . . . is well illustrated by the following incident related to the author by one of the employees of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

During . . . 1921 the plant ceased operations for a period of time, and many of the workmen were laid off. One of the men who had been an employee for many years was Billy Emmons, and he was one of the men . . . discharged. One day . . . Mrs. Harter made a tour through the plant, as was her practice [S]he discovered that Billy Emmons . . . was not in the plant, whereupon she inquired, "Where is my Billy?" Upon being informed that he, along with others, had been laid off, she said to her informant, "Get him back! As long as I have a dollar left, he'll be employed." And so Billy Emmons was reemployed.⁴

. . . [Elizabeth's attitude] of deep concern for all who were connected with the [firm] accounted in a significant way for the high morale that in large measure characterized the employees for most of the years that the [company was] in existence. Even today one hears from old employees only praise and an expression of appreciation for Mrs. Harter, as well as a sense of pride that they were once [employees] of the old company. . . .

Mrs. Harter was a great benefactor, and with her financial resources gave aid to thousands of young people. Through her generosity many of them were able to secure a college education. . . . [S]he provided assistance [to] a number of young men who completed their medical education.

She was one of the largest donors to the Trinity Lutheran Church in Canton, when the present edifice was erected. . . .

Her gifts to the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. were generous, and she was the founder of the Associated Charities of Canton. She contributed to the Canton's Women's Club at its inception and was its only honorary member. She and her stepmother endowed Aultman Hospital in honor of her father. To these and other charities she gave at least [a million dollars]. . . . The bulk of her donations came from current income rather than from capital investments.

Mrs. Harter was the mother of six children. A son, Cornelius, died at the age of five, and

a daughter, Eliza, died in infancy. At . . . her death she was survived by four daughters: Mrs. E. E. Esselburne and Mrs. James Fogle, both residents of Canton, Mrs. Henry Alexander of Cleveland, and Miss Elizabeth Harter, who resides near Hartville, Ohio. She was also survived by twelve grandchildren.

Mrs. Harter's death occurred on October 25, 1932, at the age of eighty-five, having survived her husband by forty-two years. Her death [followed an] illness . . . of five years. . . . Funeral services . . . were held in the home and at Trinity Lutheran Church . . . in Canton. . . . [I]nterment was made in the Aultman-Miller plot in Westlawn Cemetery in Canton

Michael Daniel Harter

Michael D. Harter was born in Canton . . . on April 6, 1846. In 1869 he was united in marriage to Mary L. Brown of Massillon, Ohio. To that union was born one daughter, Mrs. J. E. Vaughn, Jr., [and] four sons, H. H. Harter, Robert Harter, Isaac Harter, Jr., and Huntington Harter.

. . . [H]is father was identified with the business interests of Canton as a merchant and banker. [Michael] acquired his education in the public schools of Canton and was graduated from Canton High School. He did not attend college but continued his education by studying and devoting his attention to the problems and methods of his father's business. . . . In 1866 he established a bank in Canton

Throughout his life he was . . . characterized as . . . endowed with a brilliant and logical mind. . . . [H]e was a great and forceful thinker, a wise and constructive statesman, as well as a patriotic citizen. . . . [H]e was a warm and generous person . . . and . . . an entertaining conversationalist. . . .

That he was deeply patriotic . . . is evidenced by a gift that he made to the city of Mansfield. This was a soldier's monument that stands [in] the public square On June 2, 1881, a program was presented in connection with the decoration of the soldiers' graves in the Mansfield Cemetery. On that occasion the following letter written by Michael D. Harter was read to the assembled crowd

"I feel that Richland County has already waited too long for the erection of a monument which will keep alive . . . the remembrance of the patriotic sacrifices of the dead.

"Therefore, if it will be acceptable to the Memorial Association, I will give to this community a soldiers' monument which shall be a duplicate of the monument which stands opposite Congress Springs at Saratoga.

"The figure which is of iron (bronzed) is that of an infantry soldier and is seven feet in height. It was designed and executed under the personal supervision of the Seventy-Seventh New York . . . and is as nearly a perfect representation of the American soldier as I have ever seen.

"The expense of a foundation and everything connected with the proper setting will be paid by me"

. . . [H]e was a member of St. Luke's [Lutheran] Church in Mansfield. . . . On February 27, 1887, the congregation decided to erect a church building. Harter donated . . . the triangular piece of ground at the intersection of Park Avenue West and Marion Avenue on which the church edifice was erected. . . . [H]e gave a lot located at the rear of the building to be used for a parsonage. The church . . . was completed and dedicated on November 22, 1891.

The Harter home was located on Park Avenue West in Mansfield and surrounded by a

large lawn. It was opposite the residence of Senator John Sherman. Some years ago the dwelling was razed to provide room for . . . a [business] building.

Reference has already been made to the appointment of Harter as . . . Manager of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. During 1869, the [firm] being in need of a manager, Cornelius Aultman persuaded Harter to assume the responsibilities of that position. Aultman had known Harter from childhood At that time Harter was twenty-three years of age, and that was no minor responsibility to be assumed Harter's association with Aultman was . . . close No doubt Aultman perceived in the young man innate talents and possibilities for great leadership based upon his zeal and eagerness to learn.

. . . [Harter] was conservative in the office and aggressive in the factory. During his life he held more . . . official positions than any other person connected with the [firm], serving at one time or another as manager, treasurer, vice-president, and president.

The [company] enjoyed a profit during all of the years that he served Almost unprecedented is the fact that [the firm] did not suffer a loss from 1867 until 1890. While complete records are not at hand, yet the records that are available indicate that the [annual] net income . . . ranged between \$90,000.00 and \$100,000.00, an outstanding achievement for those unsettled years.

[Harter] was involved in other business enterprises in addition to [Aultman & Taylor]. He was one of the founders and incorporators of the Mowry Brick Company Mr. Mowry . . . patented a brick-making machine, [and the firm] was organized for the purpose of manufacturing and selling the machine [I]t proved to be a successful [venture]. Harter was also instrumental in establishing the Savings Bank in Mansfield and served as a director.

. . . [H]e was also identified with the Western Straw Board at St. Mary's, Ohio, . . . the Brooklyn Biscuit Company at Brooklyn, New York, and the Electric, Light, and Power Company. He established the Isaac Harter & Sons Milling Company at Fostoria, Ohio, which was one of the largest producers of flour in the state of Ohio. He was President of that company, and A. Mennel was Vice-President and General Manager. Mennel was also . . . a member of the board of directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. Harter was the confidential friend and advisor of many of Mansfield's businessmen. He was loved by the employees of [Aultman & Taylor], since in him they had a trusted friend who was always ready to lend a listening ear to their problems and [do] whatever he could to alleviate their [suffering].

In 1890 he was elected to Congress from his home district. He was a member of the Democratic Party—a Jeffersonian Democrat—a “Free-Trader”—and believed in the axiom “That government is best which governs least.” He was a . . . champion of . . . free trade and Civil Service Reform. The tariff question and sound money [policy] were . . . burning political issues during the early part of the 1890s, but even in his own political party . . . only a minority . . . agreed with him. . . . [N]o one doubted his courage and honesty. The titles of the pamphlets and circulars that carried his addresses are indicative of the various phases of the issues that were discussed during his campaigns One of his ambitions was to modify the McKinley Tariff Law. He supported the Wilson Act, which became law and established the gold standard. Much of his effort was directed against the Bland Act. He was also opposed to the Free Silver Movement.

. . . Upon his election to Congress . . . Harter withdrew from active participation in the affairs of [Aultman & Taylor] so that he could devote his full time to his duties in Congress. Then, in 1891, upon his recommendation and insistence, a new company was organized, a complete treatment of which will be presented in a later chapter. Suffice it to state at this point

that, beginning [in] 1891 and [continuing] until his death, he served as president of the Aultman & Taylor Company and vice-president of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. . . .

A number of his friends cherished the ambition that . . . he would become a United States Senator and eventually President of the United States, but that dream perished

The newspapers of the period . . . reveal that . . . [Harter] was subjected to all of the vituperation that unfortunately often characterizes . . . political life He had his . . . enemies, some of whom went to great lengths in an attempt to bring discredit upon him. In a conversation with Virgil Cline of Cleveland in the halls of Congress . . . a year and a half before he retired, [Harter] stated that he intended to retire to private life, adding that he was disgusted with the falseness and show of public life. . . .

. . . [U]pon completion of two terms in Congress he declined another nomination by his party and returned home, never again to participate in the business or political worlds. His political activities left him a discouraged and . . . exhausted man. . . .

Harter arrived in Fostoria on Wednesday, February 20, 1896, for the purpose of looking after . . . the Isaac Harter & Sons Milling Company. . . . [H]e went to the house that he and Mrs. Harter had furnished for their son Robert. The house was in charge of Mr. and Mrs. S. M. Knapp, who had gone there from Massillon. Harter attended a supper at the Presbyterian Church in that city on Friday evening and apparently was in good health and spirits.

At the time of his retirement on Friday night . . . he requested Mrs. Knapp not to call him for breakfast, and she followed his instructions. However, when a late hour arrived and he did not arise, she became concerned about him. . . . [H]e was found lying on the bed in his night robes with a 32-caliber revolver clenched in his right hand. A bullet wound was in his right temple, and the bullet had passed through his head. A letter was left . . . addressed to Mrs. Harter, the contents of which have not been revealed to the public. What motivated . . . Harter to take his life will probably never be known except within the confines of the immediate family.

A brief funeral service was held at Fostoria, after which the body was taken to Mansfield, where another brief service was conducted by . . . the pastor . . . of the Lutheran Church of which Harter was a member. . . . [I]nterment was made in the Mansfield Cemetery.⁶

Following the publication of a sensational charge of graft on the part of the Richland County Treasurer and upon the request of a group of citizens, the State Auditor made an examination of the records of the County Treasurer. This examination revealed that there were a number of irregularities in the conduct of that office. These were brought into the open as a result of a suit . . . against the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and the M. D. Harter Estate for lack of payment of back, or delinquent, taxes in the amount of \$228,000.00. An extensive and complete report on the condition of the Treasurer's Office was published in the newspapers. Within the State Auditor's report is a statement of the appraisal of the M. D. Harter Estate as submitted by George Brinkhoffer, who was the administrator of the estate. . . . The total appraised value of the [Estate was] \$523,643.74.⁷

. . . [Harter's] most notable contributions were made in the arena of business and in particular as a leader of [Aultman & Taylor]. . . . Being a modest and generous person, his giving was done without ostentation. Twelve years after his death his family was still being informed [about his charitable gifts]. Many were known only to him and to those whom he benefited. . . . For one so gifted and talented his years came to a close all too soon. . . . Perhaps one may well conclude that the noted manufacturer and industrial leader in some measure achieved greatness.

Notes

1. Bixler, Lorin E. *Cornelius Aultman, C. Aultman & Co., and the Aultman Company*. Enola, Pennsylvania: STEMGAS Publishing, 1967. 23, 27, 77.
2. Ibid. 84. Alexander, Quintin. Unpublished thesis, U of Pennsylvania.
3. *Canton Repository*, November 25, 1932.
4. Interview with Earl Schuler.
5. *Mansfield Shield*, June 2, 1881.
6. Baughman, A. J., ed. *Centennial Biographical History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1901. 170. *Mansfield Daily Shield*, May 10, 1894, and February 23-26, 1896.
7. "Estate of Michael D. Harter," *Mansfield News*, October 9, 1901.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

The fifth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode, appears in this issue of the *Album*, which is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. A professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, Dr. Bixler worked hard and long to gather data and to write this detailed chronicle of the achievements and the eventual blunders of a once-great company. In this installment, Dr. Bixler continues his series of biographical sketches depicting the people who made Aultman & Taylor famous.

Chapter 5

The Harter Family, Continued

George Dewalt Harter

George Dewalt Harter, the third son of Isaac and Amanda (Moore) Harter, was born on Christmas Day, . . . 1843, in the city of Canton. He acquired his education in the Canton public schools and was graduated from high school at sixteen years of age with a record of high scholarship. Soon after graduation from high school he was employed as a teller in the Savings Bank of Canton.

. . . [T]he Civil War was raging, and, when eighteen years of age, Harter enlisted in the army, Company E, 115th Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on August 14, 1862. His promotion in the army came in rapid succession. On September 18, 1862, he was made a sergeant of his company and, on December 15th of that year, became a first lieutenant. He proved to be an efficient, competent officer, and [he] experienced hard fighting. Lieutenant Harter was given a meager garrison in a block house near Nashville, Tennessee, back of which and under [his] protection was a large group of African Americans. His garrison was attacked by Hood's army, and two of his men were killed. He retired with his troops at night and became a part of the army of General Thomas. At the close of the war he returned to Canton and, with his brother Michael D., formed the banking firm of George D. Harter and Brother.

At the time of his death, he was President of the banking firm of Isaac Harter and Sons. He was conservative in his banking practices, considerate and liberal with his patrons. He was a successful banker and businessman. There were many men in Canton and Stark County who became successful largely because of the favors given them by Harter.

His estate was a large one for those times. Public and private charities benefited by his liberal gifts. . . .

He was an active member of Trinity Lutheran Church in Canton, which received a goodly share of his contributions. During his adult years he served in several official capacities in his church. At the time of his death, he was . . . Sunday School Superintendent. Along with his wife he was a . . . contributor to Aultman Hospital. He was most appreciative of the best in literature and art. His private collections were among the most outstanding in the state. In keeping with his tastes his home was beautifully furnished

. . . He was a member of the Y.M.C.A. Board of Managers and [served] on its building committee. In politics, his allegiance was to the Republican Party, yet he was no narrow partisan. He was always . . . tolerant of those who held . . . other points of view He was a quiet, unassuming person, always attentive to duty. . . .

He died on December 8, 1890, at the age of forty-seven As related previously in the biography of his wife, he and Elizabeth Aultman were married on March 3, 1869, and the names of their children were given in that account.

Harter was a stockholder and a member of the board of directors of the Aultman & Taylor Company from 1875 until . . . [he passed away]. Upon the death of Aultman he became President of the company, serving in that capacity from 1885 until 1890, the year of his [own] death. . . . Because of his intimate knowledge of the business of the [firm], the transition . . . was a smooth one. There is little wonder that Harter carried on very well following the death of Aultman and [that], under his leadership, the company continued to prosper.¹

Harter's disposition was that of a modest and retiring citizen. . . . His success was due to a life devoted to hard work in business. He devoted no time to recreation. There were those among his friends who felt that his life might have been longer, if he had [allocated some time] . . . to recreational pursuits.

He never sought public recognition or distinction, but unsolicited honors were thrust upon him. . . .

Henry William Harter

Henry William Harter, brother of Michael D. and George D., was a native of . . . Canton, having been born there on May 9, 1853. . . .

He attended the Canton public schools and, following his graduation from high school, enrolled at Gettysburg College in 1870. He was graduated from that institution with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1874 and was valedictorian of his class. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the national honorary scholastic fraternity. In 1910, Gettysburg College conferred upon him [an] honorary [doctoral] degree.

Following his graduation from college he returned to Canton, where he studied law in the office of the firm of Lynch and Day. After reading law for two years he enrolled in the Law College of Columbia University, from which he graduated at the end of two years. He was admitted to the bar in the spring of 1877 and soon thereafter was admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. He was an outstanding citizen and a leading member of the

Ohio bar for almost sixty years.

In 1879 he was elected prosecuting attorney of Stark County, Ohio, and began his duties in that office on January 1, 1880. He held that office until 1885. In 1901 he became the nominee of his party for the office of Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of the first subdivision of the Judicial District of Ohio and was elected at the November election of that year without opposition. . . .

Judge Harter was a stockholder and a member of the board of directors of [Aultman & Taylor from 1886 until 1923]. He was a small stockholder, yet, because of his preparation and experience as an attorney, he was a most valuable member of the board Since Elizabeth Harter was his sister-in-law, he became her confidant, and, when she was unable to attend meetings of either the stockholders or board of directors, it was he that she [customarily] appointed as her proxy.² . . . [Beginning in the late 1880s, Harter] served as vice-president [of the firm].

The minutes of the stockholders and board of directors show that he was regular in attendance, as well as an active and influential participant.³ . . .

Isaac Harter, Jr.

This biographical sketch is devoted to Isaac Harter, Jr., the youngest of the Harters affiliated with the company. He was born in Mansfield, Ohio, on January 2, 1880, a son of Michael D. and Mary (. . . Brown) Harter.

After attending St. Paul's school in Concord, New Hampshire, he was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a B.S. degree. Following his graduation he joined the boiler department of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. In 1904 at a meeting of the board of directors he was elected Acting Superintendent of the Boiler Department at a salary of \$200.00 per month. A little later he was made [a director] of the company, from which position he resigned on June 5, 1906. . . . [T]he minutes of the board of directors state, . . . "The resignation was accepted with regrets, and on motion of J. A. Moore it resolved that a vote of thanks for his earnest and intelligent efforts in the interest of the company be expressed and recorded on the company's minutes."³

He continued to serve as a stockholder until the company went out of business. His holdings of stock . . . amounted to 8,868 shares, making him one of the large stockholders in the company. . . .

Soon after the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company sold their water-tube boiler business to the Stirling Company of Barberton, Ohio, Harter joined that company and served as superintendent of their plant until 1919. The Stirling Company was absorbed by the Babcock and Wilcox Company in 1920, at which time Harter became superintendent of their plant in Bayonne, New Jersey, and also became assistant to the president of [Babcock and Wilcox]. Four years later . . . he was elected President of that company and also Vice-President of the Babcock and Wilcox Tubular Products Division. He served the parent company in that capacity until 1947, when he was elected Chairman of its board. He held that office until his retirement in 1951. Following his retirement he served as a consultant to the company until the end of his life.

. . . He . . . developed sound metallurgical practices in the welding of steel used in the manufacture of boiler drums. Prior to these developments, boiler plates had not been welded perfectly for commercial use. At the time that the Hoover Dam was being built, the Babcock and Wilcox Company supplied some 14,000 feet of . . . welded tubing, the diameter of which ranged

from eight to thirty feet. These tubes were used for the passage of water through the Dam. It was the application of [Harter's] X-ray technique to [test the] soundness of [the] welding that was the key to the successful development of this kind of tubing. . . .

Still another contribution that Harter made to the industry was in clarifying the reason for caustic embrittlement of boilers under pressure. He discovered [a] proper treatment [for] bad water which eliminated the danger of this kind of cracking. From 1951 until his death Harter was involved with the U.S. Atomic Commission Industrial Advisory Committee and Patent Compensation Board.

He had to his credit sixty patents These involved steam boilers, furnaces, refractories manufacture, electric welding, metallic tube manufacture, and continuous casting of steel. . . .

Many honors were conferred upon Harter. . . . In 1951 he was awarded the Newcomen Medal for his achievements in the field of steam by the Newcomen Society and the Franklin Institute. . . . In 1955 an honorary [doctorate in engineering] degree was [awarded] him by [the] Stevens Institute of Technology.

. . . He was a fellow of the American Welding Society; Institute of Metals of London, England; Phi Kappa Sigma, [and] Sigma Chi

[M]ost of his contributions were . . . in the area of steam, and in all of these his primary concern was to increase the safety of boilers. Two instances where he exerted timely influence makes this point . . . clear. One of these was the assistance that he rendered in the development of the code of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, which set standards for boilers that greatly enhanced their safety. Still another little-known contribution . . . led to the enactment of the Ohio Boiler Code. . . .

One of the provisions of that law had a direct impact upon the builders of boilers. It required that state inspectors visit the factories regularly where boilers were being built and inspect the process of manufacture, as well as the finished product. This was done so as to assure the state that there was compliance with the law by the manufacturers. Many of the features of that law have been incorporated in the boiler laws of . . . other states. . . .

His chief recreation interest was sailing. In addition . . . he had a special interest in translating French novels into English.

He was married twice. His first marriage was in Lowell, Massachusetts, to Elizabeth Farrington To this union was born one son, Isaac. His first wife died in 1955. On June 13, 1956, he was married in Fort Kennedy, Pennsylvania, to Alice (Crome) Howland . . . of Pittsburg She was first married to Edwin Gilbert Howland.

Isaac Harter, Jr., died on August 22, 1957, in New York City at the age of seventy-seven, and burial was made in the Mansfield Cemetery.⁴

James Underhill Fogle

James Underhill Fogle was born August 14, 1877, the son of Henry C. and Clara Underhill Fogle and was a life resident of Canton. He was married to Amanda Harter, a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. George D. Harter and a granddaughter of Cornelius Aultman.

Fogle's father held the office of treasurer of the Canton Light, Heat, and Power Company. He was also the general manager of the Canton-Massillon Electric Railway, [which] provided transportation between the two cities With the advent of the automobile, the electric railways became obsolete.

Fogle was a member of one of Canton's early and prominent families. He grew to manhood in a family steeped in the business and industrial life of the city, which prepared him for the important responsibilities that he assumed during his adult life.

He was President of the Bucher & Gibbs Plow Company in Canton. That company manufactured the Imperial plow, both walking and sulky plows, and [rollers], as well as spike-tooth, spring-tooth, and disk harrows. In addition to . . . farm implements, [Bucher & Gibbs] manufactured farm dinner bells, . . . school [bells], and church bells. For many years it was one of Canton's most prosperous and growing industries.

Fogle was the last president of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. Even though a competent businessman, he was called to the presidency of that [firm] during its waning years, so that there was little that he was able to do to save the company. Far-reaching decisions that hastened the demise of the [firm] had been made before Fogle arrived [on] the scene.

Fogle was the last charter member of the Canton Club. He was also a charter member of the Lakeside and Brookside Clubs of Canton. He died on July 29, 1960, and was survived by a daughter, Elizabeth Fogle, and three sons, William L. of Canton, Richard H. of New Orleans, Louisiana, and Stephen F. of Gainesville, Florida. He was also survived by a sister, Mrs. Emanuel Snyderacker of Chicago and four grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his wife on September 30, 1946, and a son, James U. Fogle, Jr., who died in August of 1956.

Burial was made beside his wife in the Aultman-Miller lot in Westlawn Cemetery in Canton. The family home for many years was located at 925 Cleveland Avenue N. W. in Canton.⁵

Notes

1. Danner, John. "Old Landmarks of Canton and Stark County, Ohio." *Canton Repository*, December 11, 1890.
2. Ibid. 1096-97. Howe, Henry. "Historical Collections of Ohio." *Daily Shield and Banner*, Mansfield, Ohio: November 8, 1891. *Canton Repository*, May 6, 1906. Records in the Office of the Registrar, Gettysburg College, January 6, 1969.
3. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
4. *The National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, 1965. 547-48. *Canton Repository*, August 23, 1957.
5. *The Canton Repository*, July 29, 1960.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the sixth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. During his lifetime, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, published a few of his chapters as separate articles in this magazine and others, but the bulk of his book remained unpublished until now. Dr. Rhode compares the discovery of

Dr. Bixler's manuscript to finding a lost city of gold. In this installment, Dr. Bixler demonstrates his considerable story-telling skills.

Chapter 6

The Starved Rooster and Havoc Wrought by Fires

The role of the trademark [of the starved rooster] was to epitomize graphically the admirable qualities . . . of the manufactured products [of the Aultman & Taylor Company]. It is a plain fact that companies and their products have often been known primarily by their trademarks. . . .

The origin of . . . the starved rooster as a trademark was one of those . . . innocent experiences that occur only [rarely]. The writer is indebted to Lyle Hoffmaster, who shared with him a fragment of the story of the "starved rooster." As he suggests, the story may perhaps be legendary, yet it seems to possess sufficient authenticity to warrant the belief that the incident may . . . be more factual than legendary. It had its origin in the vicinity of Benedict, Nebraska. But whether legendary or factual, let Hoffmaster relate the story as his father told [it] to him on several occasions:

"A thresherman and a proponent of Aultman-Taylor machinery was threshing one day and noticed this emaciated rooster picking up grain around the separator. . . . [A] practical joker, he caught the old fellow, put him in a crate, and shipped him to Aultman-Taylor with the caption 'Fattened on an Aultman-Taylor strawstack.' The factory people got quite a kick out of it and kept the old [rooster]. Shortly, they conceived the idea of using him for a trademark. The old rooster lived for some time, a sort of mascot around the plant and, upon his death, was buried on the hill where the old office stood. Both the building and hill are now gone."¹

. . . It was the brilliant and imaginative Michael D. Harter, . . . treasurer and general manager of the company, who conceived the idea of using the starved rooster for a trademark. This was during the latter part of 1875 and the early part of 1876. It is quite possible that the inspiration for this trademark came to him upon the arrival of the rooster at the factory. At any rate an application was made for registration of this trademark in the United States Patent Office on February 11, 1876, and was completed on March 7th of that year.

The purpose of the trademark was clearly set forth in the registration papers. The description of the trademark . . . appears as follows:

"Said trademark is designed for use in connection with threshing machines, and it is intended to indicate that the straw [that] has been threshed by our machines has all the grain so thoroughly and entirely removed from it that no carnivorous animal could get a living out of it but on the contrary would soon starve, even though allowed to pick over an entire stack of straw. In order to illustrate the idea, the figure of an animal is employed, or, at least thin in flesh or poor in health and general appearance in combination with the words 'Fattened on an Aultman-Taylor strawstack.'"²

As already noted the company's largest building was a warehouse that was built in 1869. On it was painted a starved rooster. If a line had been drawn from its head to its farthest extremity, it would have been almost one hundred feet in length. Travelers on the railroads leading into Mansfield remembered the large warehouse with the starved rooster on each end of the building. It was plainly visible for a long distance, and, upon approaching Mansfield, it was the first point of interest to catch the eyes of those who traveled by railroad.³

The anecdote relative to the painting of the starved rooster assumed various forms as it was transmitted from one person to another, but what appears to be the most authentic one was related to the author by Kenneth Dirlim, who was a highly respected citizen of Mansfield and a local historian. Dirlim was acquainted with M. D. Harter and other prominent personages in the company, and . . . he was in a position to have acquired firsthand information. The events culminating in the painting of the starved rooster may be chronicled as follows.

Who painted the starved rooster? A “bum” came to Mansfield, [and] being destitute . . . [he] sought a job whereby he might earn a small pittance with which to keep body and soul together. No one learned his name, and there are no records that identify him. In any event he contacted Michael D. Harter and volunteered to paint the rooster on both ends of the warehouse, whereupon he was provided with brushes and paint and went to work. In due time the rooster was painted on both ends of the warehouse.

The sequel to the story is that . . . whence he came and whither he went no one ever knew. Only this can be said—that, if he left a legacy of any note, it was the huge rooster that he painted on both ends of the warehouse. It was seen by thousands who perhaps remembered Mansfield as the home of the starved rooster, the trademark of [Aultman & Taylor].⁴

The company made extensive . . . use of [its] trademark. It appeared at several places on each of their separators, clover hullers, steam engines, and tractors. All of their letterheads carried a picture of the starved rooster. Their advertising materials and catalogs were profusely illustrated with their trademark. An example of this appeared on the front cover of their catalog for 1898. It carries a picture of [the firm’s] Columbia separator attached to a Hercules engine showing the outfit traveling on the road. On a rail fence beside the road sits a starved rooster, and nearby is the following poem:

“This is the cock that crowed in the morn,
With features deranged and look forlorn;
For scratch where he might and roam where he may,
He found not a grain his labor to pay.
Aultman-Taylor’s thresher had been that way.”⁵

The company distributed watch fobs and other trinkets with an imprint of the rooster, which each man showed when he went to work and when he left at the close of the working day. . . . Many of these original brass trinkets or souvenirs may be found among former employees or their relatives. They have become valuable collectors’ items and are highly prized by many people.

The rooster became the butt of a variety of stories, anecdotes, and jokes. These enhanced and embellished the reputation of the starved rooster so that this trademark became ever more popular with the passing of years. Typical of these yarns is the eloquent and almost poetic characterization of the rooster by one imaginative reporter:

“Their witty emblem, the lord of the barnyard, erstwhile of proud mien and clarion voice but now starved, forlorn, bedraggled because trusting in former experience he attempted to find solace in the strawstack passing through the teeth of an Aultman & Taylor thresher, this degenerate and pitiful bird has awakened the sympathy of many a housewife upon the prairies of Illinois and the fertile farms of the sluggish Platte or the broad and blizzard-swept wheat fields of North Dakota, teaching everywhere most impressively the lesson that, [in] Mansfield in the state of Ohio, some things are done well and thoroughly.”⁶

Following the organization of the new company in 1891, this trademark was transferred to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. It was registered in the . . . Patent Office so that it was protected not only in the United States but also in every country of the world where grain

and threshers were used.

The [mentioning] of Aultman & Taylor is for many to conjure up in their minds the starved rooster, for that trademark . . . characterized [the company's] machinery . . . [T]his was . . . particularly true of their separators. The starved rooster became inseparable from [the firm's] machinery and was one of the most famous of all trademarks.

Havoc Wrought by Fires

[As mentioned earlier,] during Monday night of May 26, 1896, . . . Mansfield was engulfed by a severe electric storm. It was accompanied by strong winds and a blinding downpour of rain. At approximately eleven o'clock that night a bolt of lightning struck the gigantic warehouse of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. The building was [hit] about six feet from the west end, and, within minutes, the [structure] became a mass of flames By the end of an hour the roof and walls collapsed. It was all over, and the warehouse . . . with the starved rooster [logo] appearing at each end of the building was forever gone. That unusual building that had attracted so much favorable attention and that had been admired by so many people was now in ruins and became only a sad memory.

The fire was first seen by a crew with a Pennsylvania switching engine at the east end of the yards. The engineer, John Garber, had pulled his engine in on the south side opposite the Mansfield Buggy Works to permit the midnight trains to go by. While the men were eating their midnight lunch, the lightning struck the warehouse, and immediately it became a caldron of fire. Newspaper accounts state that the wind was of hurricane proportions; the rain fell in torrents, and the lightning illuminated the city with its gruesome light

Excitement in the city was high. Upon seeing the fire the railroad engineer blew the locomotive whistle and thus awakened the slumbering people of Mansfield. All over the city they observed the red light in the sky that was a spectacular sight. Following the alarm given by the engineer and the signal of the fire department bells, the city was alert and sought to ascertain the location of the fire. It was soon obvious to all that it was in the northern part of the city in the vicinity of the Aultman & Taylor Works. . . . [M]en, women, and children dressed quickly in whatever garments were near at hand and hastened to the fire. . . . [W]ithin an hour 8,000 people had gathered about the factory anxious to lend a helping hand and assist in any possible way.

The elevator shaft in the warehouse became a huge conduit within which the fire was fanned by the fierce wind. When the fire struck the elevator shaft, an enormous flame reached skyward to a great height. It was an awe-inspiring sight. The strong wind from the west impelled the fire toward the eastern end of the building. From the warehouse the fire moved to two of the adjacent lumber yards that were located northwest of [the] building. The sheds were filled with finished lumber ready to be used in the construction of machines. There was a great loss of lumber that hampered seriously the building of threshing machines following the fire.

The [flames] spread rapidly from the warehouse to the new paint shop. It had two parts: a working part where the painting of the machinery was done and another part where the oils and paints were stored. The northern end of this building was destroyed, as well as all of its contents of paints and oils.

The company employed two night watchmen, Conrad Yonger and John Andregg, who were on duty that night. Andregg left the warehouse following his inspection soon after eleven o'clock [and] shortly before the lightning struck. He had gone through the new paint shop and had just entered the old paint shop when the crash came. At once he was aware that a bolt of

lightning had struck somewhere in his immediate vicinity. Immediately he ran into the big warehouse and started to go through it, but the intensity of the fire and smoke blinded him so that he could not see his way. He said that the flames resembled a water-spout and disappeared in the elevator shaft. He turned to run and could not see which way to go.

Groping his way back to the door he fell [out of breath] on the outside of the building. Soon he recovered and ran to Yonger and told him to turn in an alarm, but he was unable to operate the fire alarm apparatus. However, an alarm was finally turned in by someone on the corner of Main and Bloom Streets. The next morning, Andregg was almost completely exhausted [from] his exertions during the fire.

No previous fire in Mansfield was as devastating as the one of the night of May 26, 1896. Unfortunately the fire occurred right at the opening of the shipping season, and most of the year's output of threshing machines was reduced to [ashes]. Damage and loss reached great proportions.

The warehouse and its contents were the major losses. In addition to a year's output, a separator and a swinging stacker that the company had exhibited at the [Columbian Exposition of 1893] were in the warehouse and . . . were a total loss. It will be recalled that [the firm's] first separator was sold to Mr. Darling and, eleven years later, was bought by the company and brought back for exhibition purposes. It was stored on the upper floor of the warehouse and was [consumed] by the fire. [The firm] also had exhibited at the [Columbian Exposition] a nickel-plated engine, and at first it was thought that this engine was lost along with the other valuable contents of the warehouse. However, . . . it turned out that this engine was stored in another building and, for the time being at least, was saved.

. . . All told, about 250 machines, including separators and clover hullers, were in the warehouse ready for shipment. Besides these, there was a loss of sheet iron that was next to impossible for [the company] to replace in time to be used in the manufacture of machines for that season. Having been subjected to the intense heat of the fire, the steel was worthless. Belting amounting to \$8,000.00 was placed in the warehouse a week prior to the fire, and it likewise was a total loss. The price of the separators ranged from \$275.00 to \$450.00 [each].

There was still another [considerable] loss . . . that [the firm] was unable to estimate, and that was the loss in trade. At the time of the fire orders were being filled for July, and shipments were being made daily to . . . agents in the South and West. This was especially true with respect to the South, where a lighter grade of machine was used. [The company] lost a large number of machines that should have been ready for delivery in June. . . . The total loss from the fire amounted to between \$150,000.00 and \$200,000.00.⁷

In one respect the company was fortunate, since its officials had the foresight to carry blanket insurance that covered all parts of the plant. Their insurance in the amounts indicated was carried with the following companies:

Millers National	\$ 22,000
Underwriters' Mutual, Lloyd's	20,000
Mercantile, Lloyd's	20,000
Manufacturer's, Lloyd's	20,000
United Cities	18,250
Fidelity and Casualty	15,000
Atlas Mutual	15,000
Globe	10,000
Great Western, Lloyd's	10,000

Trader's Fire, Lloyd's	10,000
Mutual Fire	10,000
Central and Manufacturers	7,500
Miller's Manufacturer	7,250
Manufacturer's, Lloyd's	6,000
Norwood	5,000
Merchants and Manufacturers Mutual	5,000
Merchants and Manufactures	5,000

[The firm's] total insurance coverage amounted to approximately \$206,000.00. . . . [T]his covered [the] actual loss from the fire.

The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company was not the only [firm] to suffer loss from the fire. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company lost a caboose with clothes and all of the equipment that was usually carried in it. They also lost two gondolas. The Big Four lost a gondola that was loaded with machinery consigned to Piqua, Kansas. The B&O had a repair car loaded with trucks that was badly damaged, and seven of their gondolas were destroyed. These were standing near the warehouse. Several additional gondolas were loaded with coal, but [they] were saved.

The Mansfield Buggy Works, . . . located across the tracks, [was] in imminent danger, but the fire department with the assistance of bystanders saved this factory. A [large] hole was burnt into the roof, but the fire was quickly extinguished by several men who climbed onto the roof.

The Tremont House was a hotel located only a short distance from the new paint shop. Had it not been for the strong west wind and the rain, the Tremont House might have been destroyed. . . . The Tremont House was filled with guests, and one could well imagine that they were badly frightened. However, panic was avoided by the night clerk, Charles Gray, who had the presence of mind to calm the fears of the . . . guests and assured them that the hotel was not in danger of burning.

As already indicated, flames from the fire rose high in the air, and fire brands flew over into the Newman's addition, but the heavy rain extinguished them . . . as soon as they fell to the ground.

Almost inevitably, errors in judgment emerge on such occasions. An example . . . occurred when a crew of an Erie freight train pulled out a car loaded with machinery while it was burning. The . . . bed of the gondola was a mass of flames. Acting with keen alertness and good judgment the yard master immediately ordered the crew to take the burning gondola back, since otherwise it might [start] a fire in another section of the plant or yards.

. . . A telegraph pole that stood across the tracks from the paint shop on the north side of the tracks was on fire at its top. Firemen were unable to reach the fire with their hose. The pole was slippery . . . , but, in spite of these conditions, one of the railroad men climbed to the top of the pole and extinguished the fire. . . . [T]wo men entered the immense cloud of smoke that was rolling across the Pennsylvania tracks and, by almost superhuman strength, succeeded in moving a caboose and five railroad cars away from the fire. . . .

[After the fire,] [a]bout sixty of the men who were employed [at] the yards and warehouse were laid off The force in the shipping department was also decreased, until [the company was] able to rebuild and return to full production.

. . . [T]he ruins from the fire were still burning and smoldering the next day. On the morning following the fire gangs of men were busy cleaning up the rubbish Even though

disastrous, the fire failed to dampen the spirits of either the officials or the employees of the company. Immediately they set about the task of rebuilding and carried on the manufacturing of threshing machines with the facilities . . . not damaged by the fire. With the resumption of work, the [firm] saved a part of its trade. [The company] had on hand at the time of the fire thirty-four partly finished separators and clover hullers. These were quickly finished and shipped to their agents.

. . . On the morning following the fire the Russell & Company of Massillon, Ohio, offered to provide any help that their [firm] might render to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. . . . [T]he gesture of [Russell] no doubt was appreciated by the Aultman & Taylor people. . . . [T]he Russell & Company . . . was keenly aware of the . . . inconvenience caused by fire, since . . . in 1878 . . . their plant was destroyed by fire. On that occasion, it was C. Aultman & Company of Canton . . . that came to the assistance of [Russell] . . . by loaning . . . equipment and machinery that enabled [the firm] to continue building threshing machinery.⁸

It is worthy of note that, even though these companies were competitors, yet at a time of disaster . . . they did not hesitate to proffer assistance. [Such] actions . . . constitute a positive commentary on the magnanimity of the leaders of [these] renowned industries.

Fire of 1903

On Saturday evening, February 3, 1903, at about six o'clock, a second fire [began] at the Aultman & Taylor plant. . . . [I]t threatened to result in extensive damage to the [factory]. This fire originated in the main boiler room, but less damage occurred than the flames at first indicated. With the exception of one building the plant escaped damage. The alarm was reported by the American District Service, and the men from two fire stations responded. . . . [T]he flames rose high in the air and attracted the attention of the residents from all over the city. The firemen secured control of the fire in a remarkably brief period of time.

Daniel Webster, who was at the time superintendent of the company, stated that . . . the fire started either from an overheated stove in the boiler room or from a hot smokestack. The roof and exterior of the boiler room were burnt out.

Fortunately the fire was confined to the boiler room. Every effort was made toward saving the engine, since it was the most valuable piece of machinery in the plant. If the fire had reached the engine room machinery, such as the air compressor, generators, and engine, it would have been impossible to have replaced them in less than four or five months. As it turned out, [the company] had two boilers left unscathed by the fire . . . , and these provided sufficient power to operate the machine shop. . . .

The powerhouse contained two vertical Cahall and two Babcock and Wilcox boilers. . . . All of the framework surrounding the boilers was destroyed. Since the walls of the building [were] constructed of brick, they were left standing The building in the vicinity of the boiler room was badly damaged, but . . . the solid casing of brick [permitted] the boilers [to escape] material damage. A small adjoining building that housed . . . marine boilers . . . that were being tested was . . . destroyed. However, the boilers were only slightly damaged. The engine room and the dynamos escaped severe damage. An imminent hazard in fighting the fire was the fact that several barrels of benzene were stored in the building, but fortunately they [were] removed . . . before the flames reached that part of the building. The severest damage outside . . . was in the breaking of the steam feeds and water mains . . . caused by the falling of the roofs and other debris.

On Saturday night immediately following the fire, as well as all day Sunday and Monday, a large force of men were at work clearing away the [wreckage]. . . . [B]y Thursday of that week, the plant was again in full operation.

The loss from the fire did not exceed \$10,000.00, all of which was covered by insurance. . . . There was no loss of manufactured machinery, and so [the company's] business . . . did not suffer as [in the] previous fire.⁹ . . .

Fire of 1914

The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company plant was involved in a third fire, which occurred at two o'clock on Sunday afternoon, February 1, 1914. Large clouds of smoke accompanied by flashes of angry flames rose skyward in the north end of the city and were visible for many miles. The ringing of the firebells brought home to the citizens of Mansfield [that, once again,] one of its largest manufacturing establishments employing some 650 men was threatened with destruction. [Dr. Rhode notes that, according to a postcard owned by Frank E. Goulde of Danville, Ohio, and published in the July/August 2000 issue of *The Iron-Men Album Magazine*, at least one building of the Aultman & Taylor factory had been destroyed on March 25th of the previous year—not by fire but by floodwaters that transformed nearby Toby's Creek into a raging torrent.]

. . . [A] concerned and anxious community was grateful for the splendid work of the firemen. Through their efforts . . . the blaze was confined to the warehouse that [contained] finished materials [and] a considerable quantity of parts of separators.

The exact cause of the fire was unknown. However, it was thought to have [originated in] defective wiring. The blaze was prominent at the location of the company's largest electric motor and where was also concentrated the largest number of wires. . . .

The storage building of the company, a two-story tile and frame structure encompassing 100 x 100 feet was . . . destroyed on that fateful Sunday afternoon. It was located north of the Union Railroad Station. . . . When the company watchman, Andrew Laser, discovered the fire, it was burning fiercely, and he immediately notified the fire department . . . [I]t was too late to save the structure in which the fire originated.

The ruins of the building were still smoldering during the morning after the fire. Twisted bolts, cogs, and chains in the ruins were mute evidence of where the separators once stood. The building and its contents were covered by \$36,000.00 . . . of insurance.

The officials of the company stated that the time of the year when the fire occurred was when their business was rather slack. Only a part of the workers were affected by the fire, and those men returned to work by the end of a week. In slightly less than a month after the fire the plant was operating to full capacity. By that time repairs to all buildings were completed, and new storage quarters were arranged prior to the rush of the season.

The loss caused by the fire was estimated to have been about \$40,000.00. . . . [T]he loss was apportioned among a large number of . . . insurance companies.¹⁰ . . .

Notes

1. Letter from Lyle Hoffmaster, December 3, 1967. (Dr. Rhode notes that Artist Charles T. Greener of Faulkton, South Dakota, was credited with having created the famous rooster. See Gerry Lestz's "Can You Help on 'Skinny Rooster'?" in *The Iron-men Album Magazine* for

May/June 1988, 19.)

2. U.S. Department of Commerce, Patent Office, Washington, D.C.
3. *The Rooster*, October 1920. 5.
4. Aultman & Taylor catalog, 1898.
5. Graham, Albert Alexander. *History of Richland County, Ohio*. Chicago: A. A. Graham, 1880. 499-510.
6. *The Mansfield News*, April 27, 1901.
7. *Mansfield Daily News*, May 26, 1896.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Mansfield Daily Shield*, February 23, 1903.
10. *Mansfield Daily Shield*, February 2, 1914.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

The seventh installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company appears below. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book, which affords rare insights into the life and times of a major American manufacturing firm. For over twenty years, Dr. Bixler's unpublished manuscript lay virtually forgotten in the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library. Then, acting on a tip from George Richey, Dr. Rhode found the book, edited it, and prepared it for publication in the *Album*. In this installment, Dr. Bixler highlights Aultman & Taylor's lucrative trade in water-tube boilers.

Chapter 7

A New Company and Water-Tube Boilers

Immediately following his election to Congress in the fall of 1891, Michael D. Harter withdrew from an active role in the management of the [Aultman & Taylor Company], a responsibility he had assumed for twenty-one years. Having been elected to represent the people from his section of the state [of Ohio] in the halls of Congress, he was desirous of devoting all of his time and energy to that new endeavor.¹ . . .

Newspaper accounts asserted that [a foremost] manufacturing company of . . . Mansfield was the Aultman & Taylor Company. Its business had been successful due primarily to its efficient management, as well as the business tact of its . . . Treasurer and Superintendent Michael D. Harter. At the time of his retirement as an active participant he owned a considerable amount of stock in the company.²

In accordance with Ohio law, notices were published in the local newspapers beginning [on] August 23, 1891, [announcing] that a reorganization of the Aultman & Taylor Company was to be [completed] These accounts asserted that the [firm] was to be bigger and better than ever, [that] the reorganization was to occur after twenty-five years of a most remarkable record, and that the year of 1890 [had been] an unprecedentedly good one. Primarily . . . because of his retirement, Harter deemed the time opportune for the organization of a new company.

Accordingly he initiated the movement [that established] the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

While the newspaper referred to the transaction as a reorganization, yet . . . it is more accurate to state that, to all intents and purposes, a new company was [established, as indicated by the change of name to] . . . the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.³ At the close of the [1891] season the Aultman & Taylor Company sold their plant to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and ceased the manufacture of machinery. The [new] company was incorporated . . . on September 1, 1891, and began operations on that date.

. . . [T]he [company] earned more than \$2,500,000.00 from 1867 to 1891 inclusive. That was an average of about \$120,000.00 per year. These figures alone constitute positive proof that the [company was] prosperous . . . from [the outset]. Indeed [there was no] loss during any of those years, a most enviable record The season that closed on October 1, 1891, the final year of the Aultman & Taylor Company, showed a profit of approximately \$200,000.00.

. . . [W]hen the original company was founded, it was incorporated . . . [on] November 9, 1867 as the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. This was its official title until October 29, 1875, at which time the title of the company was changed by the omission of the word “manufacturing,” and the firm became simply the Aultman & Taylor Company. Beginning with 1891 it continued to exist concurrently with the new company, even though it built no machinery after that year. The reason for this situation becomes clear as the history of the two companies [unfolds].⁴ . . .

[S]o far as the stockholders were concerned, there was little change in the actual holdings of the new company as compared with the old; those who owned stock in the Aultman & Taylor Company also became stockholders in the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. A few persons acquired stock due to a proviso that all officials of the company were required to own stock. However, the number of new persons involved in the purchase of stock was relatively insignificant.

The capital stock paid in originally to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company was \$140,000.00, but later \$100,000.00 was added [B]efore the organization was finally completed, the capital of the company was set at \$500,000.00. This consisted of 5,000 shares [at] \$100.00 each

The records of the proceedings of the incorporation show that, on August 1, 1891, James E. Brown, Arnold Kalmerten, W. A. Habeson, and Michael D. Harter were subscribers to the articles of incorporation⁵

The first board of directors of the new company was comprised of Henry W. Harter, A. Kalmerten, James Reynolds, J. E. Brown, and F. L. Loomis. The board . . . met on October 1, 1891, and elected Brown President, Henry W. Harter Vice-president, Kalmerten Secretary, Reynolds Treasurer, and W. G. Pile Superintendent.

The annual salary of the president was fixed at \$4,000.00, the vice-president at \$600.00, and the superintendent at \$1,800.00. . . . [T]he officers with the exception of the vice-president were to devote all of their time to the business of the company. [A lawyer, Harter] served as counsel for the [firm].

Having been elected President, Brown succeeded Michael D. Harter as the guiding spirit of the company. He [presided] until the [firm] went out of business, covering a period of thirty-two years.

. . . One condition imposed by the old company . . . was the right of its stockholders to subscribe for one half of the capital stock in the new company, for which they paid in full, as did all other stockholders.

. . . [T]he new company purchased the real estate, machinery, materials, and tools on hand . . . in the plant at Mansfield. By joint agreement between the two [firms], the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company paid to the Aultman & Taylor Company \$120,000.00 in cash for the above items. The engines and parts were sold at forty percent of the list price, which was considered to have been a low price. The second-hand engines were sold at thirty percent of the list price with the old company paying the freight to the factory. . . . [A]n effort was made to sell as many of them as possible . . . in the country instead of returning them to the factory. The new company paid \$250.00 for each of the old engines with the exception of the Eureka engines. While the price paid for the Eureka engines is not available, . . . it may be fair to assume that the list price was the amount paid

[A]ll of its other assets, such as notes, accounts, farms, cash on hand, bills receivable, stationery, [and] stamps . . . were retained by the old company. Insofar as was possible its affairs were closed up, which left the new company with a clean sheet, as well as a reputation equal to that of any similar company

[T]he new company was not charged for the office fixtures at home or abroad or for vaults, safes, carpets, [or] furniture . . . at Mansfield. In return . . . the old company was given free access to and use of the offices . . . as long as they were needed. . . .

[T]he portion of the salaries and expenses of the collection department and the bookkeeping department were adjusted at the end of each season on an equitable basis between the two companies. The records show that these were larger during the first few years than in later years. During the ensuing years money trickled into the treasury on notes and accounts that were often long past due. . . . [T]hese accounts were eventually liquidated or became defunct. [T]hese propositions were extremely favorable to the new company, but . . . the stockholders in the old company owned more than half of the stock in the new company.

. . . When the organization of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company was accomplished on October 1, 1891, it was indebted to the Aultman & Taylor Company for . . . \$648,269.27. On March 2, 1896, a note was executed by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company for the [full amount] and . . . was payable on July 1, 1897. However, the note was extended from time to time until July 1, 1902. At that time the Aultman & Taylor Company . . . stated that the note . . . was long overdue. . . . [T]he Aultman & Taylor Company requested that the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company . . . pay interest on the note In accordance with the above [resolution], the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company executed a new note . . . that was to bear interest at the rate of 4% per annum, and this note was made payable July 1, 1905.

. . . [A] special meeting of the stockholders [of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company] was called for February 26, 1906, for the purpose of considering . . . the question of increasing the capital stock of the [firm] from \$500,000.00 to \$1,000,000.00. . . . [T]he increased stock was to be preferred as to capital and dividends. . . . [T]he holders of the preferred stock were to receive from the assets remaining after paying debts and liabilities the full payment of the par value of the preferred stock before anything was paid upon the common stock. . . . [T]he holders of the preferred stock were entitled to dividends at the rate of six percent per annum, payable . . . out of the surplus in preference to all other stockholders, and those dividends were to be accumulative.

. . . On February 26, 1906, . . . [the] special meeting of the stockholders was convened, [and] assent was given to the , , , preferred stock. There was unanimous agreement that it was of the utmost importance to have the debt reduced or wholly discharged. It was emphasized that the indebtedness constituted a menace to the credit of the company, and its existence prejudiced the standing of the [firm] in the minds of conservative persons. It was also pointed out that the stockholders would find it difficult, if not impossible, to sell shares near their true value, so long as the [debt] prevailed. Even though . . . the debt was held by friends of the company, . . . it was stated . . . that . . . “changes may at any time occur that might put the control of this large demand . . . in hands less disposed to continue the favorable treatment” [T]he claim could be pressed against the company disastrously if . . . it should be controlled by adverse or indifferent interests. The argument continued that, if converted into stock, it would be a continuous investment . . . , and payment could never be demanded. The right of redemption was reserved, which could be a valuable privilege. It was hoped that, within a few years, the condition of the company . . . would be such that [it] could sell a preferred stock bearing a lower rate of dividend and with such help retire the new stock. . . .

Seventy-two of the stockholders, including proxies, were in attendance at the meeting. Sixty of the stockholders, representing 4,769 shares of capital stock, assented in writing to the increase of capital stock by issuing 5,000 shares of preferred stock.

The remainder of the debt, which amounted to \$148,269.27, was covered by a note executed by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company bearing interest at the rate of 4% and which was to fall due on December 6, 1906. Thus . . . the debt of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company was liquidated.⁶

. . . In the final analysis, the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company absorbed the old [firm] although attended with financial problems A period of ten years was required to [complete] the transaction. . . .

On the basis of the president’s report it appears that the first year was . . . very successful . . . for the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. The total sales of threshers, engines, sawmills, clover hullers, and repairs amounted to \$105,000.00. . . . [T]o avoid any fallacious showing of earning, it was concluded to carry \$100,000.00 of repair credit [in a] sinking fund. This was done to offset any deductions from repairs [by] reason of discounts for repairs, etc.

At the meetings following the close of the first year, the board of directors declared a cash dividend of 8% on capital stock [and] carried \$180,000.00 into surplus and \$25,627.76 into [the] sinking fund. . . .

Water-Tube Boilers

During the early 1890s the [Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company] was approached from time to time with requests to build stationary boilers, as well as to do contract work. John Cahall, . . . superintendent of the boiler department, and his son, William, were possessed with considerable inventive genius. John Cahall was awarded . . . on October 25, 1892, patent #485087 [for] a vertical . . . water-tube boiler and on April 17, 1894, patent #518519 [for] a horizontal . . . water-tube boiler. Beginning in 1895 the company manufactured the Cahall . . . boilers and successfully placed them on the market. During the same period . . . they also built the Babcock and Wilcox water-tube boilers.

. . . In the case of . . . fire-tube boilers the hot gases pass through the tubes or flues on their way to the smokestack. . . . [T]he large mass of water outside of the tubes is heated, and

steam is produced. This was, with a few variations, the almost universal type of boiler used in manufacturing plants and mills until late in the 1850s and early 1860s. During those years there were many boiler explosions So there arose a demand for a boiler that possessed safety features not found in . . . fire-tube boilers.

Stephen Wilcox is generally credited with being the first (in 1856) to use inclined water tubes, connecting spaces front and rear with a steam drum above. In 1866 Babcock became associated with George Herman Wilcox. During that year the Hope Iron Works in Providence, Rhode Island, built the first Babcock and Wilcox water-tube boiler, which was sold in 1867.

The conditions peculiar to the water-tube boiler are the reverse of those in the [fire-tube] boiler previously described. In [the water-tube] boiler the water occupies the space inside the tubes, and the hot gases generated in the firebox pass on the outside of the tubes toward the smokestack. The heating of the water within the tubes produces the steam, [which passes] into a drum or drums at the end of the tubes. In the Cahall boilers the steam in the drums was superheated. . . . [B]oth types of boilers had certain advantages The water-tube boiler steams more quickly than does the fire-tube boiler due to the fact that there is not a large mass of water to be heated Moreover, boilers of this type are not subject to dangerous explosions, since, in the event an explosion does occur, only one of the tubes is likely to let go. . . . [I]t likely [will] cause little or no damage [T]hey carried from 300 to 800 pounds of pressure [per square inch], which satisfied the demand for more power. . . . [T]hey were compact and saved valuable space. But [they] had . . . disadvantages; they were more expensive than fire-tube boilers and more difficult to keep in good working order. [Such] boilers were used in [factories and] on ships.⁷ . . .

[T]o launch into the building of [water-tube boilers], it became necessary for the company to enlarge its facilities. A more complete treatment of plant [additions] will be presented later, but [for now] it is enough to state that a considerable outlay of funds was required for . . . construction, as well as for the purchase of machinery and equipment designed for the manufacture of [such] boilers.

As already noted the company began building water-tube boilers in 1895 and . . . in 1905 . . . sold that business to the Stirling Company. The [firm's] records show that this venture proved to be a lucrative part of their business. With the exception of a few years their boiler department made a satisfactory profit.

Agents and Contracts

The sale and marketing of [water-tube] boilers at times became an exasperating problem for [company] officials At a meeting of the board of directors on July 24, 1894, Brown recommended that the [firm] enter into a contract with H. E. Collins of Pittsburg . . . for the exclusive sale of the Cahall water-tube boilers. A second contract . . . was executed on September 29, 1896. This contract carried an addendum that included the Thayer Company of Boston, . . . Philadelphia, . . . and New York.

At the board of directors meeting on November 24, 1896, [a contract between the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and W. C. Temple of Pittsburg] was submitted and approved. . . . Temple was made the sales manager for the Cahall, Babcock and Wilcox, and any other water-tube boilers the company [might choose] to build. . . .

Apparently Temple was not satisfied with [the] contract, for at a meeting of the board of directors on January 19, 1899, he [proposed] that he be placed on a fixed salary of \$6,000.00 per

annum with an additional five percent of the gross amount of the sales of the water-tube boilers. . . . [T]his proposition was unacceptable to the directors, and negotiations were continued.

On February 24, 1900, a new contract between the company and Temple was submitted to the directors. . . . In lieu of the compensation provided . . . in the 1896 contract Temple received . . . [one-third] of the net profit on all boilers and appurtenances. In addition to this, the company agreed to pay him six percent of all sales [free-on-board] at the factories, after deducting from the proceeds the expenses for selling those products. [The new contract became] effective January 1, 1900.

In 1904 the directors were again confronted with . . . executing a new contract with Temple. At their meeting on November 7 . . . Isaac Harter [reported] on negotiations . . . with Temple for a revision . . . of the latter's contract [The board requested] W. W. Darley, who served as mediator between the parties, [and Harter to put their propositions in writing for the next meeting].

Brown reported to the directors at their meeting on January 19, 1905, that . . . a settlement . . . had been effected. Apparently the company was in arrears in its commission payments to Temple [Agreements were submitted to the board and approved.]

An important adjunct to [the] water-tube boilers was [stoker manufacturing]. Beginning [in] October of 1897 there was an unexpected growth in demand for [the] Mansfield Chain Grate Stoker. . . . [D]uring the [next] fifteen months [the firm] sold 166 of them, which had a value of \$186,000.00. One hundred of them went to the Carnegie Steel Company, which was the largest user of [the company's] stokers at that time. . . .

[Y]et another type of stoker came to the attention of the officials of the company which they envisioned would be an important addition to their business. That was the Meldrum Koker Stoker, which was an English invention and patented in the United States. . . .

Several members of the board looked into the merits claimed for that device and were convinced that it would be a desirable addition to their business. Negotiations were begun during the early part of 1905 with [Meldrum's] agent, Arthur D. Southam, for the purpose of securing sole control of that stoker in the United States. Following extended discussions a proposition by the board was offered to the Meldrum brothers [and eventually accepted]. . . . [T]he company began the manufacture of the Meldrum Koker Stoker and placed [it] on the market along with the Mansfield Chain Grate Stoker and [the firm's] water-tube boilers.

. . . Isaac Harter on April 15, 1905, . . . presented a proposition [from] Kennedy Parks, who invented a special machine for making seamless headers, [which] were an important part of [the company's] water-tube boilers. Parks claimed that his machine would not only reduce the cost of [the] headers but . . . also produce a superior header. Following his presentation, the company appropriated \$500.00 for experiments with Parks's machine. On May 3, 1905, an announcement was made that the experiments had been successful and an agreement . . . reached with Parks⁸

Foreign Trade

. . . [The firm] expanded [its] business to include a number of foreign countries. [The company] had a good [market] for [its] water-tube boilers [abroad] which continued until [it] disposed of that part of [its] business.

In 1899 a firm of brokers presented a proposition that entitled them to the exclusive sale of the Cahall boiler in Germany and Austria on a royalty basis of ten cents per square foot of

heating surface. Temple was authorized to close [the] contract Each year thereafter, shipments of boilers went to those two countries.

In 1901 the firm of Dank & Company, Limited, of Oldbury, near Birmingham, England, expressed a desire . . . to build the Cahall and Babcock and Wilcox water-tube boilers. . . . [T]hey requested that permission be granted to sell those boilers in the United Kingdom Those requests were acted upon favorably by the board of directors The English firm was also granted the right to manufacture and sell the Mansfield Chain Grate Stoker

Brown reported that he had been conducting correspondence with . . . William McLean & Company of Melbourne, Australia, concerning the marketing of [the company's] boilers in that country. This firm, through its representative, O. H. Remington, had applied for the exclusive agency for the sale of . . . water-tube boilers and . . . Mansfield Chain Grate Stokers in . . . Australia and New Zealand. . . . [A] contract was executed between . . . McLean & Co. and the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, and many of [the firm's] water-tube boilers went to Australia and New Zealand.

. . . [T]here were [other companies] authorized to market [the water-tube] boilers. [They] included E. P. Martz, Henshaw, Bulkley & Company, Hendrie & Bothhoff Manufacturing & Supply Company, and Alexander Lewis.

Another outlet for the sale of [the firm's] water-tube boilers was the United States Navy. . . . W. C. Turner, Vice-President of the Thayer Company, [was authorized] to sign on behalf of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company . . . documents . . . essential in the transaction of business with the . . . Navy Department. On the basis of this action and the records of the company, it appears that the United States Navy used those boilers on a number of their vessels.

. . .

Promotion of Sales

. . . [T]he company utilized a variety of methods of bringing their water-tube boilers to the attention of prospective customers. . . . [T]he usual media of newspapers and magazines carried pictures along with [descriptions]

Fairs and exhibitions provided another avenue for bringing [the firm's] boilers to the attention of the public. The company exhibited [its] water-tube boilers at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition . . . held in St. Louis during 1904. . . . Isaac Harter, Jr., [later] called attention to a supply of booklets . . . left over from that Exposition. It was his suggestion that the company print a card calling attention to the fact that the [water-tube boiler] had been awarded first prize [I]n compliance . . . , a card was printed that had . . . a picture of the medal that the company had won. These cards along with the booklets were mailed to users of boilers.

Financial Aspects of the Boiler Trade

On April 5, 1905, Isaac Harter, Jr., recommended the adoption of a new price list on [the company's] boilers and repairs. The new price list . . . became effective on May 15 Apparently the new . . . list did not decrease . . . sales. [Only the Thayer Company] objected to the new price list

Shortly thereafter the Thayer Company brought suit against the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company to recover damages. Company records mention this lawsuit but give no information as to its outcome. In order to avoid the recurrence of such difficulty, succeeding

price lists carried a statement to the effect that the company reserved the right to change prices at any time

On October 1, 1897, [the firm's] total boiler sales amounted to \$10,958.70; on January 1, 1898, they amounted to \$119,926.52; on January 1, 1899, they amounted to \$122,574.50; on January 18, 1900, they amounted to \$2,620,871.69; on January 1, 1901, they amounted to \$1,757,489.74; and as of January 1903, they amounted to \$2,300,000.00. . . .

On January 1, 1899, commissions due . . . [the] agents amounted to \$14,808.69; on January 18, 1900, commissions due Temple amounted to \$100,930.15 and to the Thayer Company \$33,739.10

During 1901 there was a marked increase in the volume of [the company's] boiler business. . . . The first five months of 1903 were distinguished by the receipt of a very large number of orders, the aggregate of which was much larger than any other similar period in the history of their boiler business, but the last six months of that year were decidedly the worst period During that year there was a large increase in the demand for their horizontal, and [a] decrease in [the demand for] their vertical, boilers. . . .

During the first part of 1905 the boiler department showed a gain of 15% in shipments over the same period in 1904. There was about [a] 100% increase in the sales of boilers.

. . . [T]he company arrived at a crucial milestone and made a decision that had far-reaching consequences, most of which were unforeseen by those who were responsible for guiding the destiny of the [firm]. At the meeting of the board of directors on September 7, 1905, Brown [reported] that negotiations had been in progress for the sale of the . . . water-tube boiler business. He [announced] that a contract had been drawn up with the Stirling Company of Barberton, Ohio. That company, while its plant was located in Barberton, was organized and existed under the laws of the State of New Jersey.

. . . [F]or a number of years it was common practice of many companies to be incorporated in . . . New Jersey, even though their plants may have been located elsewhere. This practice prevailed because the incorporation laws of . . . New Jersey were more favorable to the corporations than was true in most of the other states. . . .

Mrs. Harter offered a motion . . . to execute the contract with the Stirling Company. That motion passed

[T]he machinery and equipment used in the manufacture of water-tube boilers was moved to Barberton during 1905 The contract between the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and the Stirling Company was [completed] on September 15, 1905. That sale included all of the fixtures and machinery . . . used in the manufacture of water-tube boilers. Among the articles listed were . . . rivet machines, punches, shears, stokers, cranes, planers, hoists, boring mills, locomotive cranes, headers, patterns on hand, and many others, comprising more than [a] hundred items. . . .

The final contract that was executed between the company and Temple provided that he . . . receive \$1,000.00 per month plus a commission of three-fourths of one cent per square foot of heating surface. That contract was to have continued until . . . October [15], 1911. The contract with the Stirling Company provided that, if possible, it was to reach an agreement with Temple. In the event that they failed to [do so], the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company would fulfill its obligation to Temple. In case the latter situation prevailed, the Stirling Company was obligated to reimburse the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company to the extent of \$1,000.00 per month plus three-fourths of one cent per square foot of heating surface.

. . . [C]ontracts in force with [other] companies were to continue until the date of their expiration. . . .

Another adjustment involved the Cahall patents. At that time William H. Cahall owned the interest of Helen E. Cahall and John Cahall in [certain] patents. The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company obligated itself to secure their interests . . . from William H. Cahall. [The firm was] to secure the consent of William H. Cahall to the sale by the Stirling Company of the Cahall vertical and horizontal . . . boilers. . . .

The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company also agreed that it would not engage in the manufacture or sale of water-tube boilers . . . for a period of ten years from the date of the contract. . . .

[The] agreement was ratified by the board of directors at their meeting on September 15, 1905, and signed by J. E. Brown, president of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, and by Edw. R. Stettinius, first vice-president of the Stirling Company. . . .

The Stirling Company paid . . . the sum of \$275,000.00 for [the] water-tube boiler business. To cover this sum, . . . eleven promissory notes were written In addition to this sum they paid \$45,000.00 for all contracts and orders for water-tube boilers on hand. . . . When consideration is given to all of the financial facts incident to the sale, it is probably fair to assume that the Stirling Company paid between \$350,000.00 and \$400,000.00 for the water-tube boiler business

In view of the fact that [the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company's] water-tube boiler business [was] lucrative . . . , why did they sell it? . . . Did the officials consider the building of threshing machinery more profitable? . . .

If the price received for the business is compared [to] the profits realized during the ten years of building and selling water-tube boilers, it appears that the price that [the firm] received for the business is much less than should have been realized. In view of the expansion of the water-tube boiler business of the Stirling Company and later the Babcock & Wilcox Company, one cannot escape the conclusion that, had [Aultman & Taylor] continued their water-tube boiler business, they . . . might have continued in business for . . . more years

That there was a ready sale for [Aultman & Taylor's] boilers is evidenced by the fact that, for a number of years in spite of operating their plant to full capacity, they were unable to manufacture a sufficient number of boilers to satisfy the demand. Under [such] conditions it is difficult to understand the need to continue the outlay of huge sums of money in commissions. . . .

In spite of the fact that the Stirling Company was anxious to acquire the water-tube boiler business, [Aultman & Taylor] employed an agent [to conduct the sale] who was paid a huge sum of money for his services. There are those who are of the opinion that the entire transaction had the earmarks of mediocre management and a lack of good judgment.

Whether the officers of the company were at all times prudent and wise in their judgments and actions will probably always be a matter of conjecture and opinion. . . . Nevertheless, . . . it can scarcely be disputed that the sale of [the] water-tube boiler business and the [relinquishing] of the patent rights [to] the Cahall boiler [were] little less than a colossal blunder.⁹

Notes

1. "Biography of Michael D. Harter." 74-85. *The Sunday Shield*, August 23, 1891.
2. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. Brown, J. E. "The History of This Company and Its Predecessors." *The Rooster*, 1920.
3. Brown, Ted, secretary of the State of Ohio, Court of Common Pleas, Richland County, Ohio.
3. Ibid.
4. Since there were three distinct companies, reference to them is made by their legal names.
5. Record Book.
6. Ibid.
7. A technical presentation has been avoided. For those who desire a more complete . . . discussion, it is suggested that they consult . . . treatises on water-tube boilers.
8. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
9. Ibid.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the eighth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's annals of the Aultman & Taylor Company, as prepared for publication by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's heretofore unpublished book. Acting on a tip from George W. Richey, Dr. Rhode found the manuscript at the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library. Calling it Dr. Bixler's *magnum opus*, Rhode is excited to be involved with the project of making this history of the Aultman & Taylor Company available to readers of the *Album*.

Chapter 8

The Separators

[Aultman & Taylor] built six distinct types, or classes, of separators. They were the Vibrator, Mexican, Dixie, Globe, Columbia, and the New Century. Since a description of their Vibrator separator appeared in an earlier chapter, no mention will be made of it at this point. Following the initial success of the Vibrator, the company continued to experiment, making changes and improvements [on] their machines. . . .

Many of the companies named their separators for the purpose of emphasizing the qualities . . . peculiar to their machines. With the exception of the Vibrator the Aultman & Taylor Company did not follow that practice. The names that they chose for their separators did not reflect their qualities . . . , and neither were they descriptive of the mechanism of their machines. Rather, it appears that the names of their separators were chosen primarily on the basis of the popular appeal of a name at a given time.

Thus, the "Mexican" was due in part to the popularity of their machinery in Mexico. It

also had an adventurous appeal, since [Mexico] was . . . not too well known at the time. “Dixie” came partly as a result of a popular song entitled “Way Down South in Dixie,” which was composed in 1859 by Daniel Decatur Emmett, a native of Mount Vernon, Ohio. The name not only became popular in the South but . . . also had a nostalgic appeal to the Civil War veterans, many of whom were patrons of the Aultman & Taylor Company. Above all, the [firm] enjoyed a thriving trade in the Southern states. The “Globe” was placed on the market in 1888, and that name signified the world-wide use of their machinery.

The “Columbia” [appeared] in 1893. That name had its origin [in] an American ballad entitled “O Columbia, the Gem of the Oceans,” popularly known as the “Red, White, and Blue.” It was composed in 1847 by Thomas A. Becket, a resident of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. [Columbia] was often represented by a woman dressed in red, white, and blue. That ballad also became popular during the Civil War, and its popularity continued unabated well past the turn of the century. No patriotic gathering or Fourth of July celebration was complete without the singing of that [song].¹ . . .

The “New Century” was ready to be placed on the market at the turn of the century, hence the name So it is clear that the names chosen for [the firm’s] separators had a popular appeal

The Dixie

The improved Dixie was known as the famous “Starved Rooster” machine. Being simple in its construction, it appealed to many threshermen. . . .

[A company catalog stated,] “All of the 1897 Dixies will have sheet iron pans between upper and lower shakers at rear end, to prevent straws from shooting into the sieves. The 20 x 32 will have five rakes and will be 21 inches longer than in 1896; it will have a flaring front, giving four inches more feeding room at the mouth of the cylinder.”

[The company catalog described the separation of the Dixie separator:] “All Dixies, except the two smallest sizes, have twelve-bar cylinders, made out of the best soft open-hearth steel. The 17 x 28 and 20 x 32 have nine-bar cylinders. The cylinder spikes are of a special grade of steel, and all stamped with our trademark, to protect our customers from imitations. The concaves are adjustable, by means of a ratchet, to suit the condition of the grain and straw. Behind the cylinder is the heavy sheet steel beater with three wings, which takes the straw from the cylinder and assists it in knocking out the grain and carrying the straw onto the upper shaker, and absolutely preventing choking, which is so annoying and the cause of so many breakages. It also acts as a dust conveyer, as it creates quite a blast, and carries the dust out of the rear end of the machine. Now look at our shaker; it is of the utmost importance, as it is one of the chief mechanisms of a grain separator. We have four to six breaks to the straw against one to three in other machines, thus affording a great advantage over all other makes of separators. The four larger Dixies have six, the 20 x 32 five and the 17 x 28 four rakes. All sizes have notched fishbacks in sections, forming two additional breaks, which cause a much thinner and speedier flow of the straw as it passes over the shakers. This adds very materially to the separation. It is through shaking of the straw and the thin flow that saves the grain. The distance which the straw must travel in our machine while in constant agitation before passing out of it, allows it no opportunity to hide any grain and carry it on to the straw pile.”

[The Dixie separator’s cleaning apparatus received the following catalog commentary:] “The cleaning apparatus is next in importance. Ours is an overblast supplemented by a deflector.

The function of the deflector is to divide the blast in such a manner as to distribute 1 1/8 inch of it between the sieve and chaffer on lower shaker. The object of this division is to separate the chaff from the grain before it reaches the sieve, thus preventing the clogging of sieves. It is an impossibility to clog our sieves. No other machine can boast of anything like it. Our front sieve adjuster is so arranged that one or more sieves can be used.”

[Finally, the catalog described the lower shaker or grain pan:] “It is very important that the Grain Pan is absolutely true, and this we accomplish by a peculiar construction of our crank shafts. The crank chairs are toward the outer ends, two on each side in opposite directions, so that the motion of the two outer and two middle pitmans is alternately. All sizes of Dixies have four pitmans. All our ‘97 Dixies have sheet steel Grain Pans.”²

The Columbia

It was in 1892 that the company built [its] first Columbia separator, which was tried out at Crookston, Minnesota, in the spring of that year. During the following year F. W. Galland sold their first 42 x 64 Columbia separator, which also went to Minnesota. That machine established a record of doing more work in a [shorter] time than any other machine in [the] territory. It was a popular machine from 1893 to 1901. During those eight years [the firm] probably built and sold 1,500 to 1,600 of them. The last Columbias were [produced] in 1901, and they were superceded by the New Century.

The catalog for 1897 states . . . , “The cylinder has twelve double bars, which are made out of the best grade of soft steel. It is laid off by skilled mechanics, who give their entire attention to this work. The same parties also spike it. The next thing of importance is the balancing of it. This is in charge of a competent man, who has an experience of 25 years in the same line of work.” . . .

[The catalog offers this description of the fan:] “The fan has an overblast. It is provided with a regulator that can be set so as to throw the wind on any part of the sieves, as the occasion or the condition of the grain may require. This feature is invaluable. The Fan is driven from the cylinder shaft. The Columbia is a very quiet running machine. You can hear the hum of the cylinder, and that is music to the ear of every farmer and thresherman. Four sets of fishbacks and slatted work constitute the upper shaker. The first three sets move together—the rear one is reversed, moving forward, when the other three move backward Now the great throw of the upper shaker comes into play, hustling the straw out so fast that it has no chance to bunch. This hustling of the straw in a thin stream over the edges of the fishbacks, with the four breaks, caused by the four sets of fishbacks, elevating it to an incline of sixteen inches from the cylinder in the rear set of fishbacks, gives us the perfect separation we claim and enables us to separate all the grain and even the chaff from the straw.”³

The catalog for 1900 carried [an] illustration of [the] Columbia separator, to which was attached a Russell windstacker and a Parsons self-feeder. The Columbias were [the company’s] first separators to which those attachments were added. . . .

The New Century

On November 12, 1898, it was reported to the board of directors that a new separator had been designed by Galland and built by the company. It had been subjected to . . . practical tests that proved it to be a superior separator and cleaner. Isaac Harter, Jr., presented a motion

authorizing the building of fifteen to twenty of various sizes of the new separator and [the distribution of] them over the country, so that they would be given as much . . . testing as possible. Although Harter's motion authorized the building of fifteen to twenty . . . , [the company actually constructed] only three experimental Centuries during 1899. Also during 1899, [the firm experimented] with the Dixie . . . , but neither the experimental Dixie [nor] the New Century were in shape . . . for manufacture.

Galland sold [the company's] first New Century separator, the number of which was N20162. That separator was tried out at Austin, Minnesota, during the season of 1900. The results of the trial were most favorable and gave the company . . . assurance that the new separator would be successful. During the year of 1901 the [firm] went into full production of the New Century separator. . . .

It was in all respects the most successful, efficient, and . . . popular of all the separators that [the company] built. This was due to the fact that many improvements were made on it as the years went by, so that it indeed . . . had few . . . peers among all of the threshing machines. That it was a popular machine is evidenced by the fact that there were a number of years when the company was unable to meet the demand.

Upon its introduction . . . [the firm] gave wide publicity to its most salient features. One of the most extensive and complete descriptions of that separator was published in [the company's] catalog for 1904. Later catalogs presented modifications of that description as improvements were made from time to time⁴ The following description of the New Century separator is taken . . . from the 1904 catalog:⁵

"Instead of complicating the separating mechanism, our reciprocating device simplifies it, and it will at once appeal to those who are not slow to appreciate a good thing when they see it.

"The straw shaker consists of two banks of shake bars which are reciprocal in their operation, one relieving the other at every half revolution. It adapts itself to any kind of grain and seed.

"The straw is conveyed over the shaker in a thin spread under great agitation which means almost perfect separation. The shaker is in perfect balance and only rotates 175 to 180 times per minute, while other single agitating racks are required to make from 210 to 225 agitations per minute to get rid of the straw. Our shaker has two agitations to each rotation, making 350 to 360 agitations per minute, and this is accomplished with less power. Can you realize the great advantage we have in this device? Each rotation moves the straw 20 inches, except where the risers retard it. It is easy to operate as it has but one belt for 10½ feet of shaker.

"There are three sets of risers . . . so arranged on each section as to thoroughly break up and spread any bunch that may come from the cylinder and thus materially aid in the separation of the grain from the straw. by this means the straw is more evenly delivered on the stacker or into the blower, affording a more uniform speed and delivery. It will be observed that with all of these advantages over other single vibrating racks we agitate the straw harder and take it out thinner than is possible by any other device. . . . [T]he racks being in perfect balance . . . makes our shaker an easy runner and necessarily very durable. We do not remember of having furnished a single crank during the last two years, although many hundreds of the New Century have been sold by us. It has also been the cause of much comment how few repairs have been ordered for the New Century.

"The frame of the New Century being comparatively short and low does not require it to be so heavy and brackets not so large. It is so designed that no part of the separator has large spaces between the frame or panel work. It has two rear posts to support shaker or blower. The

small dimensions of height and length of the separator with the large high main sills and short posts insure strength so that self-feeders, weighers, and blowers may be attached without impairing the strength or durability of the separator proper. Bracket irons are so constructed that they fit on two sides of the posts and cap pieces, making our frame strong and durable.

“The siding of the separator is of pine and so constructed that it will contract and expand in any climate without injury to the machine or without marring its comeliness.

“The trucks are of steel, quite heavy and strong, width of tire being 3½ to 10 inches in accordance with the size of the separator. They are so placed beneath the separator as to aid in the draft, the rear wheel being 39 inches and the front 34 inches in diameter.

“Feed tables are of the proper size, just long enough for bundles and to allow rapid feeding. They are very simple and fold towards the cylinder.” . . .

The Oregon Special

The New Century Oregon Special was an extraordinary separator that was designed and built to thresh headed grain. A relatively small number of [these] separators were built primarily to meet the demand of the company’s trade in the Western and Northwestern states.

. . . The Oregon Special had a 32-inch, twelve-bar cylinder with 162 spikes in it. Since the work was spread over so many spikes, less power was required to operate the separator than would have been [needed] with fewer spikes in the cylinder.⁶ . . .

However, in the case of the headed grain the situation [was] quite different from that when grain in full-length straw [was] being threshed. The average length of straws of headed grain was only a few inches, and there was nothing to hold it while the cylinder threshed the grain. . . . [W]hen a head of grain hit the cylinder, it was only a fraction of a second until it was gone. If the grain was not threshed out in that fraction of a second, it was not threshed.

A few of [the Oregon Special] separators were used to thresh bundled grain. . . . [I]t was imperative to have a straw rack behind the cylinder capable of handling an unusual volume of straw. The Aultman & Taylor rack had the capacity to handle the . . . straw [from bundled grain].

With four men pitching sheaves into the feeder of his Oregon Special, Walter Blakely asserted that he could thresh 3,600 bushels of grain every day with the weigher dumping a half bushel of wheat every five seconds. That feat of threshing was accomplished with his 15 HP Aultman & Taylor engine . . .

On . . . another job he threshed 480 bushels of wheat in an hour and twenty minutes. The field of wheat from which that threshing was done yielded 48 bushels of wheat per acre. The shocks of wheat were so thick that it was . . . necessary to back into the field to get the first load.

When the straw came out of the blower having the appearance of stuffed sausage . . . , it was then that good threshing was taking place. On the other hand, when the windstacker was blowing holes [in] the strawstack, as one thresherman put it, “You could starve doing that.”⁷

As already mentioned, the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company [manufactured] only a few Oregon Special separators. . . . [It may have been too] expensive to build them. . . . [T]he competition between the companies was [so] keen [that companies] built machines that were less costly and that they were able to sell at a better profit.

Rarely was there a time when an Aultman & Taylor New Century separator did not function properly. On those . . . occasions the fault was usually with the operator, who did not read or observe the instructions with respect to the speed [at] which the separator was designed

to operate. The directions on the proper speed were usually to be found at the front of the separator under the cylinder. . . . But even when the speed fell below that stipulated by the manufacturer, the Aultman & Taylor separator would continue to operate. It could not be stalled, but, when it [ran] below the required speed, grain was lost. . . .

Interested individuals [and] inventors . . . contributed ideas and suggestions for improvements on the separator. Illustrative of such practices was an offer made . . . by A. C. Sattley.

At the directors meeting on January 4, 1905, Sattley of the Sattley Stacker company was called into the meeting for the purpose of presenting the merits of a separating device, the patents [for] which his company had control. He agreed to ship to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company one of [his] devices for experimental purposes and also to send an expert to assist in the experiments at the expense of the Sattley Stacker Company. No other reference to those experiments was made in any of the company's publications, so it is not known whether that device was incorporated into their separators.⁸

During 1917 the company built eleven "Low-Down," or low-deck, separators. They differed from the standard New Century separator in the construction of the rack. It was fitted with a three-way crank instead of a two-way. The change in the construction of the rack reduced the height of [the] 20 x 32 machine by four inches; the 23 x 36 and 27 x 42 by five inches; the 32 x 50 and the 42 x 64 by eight inches. The riddles and chaffers were forty-eight inches long irrespective of the size of the separators. [The Low-Down separators were] designed . . . to fulfill a long-felt need in the Eastern part of the country where considerable barn threshing was done. A machine lower in height was required to overcome the difficulty encountered by many machines when entering barns having low doorways. . . . After 1917 the company built both high-deck and low-deck separators.⁹

. . . [A] fair estimate of the number of separators that [Aultman & Taylor] built was approximately 40,000. That would include the Vibrator, Mexican, Dixie, Globe, Columbia, and New Century. [The company] built almost as many New Centuries as all of the other types . . . combined.

No Steel Separators

At the annual meeting of the stockholders on January 20, 1898, the president was instructed to investigate the steel construction of a separator and to report his findings to the directors at their November meeting of that year. . . . [T]he minutes of that November meeting . . . [contain] no report on the steel separator, nor was any report on that separator ever presented Neither is there any record in existence that gives even the slightest indication that the company ever built a steel separator. Moreover, former employees of the company with whom the writer conversed were in total agreement with the preceding statement.

This point has been stressed . . . to obviate an erroneous opinion expressed by some that Aultman & Taylor built a few steel separators.¹⁰ . . .

Contemplated Sale of Thresher Department

An interesting sidelight is contained in one of the president's reports to the directors. . . . [O]n January 18, 1900, there appears the following statement: "If the thresher department is not sold and we attempt to get out anything like an average output at the present day, it is going to

necessitate . . . vigorous action”

It would appear on the basis of the above statement that [the company] must have contemplated selling the thresher department. . . . Whatever may have been the considerations in that instance, the thresher department was not sold, but it is interesting to observe that its sale was even given consideration. It is to be remembered that those were the years when [the firm’s] water-tube boiler business flourished, and during a few of those years [the company was] unable to fill all of their orders for boilers. . . . [I]t may well be that . . . consideration was given to the elimination of the building of threshers and devotion of their efforts entirely to the building of engines and boilers. . . . In view of the fact that the succeeding years for the most part were profitable ones and [that] they were scarcely able to meet the demands for the New Century separator, it appears at this distance that to have disposed of their thresher business would have been a blunder of the first magnitude. Fortunately they were spared that [mistake].¹¹

Notes

1. Brown, C. A. *The Story of the National Ballads*. New York: Thomas Crowell.
2. Aultman & Taylor catalogs, 1897, 1898, 1900.
3. “Fishback” refers to notches on the agitators or shakers that propel straw back toward the rear of the machine. Sometimes the notches were covered with metal or prongs projected upward from the fishbacks.
4. Aultman & Taylor catalogs, 1897, 1898, 1900.
5. Aultman & Taylor catalogs, 1904-1923.
6. Ibid.
7. Personal letters and conversation with Walter E. Blakely.
8. Aultman & Taylor catalogs, 1904-1923.
9. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
10. Ibid.
11. Interview with Herbert C. Rupp.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

In this issue of the *Album* appears the ninth installment of Dr. Bixler’s history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, as edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler’s book. Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, passed away before he could publish the manuscript on which he had labored for many years. This installment continues Dr. Bixler’s descriptions of Aultman & Taylor machinery, including intriguing firsthand testimony.

Chapter 9

Separator Attachments, Painting, Clover Hullers, and Sawmills

. . . [T]o increase efficiency, reduce labor, and accomplish satisfactory work, a number of attachments were added to the [Aultman & Taylor] separators. The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company manufactured the Galland, Netherly, and Sattley swinging stackers. They also added to their separators windstackers, self-feeders, measuring boxes, dust collectors, etc. . . .

The Sattley Attached Stacker

One of the auxiliary attachments was the Sattley Stacker. It possessed several features that were improvements over the old drag, or web, stacker. One of these was that it could oscillate between two points, so that the straw could be deposited at various places on the strawstack between these two points. The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company presented the following description of the Sattley Stacker:

“We have made arrangements with the owners of the patents of the Sattley Stacker to manufacture this machine, heretofore we had them manufactured to our order. Threshermen may rest assured that it will be fully up to the high standard of Aultman-Taylor machinery This machine is so constructed that the discharge at the end of the stacker remains approximately over the center of the stack, thus avoiding the laborious work of pitching back in order to build a good stack.

“The lower section of this stacker is stationary so far as any vertical movement is concerned, and it has two raddles in it, and by reason of these two raddles it is not necessary to use such a wide chute. The straw goes up between these raddles and is delivered to the outer chute in such shape that it is well taken care of and is delivered onto the stack in the best possible condition for handling.

“One peculiarity of this stacker is the fact that the rear of the separator is housed in by a sheet of steel housing, and the aperture which usually exists between such housing and the turntable of the stacker, is closed up by curtains on each side which are attached to rollers on the separator. The shafts of these rollers are wound on heavy clock springs, and they pay out and take up automatically as the stacker oscillates.

“A very valuable feature of this machine . . . is the straw pressers which are composed of two long strips of wood extending from the lower chute to the outer end of the upper chute. These straw pressers are so arranged that they keep the straw from rolling back when the upper chute is elevated to its highest point, and not only that, but it prevents the straw from being blown off the chute during a heavy side or tail wind. . . .

“The weight of this stacker is so distributed that it does not injure or rack the separator. This is proven by actual experience in the field for the past three or four seasons.

“The stacker . . . builds the stack in the form of an arc of a circle.

“It is the only machine that can be folded over and made ready for the road in ten minutes.

“It does not require much power to run it, and from the fact that it delivers the straw in such splendid condition, there is no objection made by the men on the stack in stacking after it.”¹

[The] stackers reduced the amount of labor and the number of men required to build a

strawstack. They never achieved the popularity of the windstacker and were on the market only a few years when they were superceded by the windstacker. . . . On January 18, 1900, the president's report included the following statement . . . : "Of [the Sattley stackers] we have no records of the number built, but the demand for them has been quite good, and, were it not for the fact that our stacker, while the best there is, is very expensive to build, it would be advisable to push it, but I doubt whether at present costs our sales of these stackers give us satisfactory returns."² On the surface, [this] statement appears . . . contradictory. The truth is that the demand was such that it did not warrant the continuation of the building of the stackers.

The Windstacker

The patent rights on the windstacker were owned and controlled by the Indiana Manufacturing Company of Indianapolis, Indiana. That control amounted to a virtual monopoly on the windstacker. While it was necessary for the companies that built windstackers to secure permission to manufacture the Farmer's Friend and to pay a royalty of \$250.00 on each [windstacker], yet each company was granted permission to make certain adaptations to satisfy their own peculiar needs. This was true in the case of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. For a number of years they purchased the Russell geared and gearless stackers. That company [not to be confused with Russell & Company of Massillon, Ohio] was also located in Indianapolis. However, during the later years Aultman & Taylor built their own windstackers under the patent rights controlled by the Indiana Manufacturing Company.³

Painting the Machinery

The appearance and attractiveness of the threshing machinery varied among the companies and was largely dependent upon the skill of the painters. . . . During well on to a quarter of a century Mr. Walborn was the foreman of the [Aultman & Taylor] paint shop. His work showed an artistry that was seldom excelled. His daughter, Mrs. John C. Schneider, informed the writer that her father did the striping on [the firm's] machinery . . . from 1902 to 1923. She stated that he used a small fine brush and did the striping freehand. He used no instruments—no lines or striping wheel. He was a perfectionist and did not tolerate shoddy work on the part of the men who worked with him. In those few instances when the painting did not meet his standards the men were required to do the work again until his standards of workmanship were met.

Many will recall that on the side of the tailings elevator on the separators were pictures of Aultman and Taylor. Similar pictures appeared on the water tanks on the left-hand side of both their bevel gear and spur gear engines. Those pictures were done freehand by Walborn. Schneider states that her father painted those pictures with several sweeps of his brush. The fact that even today after the passing of many years there are Aultman & Taylor separators used at some of the shows upon which the pictures . . . are still visible . . . attests to the . . . talent and great skill of the painters, such as Walborn. They were . . . outstanding artists.⁴

Clover Hullers

[A] product that was added to [the company's] line in the early 1870s was a clover huller attachment that was appended to [the] threshing machine. . . . After hulling the clover . . . it was

necessary to run the seed through a fanning mill so as to make it fit for the market. Under these conditions the thresherman needed a grain thresher, clover huller, and . . . fanning mill. Such an outfit was expensive and inconvenient. [The company's] clover-huller attachment was . . . patented on May 28, 1878, by Joseph Allonas, who, as already noted, was the first general superintendent of the plant. It became known as the "Allonas Clover-Huller Attachment." That improvement turned out to be a popular one, since it not only contributed to a reduction of inconvenience to the thresherman but also added to his profits.⁵

[Later,] David Whiting of Ashland, Ohio, invented a clover huller and on July 23, 1884, filed . . . an application for a patent on that huller. . . . Patent #316,210 was issued to Whiting on April 21, 1885. For a period of almost ten years it was manufactured under the trade name of Eureka. During those years it established a reputation for superior speed, separation, and thorough work.

In 1893 the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company gained complete and absolute control . . . of the patent rights to the Eureka Clover Huller. During that same year [the firm] began building the huller that they renamed the Matchless Clover Huller. Following the acquisition of the . . . huller, [the company] made improvements from time to time . . .

[The] huller was built in three sizes, and the sizes of the cylinders were as follows: No. 3, upper 32" and lower 36"; No. 4, upper 36" and lower 42"; and No. 5, upper 40" and lower 49".

Principles of Construction

[An Aultman & Taylor catalog stated:] "Here we call your attention to the construction of the Matchless Huller. In separating the seed from the straw, the Matchless has a system of its own. This consists of a series of Rotating Troughs with adjustable slatted bottom. There are wires projecting upward from the top of these troughs to prevent the straw passing too rapidly. Under the troughs are galvanized steel cups which are attached to the bottom of the troughs.

"These cups acting as scrapers form a positive method of conveying the pods and chaff to the lower or Hulling cylinder regardless of whether the clover be wet or dry.

"In other makes of hullers, clover pods and material accumulate and stick to the separator bottom, especially in damp material from the separator bottom.

"Do you realize the advantage of having a sure, steady movement to the Hulling Cylinder if you want to do fast, clean hulling?"

Hulling Cylinder

[The catalog continued:] "The Hulling Cylinder and Concave are filled with square steel brads. These are driven securely into hardwood staves through a metal covering. The exposed end of the brad is almost square and tapers to the point which is driven into the wood. These brads are made especially for the purpose that we use them and are of material selected because of its adaptability to our purpose. The wearing qualities of the cylinder and concaves are double those of any other design because of their construction permitting the reversing of the Hulling Cylinder and Concaves end for end"

[The catalog took special note of the growing interest in alfalfa:] "Much of the alfalfa produced in the West has been hulled with the ordinary grain separator, but as the importance of alfalfa culture is taking hold of the farmer of the irrigated districts of the West, the demand for machines that will save this seed is growing. There is no machine on the American market that

is calculated to answer this purpose as well as the Matchless. It is capable of hulling, saving, and cleaning in perfect manner 100 bushels and up in a day of ten hours—almost unlimited capacity.”

. . . The company used the Harvey feeder on all of their clover hullers.⁶

Sawmills

The following is a brief description of [Aultman & Taylor’s] sawmills.

Aultman & Taylor Standard Sawmill

[A supplement to a company catalog stated:] “This mill is calculated for any power from 6 to 30 HP. It will carry saws up to 64 inches. We are prepared to equip this mill with rack as well as cable feed.

“Our patent variable friction feed is the simplest and most perfect on the market. It can be instantly set to any feed $\frac{3}{4}$ to 5 inches. It has notches in the quadrant for holding the feed in position. It has less parts than any other variable feed.

“Cable feed is novel and simple. It has no drum. The cable runs over a sheaved gear wheel. This arrangement allows a slacker cable than with a drum. Cable is always in a straight line, and the strain never varies. With a drum, the length of feed is limited; with ours it is not. Track may be lengthened any distance by setting out the sheaved wheels and providing a longer cable. Much hard labor of handling logs can be avoided by this feed, as it permits you to run the carriage out to the logs.

“A friction cone feed of great strength, capable of holding any size log, may be had in place of the variable.”⁷

With respect to [the Aultman & Taylor] pony “E” and “F” mills, [company literature] stated . . . , “It would lead too far to describe our line, but suffice it to say that we can supply our customers with anything from a Pony up to a Mammoth Mill ranging in capacity from 3,000 to 20,000 and more lumber per day.”

With the purchase of the Mansfield Machine Works, Aultman & Taylor acquired control of the Mansfield mill. It was popular among a number of users. The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company continued to build that mill . . . to satisfy those customers who were partial to it.

[A company catalog described the mill:] “The Husk, or frame, is 7 feet 10 inches long by 3 feet 6 inches wide, made of seasoned timber, 11½ inches by 3½ inches, . . . double tendoned, and held together firmly by rods and nuts instead of bolts.

“The mandrel is steel, 2 11/16 inches in diameter, wrought collar and nut; saw bearing standard, 2 inches in diameter by 10½ inches face. This size can be changed if desired. All pulleys on this mill are turned and perfectly balanced.

“The mandrel boxes are lined with the best metal. Box next to saw is adjustable; nut on frame next to main pulley is pivoted and adjusts to any position on the mandrel, relieving the mandrel of all liability to bind and heat.”⁸

Picket Mills

During the 1880s and 1890s the picket fence was used on many farms to enclose fields in

which stock was pastured. [Such] fence was constructed by nailing the pickets or stakes to horizontal boards, or the more common practice was to run several strands of wire horizontally. The wires were twisted around the pickets to hold them in place. With the . . . wide use of the picket fence a demand arose for picket mills, but that demand was of short duration. After a few years of exposure to the weather—and subject to strong winds—the wires rusted, and the fences deteriorated and fell apart. Disgruntled farmers patched them, but in the end they proved to be unsatisfactory for fencing in cattle and other stock.

The company built a relatively small number of picket mills. In 1891 . . . they [produced] ten With the decrease in the use . . . of the picket fences . . . the company discontinued . . . manufacture [of the mills].⁹ . . .

Corn Husker and Shredder

During the early part of the twentieth century the corn huskers and ensilage cutters were introduced. Like flies descending upon a spilled jar of honey, the companies scrambled to . . . market [such machines]. The mention of such names as Appleton, Blizzard, McCormick, Ohio, Rosenthal, Tornado, and many others indicates that it was deemed . . . a profitable field of manufacture. With so many companies rushing into the [production] of those machines one can understand the reasons . . . that impelled Aultman & Taylor to make a careful survey of the pros and cons of building a corn husker and shredder.

. . . [A]t the directors meeting on February 7, 1906, the subject of the manufacture of a corn husker-shredder was discussed. On that occasion it was the consensus . . . that the subject under consideration should be explored and studied thoroughly. The Van Ness proposition that had been presented to the board was laid over until the next season. The minutes give no clue as to the nature or content of that proposition. However, it may be assumed that it concerned patents . . . pertaining to a corn husker-shredder that would have been granted to the company upon the payment of a certain stipend. . . . [N]o action was ever taken on it. The president was instructed to explore the matter fully with the company's managers and to present a report at the next meeting of the board.

At a special meeting of the board of directors held on July 1, 1906, the corn husker-shredder [topic] again came up for consideration. . . . During the intervening months . . . the [idea had been] examined thoroughly with a view to adding the manufacture of a corn husker-shredder to [the Aultman & Taylor] line. After a lengthy discussion the directors voiced the opinion that the [production] of such a machine would not prove . . . a desirable and profitable addition to their line. So while it is clear that the company contemplated building a corn husker-shredder, yet it never manufactured such a machine.¹⁰

That was in all probability a wise decision. Frequently in the manufacture of agricultural machinery, when a new product emerged, it was viewed as an opportunity to make a good profit. As a result the market was often flooded with machines that remained in the warehouses or in the dealers' hands. With the rivalry and competition between the companies becoming ever keener, in due time many of them dropped out of the game. . . . [W]ith the introduction of new machines for harvesting corn, the market changed, and there was no longer a strong demand for corn husker-shredders. . . .

Notes

1. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
2. Ibid.
3. For additional information on the windstacker the following references are suggested: Bixler, Lorin E., "More about the Windstacker." *The Iron-Men Album* (July/August 1961), 3-4; Holbrook, Stewart. *Machines of Plenty*. New York: MacMillan, 1955. 106-107; Wik, Reynold. *Steam Power on the American Farm*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1953. 88-91.
4. Interview with Mrs. John C. Schneider.
5. Dr. Rhode moved this paragraph from a later chapter to this location, where it logically belongs.
6. Ibid.
7. Supplement to Aultman & Taylor catalog, 1907.
8. Aultman & Taylor catalog, 1915.
9. Record Book.
10. Ibid.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

In this issue of the *Album*, the tenth installment of Dr. Bixler's chronicle of the Aultman & Taylor Company appears. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book, as edited and prepared for publication by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, passed away before he could publish the manuscript on which he had expended much energy and great devotion. In this chapter, Dr. Bixler recalls the halcyon days when Aultman & Taylor built steam engines and pioneered in the construction of gasoline tractors.

Chapter 10

The Debut of the Steam Engine and the Aultman & Taylor Tractors

Allusion has already been made to the fact that the vibrator thresher required a steady . . . power that was impossible to secure with the horse powers. Then, too, there arose in the major grain growing areas of the country a demand for a larger separator, but horse powers were inadequate to . . . operate those machines efficiently.

Under the pressure of [these] demands the companies began to build steam engines. [A]t first portables then a few years later traction engines came into general use. . . .

[I]n spite of the skepticism that prevailed among the farmers, the demand for steam engines continued to grow apace. . . . Among the first [manufacturers] to recognize and meet that demand was the C. & G. Cooper Company of Mount Vernon, Ohio. During 1868-69 they built [an experimental] traction engine that was steered by horses.

Keenly aware of the changing conditions of the time, the Aultman & Taylor

Manufacturing Company had no intention of permitting other companies to preempt the market. . . . [T]hey quickly came to the realization that it would be necessary to build steam engines if they were to remain in business Consequently during 1876 they selected a portable engine that was deemed . . . the most perfect of all those proposed for their consideration. The design of the Aultman & Taylor engine was similar to that of the Cooper engine. . . . [They] were built in 6 and 12 HP sizes and were mounted on horizontal boilers. The steamchest was placed at the rear on the left side of the boiler with the flywheel on the right side near the front of the engine. [It] was mounted on wooden wheels and drawn by horses. It was named “The Aultman & Taylor Farm Engine.”

. . . The Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company was not among the first to [produce] traction engines but designed and built [its] first traction engine during 1880.¹ It was a bevel gear engine, [one of many] of those engines built by the company and that contributed significantly to the reputation and success of the [firm]. [The traction engine followed the same design as the portable engine. The company continued to use this design] until 1906. That year they built only four of [the engines so designed, and that] was the last year that they built [them].² [Shortly before, the firm had introduced a spur gear traction engine that differed greatly from the bevel gear style and that proved quite successful. The firm’s] building of bevel gear engines extended over a period of twenty-six years. [Aultman & Taylor] built [steam engines] for a period of thirty-nine years.

[The company’s first] self-propelled engines were known as the “Aultman & Taylor Traction Engine” and were attractive in appearance. After [the very] first traction engine was built and having satisfied [itself] that it was superior to any on the market, [the company] invited seven men to witness its operation and to render a judgment with respect to its suitability for the purpose for which it was built. [The] men were . . . [considered] experts on steam engines: . . . E. S. Downey of Aurora, Indiana; Edward Smith of La Gro, Indiana; C. F. Adams of Parkman, Ohio; Daniel Harmon of Fort Wayne, Indiana; Oscar Adams of Parkman, Ohio; and R. R. Blair of Cincinnati, Ohio. [The] men were requested to render an honest judgment relative to the [engine’s] merits The engine was given a severe test, and [the] group of carefully selected men recorded the following judgment:

“The undersigned have each had a very wide and at the same time intimate acquaintance with traction and self-propelling engines in the market; have each of us sold them and operated them and are practically familiar with them and can, without claiming any unreasonable amount of shrewdness, say we are competent to give an intelligent opinion on the subject, and think it will be safe for all parties who intend buying traction or self-propelled engines, or intend to sell traction engines to others, to accept our judgment in the matter. While we wish cordially to admit the merits of other traction engines, and while we do not criticize other makes, nevertheless it is our unanimous opinion the Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine is today the most perfect and desirable in the American market. In every point and feature, the Aultman-Taylor is at least abreast of the best, while in general workmanship, neatness in detail and perfection in finish, we have never seen its equal, and in some important points it is absolutely without rivals:

“1. the two propelling-wheels are mechanically the most perfect we have ever seen, and their height is such as to recommend them over any in the market, and their location for sustaining the weight of the engine and securing freedom of motion in bad roads has never, to our knowledge, been equaled.

“2. The lugs rolled into the tire of these wheels by a process secured to The Aultman & Taylor Company by letters of patent, is far in advance of the pins usually used, and will be found

a great daily convenience in moving from place to place, especially over bridges, where the objections to pins is apparent.

“3. In the Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine the propelling power is communicated directly from the main shaft to the rear axle, thus entirely doing away with the supplemental shaft and complicated gearing of the same, in use on all traction engines we are acquainted with. How great this advantage is will at once be understood by all who know anything about traction engines; to others we would say, in this respect the Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine has several distinct advantages: (a) simplicity; (b) economy in fuel; (d) increased durability; (e) decreased weight; (f) ease of management; (g) decreased liability to delays from breakage. We should think these advantages would add at least \$100 to the value of the Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine.

“4. The Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine has what all others lack, and what every traction engine should have, and that is a simple, easily managed arrangement for reversing the motion and propelling the engine backward as well as forward. In bad roads, and especially when the roads are full of mud-holes, this really is a prime necessity, and it is a feature we cannot praise too highly, as many men will now feel free to buy traction engines who have always refused to buy them because they feared in heavy roads they might get ‘stuck in the mud,’ and being unable to get any purchase by backing, would be greatly annoyed and delayed.

“The points named by us, taken in connection with the general excellence of the Aultman-Taylor Traction Engine, are so important as to lead us to say that, unquestionably, in our opinion, this engine is worth to any purchaser more than any traction engine in the market; and as it meets and overcomes all the objections ever made to traction engines, it must find a very general and, we cannot help but feel, an enormous demand.”

[A] team was used only to steer the engine, [for] it propelled itself. . . . The testimony of this group of men became a selling gimmick. . . . [Such] testimony given by a group of competent men whose prestige was high carried considerable weight with prospective customers and so became an effective instrument in selling the engine. . . .

[The engine was] propelled by an inclined shaft on the right-hand side of the boiler extending from the crankshaft of the engine to the rear axle [and] that was connected with large bevel gears. Hence they became known as bevel gear engines. They also became popularly known as the “Sunflower Engine” since the large bevel gear connected with the crankshaft resembled a sunflower. . . . For many years an exact model of this first engine was on display in the office of the company

Within a few years following the building of their first engine a number of improvements were made, such as self-steering, the link reverse, and iron wheels. With the rapid increase in the demand for these engines it became necessary to . . . [construct] additional shops exclusively for the building of the Aultman & Taylor Farm Engine and the Aultman & Taylor Traction Engine.

From the bending of the boiler plates to the painting of the finished engine all of the work was done under one roof. Even at that time there was a considerable amount of division of labor so that the men who were responsible for certain jobs became competent in those phases of engine building.

[During the 1870s and 1880s, when the firm began building steam engines, Aultman & Taylor enjoyed rapid expansion of its business. In a typical year during those decades the company used the following amounts of materials] in the manufacture of threshing machinery: molding sand, clay, etc., 50 [railroad car loads]; coal, 300 cars; oil and varnish, 8 cars; sail and

wire cloth, 7 cars; lumber, belting, etc., 507 cars; hardware, 9 cars; and iron, 326 cars. [A] total of 1,207 car loads of materials were used during one year. It was stated that this number of cars would make a train of fifteen miles in length.

. . . In 1878 the Aultman & Taylor Company was one of the largest builders of threshing machinery in the country. From 1868 through 1880, with the exception of one year . . . (1878), they were able to fill all of the orders for their machinery. During those years they were compelled to increase production several times . . . to meet the demands for their machinery. This was accomplished by working extra time . . . and by the enlargement of their working force.

Then, too, in order to achieve increased production it became necessary to add extensions to their plant, such as shops, warehouses, offices, and yards. These additions increased the total area to thirty-five acres.

Another interesting set of figures portrays the magnitude of [the firm's] business. In 1867 [the company] used \$200.00 worth of postage stamps while [the firm's] expenses for postage in 1880 were over \$5,000.00. . . . [I]t should be remembered that this was many years before any increase in postage occurred.

The Tractors

The successful development of the gasoline automobile gave rise to a demand for a gasoline tractor capable of replacing the steam engine as a source of power. The first record of the Aultman & Taylor Company's interest in the building of a tractor was evidenced by action taken by the board of directors on July 1, 1906. At that meeting a committee . . . was appointed, the members of which were Arnold Kalmerten, James Reynolds, and G. W. Gans. That committee was instructed to investigate the merits of a certain patent for a gasoline engine in which Kalmerten was interested.³ Apparently the idea of building [an Aultman & Taylor] tractor had its origin in the mind of one man, Kalmerten.

[The] committee was empowered to formulate a plan for adoption, if the committee [were to deem] it advisable . . . to . . . build and sell such a gasoline engine, or tractor. The committee was invested with the power to act, and so no report of the committee was ever made to the board of directors. However, later events show that the committee must have [considered] the plan to have had merit and so proceeded to act. Yet, four years elapsed following the appointment of the committee before [the company's] first tractor was built. It was [manufactured] during 1910, sold, and shipped to Fargo, South Dakota, where it was tested.⁴ . . .

. . . [The firm's] first tractor, Number 1, nicknamed "Old Trusty," was . . . sold by F. W. Galland on July 4, 1910. . . . [B]y 1920 that tractor had plowed ten-thousand acres and was used for threshing each fall It was still running well in 1920.⁵

Following the testing of that tractor, [the company] placed [its] tractors on the market. [In 1910] the executive committee of the board of directors was authorized to build in lots of twenty-five . . . from time to time as the conditions of the trade required. The records do not show the number of tractors that [the company] built each year. However, the executive committee was authorized to build 160 in 1915, 224 in 1916, and 300 in 1917. A fair estimate of the total number of tractors . . . built would . . . be approximately 4,500. [The firm produced] more tractors in the [30-60] size . . . than [in] any of the [other sizes].

. . . [Company catalogs stated:] "Our motors are built for heavy-duty service; are of the four-cylinder, four-cycle type, cylinders are cast in pairs and arranged parallel and in horizontal position. Being cast in pairs, the weight is lessened, perfect water circulation provided, greater

rigidity with fewer joints secured by bolts and a simple water and carburetor connection.”

. . . [The firm claimed,] “With the drop forge cam shaft used in Aultman & Taylor tractor motors, the timing is fixed before leaving the factory and will practically never need adjusting.”

. . . [Catalogs also said,] “All Aultman-Taylor tractors are provided with both battery and magneto. . . . Battery consists of ten No. 6 dry cells arranged in two series” [The company stated,] “The speed of our motors is automatically controlled by a fly-ball governor, placed intact in the crankcase, driven by a gear off the cam shaft. The speed may be varied from 125 to 500 revolutions per minute on 25-50 and 30-60 sizes, and from 125 to 600 revolutions on 18-36, by simply moving a lever.”⁶

[The firm’s catalogs said,] “We wish to call your attention to our valve-in-head construction. This construction insures maximum power and efficiency, with a minimum consumption of fuel. The valves are easily removed by pressing down on the spring and removing the pin after cylinder heads have been removed. A cap holds the pin in position, preventing its loss or removal except by compressing the spring. The valve rods have a ball on one end that fits in a socket in the upper end of rocker arm.” . . .

[The firm stated,] “The cylinders are cast from a mixture of semi-steel of a special chemical analysis so that they will wear smooth and hard as glass. Contrast this with soft-coarse-grained cast iron as used by many other tractor builders. . . . The cylinder heads are cast in pairs, and secured to the cylinders by heavy stud bolts provided with copper asbestos gaskets. These heads can be readily and easily removed to clean out carbon deposits in combustion chambers. To secure best results from an internal combustion engine, carbon deposits must not be permitted.”

. . . [The 30-60] achieved immediate success and was specially adapted to the needs of large farms. It was capable of pulling eight to twelve plows and operated the largest thresher built.

. . . During the season of 1918 the company announced a new and smaller size, a 15-30 HP tractor. It was designed for the 200-acre farm and was the smallest tractor that [the company] built. . . . [W]ith it they . . . hoped to satisfy the demand for a small tractor, as well as to meet the competition from other companies that had placed small tractors on the market. While it [may have been] a good tractor, it did not capture the market and was not as popular as were several other tractors of that period. It was capable of pulling four fourteen-inch plows [The company’s] 1920 and later catalogs stated that [the] 15-30 tractor could handle [the firm’s] 27-inch New Century separator fully equipped. No figures are available as to the number of that size tractor that they built, but it is probably fair to state that it [was] fewer than any of the other sizes

[The firm’s] tractors received considerable favorable publicity as a result of the . . . records . . . they made in tests . . . , particularly those staged at Winnipeg, Fremont, and Lincoln. In 1912 [the company’s] tractors were submitted to tests at Winnipeg [and] were proved to be superior. At the Fremont Power Demonstration in 1917, Aultman & Taylor tractors pulled one 14-inch plow 7 inches deep for each 3 HP drawbar rating. It was claimed that the Aultman & Taylor tractors at that demonstration showed approximately twenty percent greater efficiency than any of the other tractors entered

Then in 1919 . . . Nebraska enacted a law [that any] company that sold a tractor in . . . Nebraska was required to submit that tractor to tests Those tests were conducted on the state fairgrounds at Lincoln . . . during the latter part of June and the early part of July in 1920. The description . . . of those tests is presented in considerable detail in a statement written by W.

H. Worthington, who was the company's chief engineer: . . . "In the early part of last year (1919), . . . Nebraska put into effect a law designed to encourage the manufacture and use of improved types of tractors, and to contribute to their more successful adoption for farm purposes, and at the same time to protect the farmer against untrue and unfair claims regarding any tractor offered for sale. In order to check the claims and statements made by the manufacturer, it was decided that a stock tractor of each model sold within the state should be tested and passed upon by a board of engineers under the management of the State University.

"The test on each tractor was run in seven parts as follows: First, each tractor was given a running in or limbering up period of twelve hours on a dirt track, during which time it pulled a load ranging from one-third to its full rated drawbar horsepower. Second, the tractor was taken indoors and belted to a Sprague electric dynamometer where it carried its rated belt load at rated speed for two hours. Following the rated load run on the belt was, third, a one hour variable load test wherein the tractor developed from no load to full load, and, fourth, one hour run at one-half rated load, followed by, fifth, a one hour maximum load run with the governor wide open. After having passed these indoor tests, the tractor was taken to the cinder testing track where the sixth part of the test was applied by causing it to pull its rated drawbar load for a period of ten hours. This rated drawbar run [was] immediately followed by, seventh, a maximum load test which consisted of a series of short runs with increased load for each run until the engine was either overloaded or the drivewheel slipped excessively. The drawbar horsepower of the tractor was measured by means of an electric dynamometer car especially designed and built by the University for the running of these tests. The draft of this car could be changed at will with a maximum limit of five thousand pounds so that any desired load could be applied and maintained. A regular Gulley traction dynamometer was built into the hitch of this car in such a way that the exact pull of the tractor in pounds, together with the number of feet traveled, could be measured and recorded.

"Until such time as a tractor could be tested, the manufacturer was granted a temporary permit to sell tractors subject to the results of the tests. As a result, some ninety-three tractors were offered for test, and the work of testing them at the University began early this spring.

"Owing to the fact that a number of tractor manufacturers who were entered previous to ourselves were unable to get their tractors ready for the tests at the appointed time, we entered ahead of our turn. Our tractors were shipped the early part of June, arriving at Lincoln Saturday night, the 26th, when Mr. Hoig of the Lincoln branch wired us and immediately Mr. Cedarburg and myself went out there to arrange the tests.

"It was necessary for us to run the tractors out to the state grounds some three miles from the center of the city before bolting on the lugs. As a result of the delay, we did not get the first tractor started on the limbering up run until Wednesday morning, the 30th. During the entire time of the tests, there were always delays due to rains and other unavoidable happenings, so that we were nearly three weeks making the entire series of runs, which, however, were successfully completed without any especially exciting event, except that our 30-60 first broke the spring in the traction dynamometer, tore the 10" belt down about forty feet of its length. There were no casualties suffered by this accident, although one of the testers came very nearly being spanked to death.

"The following excellent performance of our several tractors, as taken from the official reports, speak for themselves:

15-30 Tractor Maximum horsepower on the belt	34.37
Maximum drawbar horsepower	21.19

22-45 Tractor	Maximum horsepower on the belt	46.66
	Maximum drawbar horsepower low gear	28.10
	Maximum drawbar horsepower high gear	25.58
30-60 Tractor	Maximum horsepower on the belt on kerosene	75.49
	Maximum horsepower on the belt on gasoline	80.10
	Maximum drawbar horsepower on kerosene	55.35
	Maximum drawbar horsepower on gasoline	58.05

“To give us enough load during the maximum test of the 30-60, we pulled, in addition to the dynamometer car, an Avery 18-36, our own 22-45 with clutch in and the engine turning, two stone boats, each loaded to 1500 pounds weight, and a pair of heavy rolls with concrete. The entire load made quite a dignified looking procession, and caused no end of comment. At the time this test was run, the track was covered with dust to the depth of over three inches, but owing to the design of the lug equipment used on our drive wheels slippage was but 4.3%, which established a new low slippage record for this track. It is interesting to note that our 30-60 is the most powerful tractor tested by the University.

“There is, of course, a very considerable degree of opposition to these tests among manufacturers whose tractors do not come up to their ratings, but there are a good many, who, like ourselves, really build tractors capable of satisfactorily doing everything claimed by them, who welcome this opportunity of getting an official test on so scientific and unvarying a basis.

“The University authorities, while obliged to live up to the absolute letter of the law in these tests, nevertheless were extremely courteous and obliging at all times and did everything in their power to secure the best results possible. Except in the limbering up run, our tractors were operated entirely by the University engineers, and neither Mr. Cedarburg nor myself were permitted to make any adjustments whatsoever.

“We really feel that our tractors made an enviable record, especially in view of the Winnipeg contests which were held eight years ago in which our 30-60 tractor made a medal winning performance. However, we find at this time it developed but 61.2 horsepower on kerosene and 73.4 horsepower on gasoline, and did not have to pull the radiator fans, which consumes at least three horsepower. Furthermore, an allowance of 7% for belt slippage was made at Winnipeg, whereas no such credit was given at Lincoln, all of which shows that the performance of our tractor has been continually improved. This bettering of past performances, however, indicates the . . . trend of the industry in general. Nevertheless, it is gratifying to feel that we are maintaining the lead that it has always been our privilege to assume.”

. . . In light of Worthington’s excellent report on [the] tractor tests at Lincoln, . . . one can understand . . . the confidence and pride which the company displayed in [its] tractors. . . . It was a rare privilege for those who witnessed [the] tractors performing under the severest and most rigid kinds of tests that it was possible to devise at that time. Small wonder then that the Aultman & Taylor tractors received wide acclaim and became a favorite among many users!

. . . [As a young man,] Herbert C. Rupp was employed . . . as a service man for the International Harvester Company and covered the northwestern states, including Minnesota and the Dakotas. The following incident occurred near Bismarck, North Dakota. A group of men were threshing with an Avery tractor that was giving them trouble, and Rupp was asked to . . . rectify it. He rode from Bismarck with a minister in a Model T Ford. When they approached the farm, Rupp remarked to the minister that one of the valves in the tractor was not working.

. . . [The] men were Germans, and, while Rupp worked on the tractor, they engaged in . . . conversation in the German language. . . . [O]ne of them remarked, “If this young fellow can’t

fix this tractor, we will kick his ass out of here.” . . . Presently they began talking about the . . . Ford and inquired as to how many cylinders it had. Rupp replied in German They were highly embarrassed . . . by the fact that the young fellow had understood every word that they uttered. . . .

Rupp fixed it, and the man in charge offered him ten dollars per day, if he would stay with them and keep [the] tractor running. His reply was “no,” since he was working for IHC. Then the separator man said, “I’m getting six dollars per day, and I’ll give you a dollar a day in addition to the ten dollars because, if you are not here, we will lose much more than that in delay.”

Rupp then called his boss at IHC and related . . . the circumstances His reply was, “Herb, if you don’t take care of yourself, no one else will. You go ahead and help them out.” So he worked for them at eleven dollars per day and long enough to earn four or five hundred dollars. With that money in his pocket he went to Highland Park College in Des Moines, Iowa, and completed his engineering education.

He went to Mansfield in 1919 and was employed by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company as a designing engineer. He assumed a major role in the development of the carburetor for [the company’s] tractors. It was so designed as to save fuel

About that time the company employed E. L. Brunger as Works Manager and placed him in charge of the engineering department in spite of the fact that Worthington was [the] chief engineer. Brunger had been an employee of the Advance-Rumely Company He was a disappointment, and the Advance-Rumely Company was delighted to get rid of him.

Brunger attempted to model the Aultman & Taylor [15-30] tractor similarly to the Rumely Oil Pull. Rupp was of the opinion that the frame of their tractors should have been made straight instead of having a curvature. As a result of Brunger’s . . . experimentation, the company lost the whole year of 1917 testing that tractor. When it was finally built, Rupp tried it out, plowing for sixty days, and at the end of that time the differential broke. It was not until about 1920 that [the company] overcame the problems. Rupp stated that many of the tractors that they sold during 1917-1919 were defective and that wherever they sold one they never sold another one. In the meantime . . . the Fordson was placed on the market, and Aultman & Taylor lost [its] trade.⁸

In all fairness it must be emphasized that the preceding discussion represents Rupp’s opinions, but, since he occupied a prominent position in the building of Aultman & Taylor tractors, they cannot be dismissed lightly

. . . [Aultman & Taylor] tractors proved to be successful, and the company was numbered among the leaders in the building of tractors. . . . [D]ue credit should be accorded to the officials of the company for being alert to the . . . requirements of that bygone day.

Notes

1. Dr. Rhode notes that, in Chapter 12, Dr. Bixler says that Joe Rynda’s wooden-wheel, bevel gear Aultman & Taylor traction engine was built in 1877. Dr. Bixler gives the date as 1878 in a caption accompanying a photograph of Rynda’s engine. These dates conflict with Dr. Bixler’s statement that the first Aultman & Taylor traction engines were produced in 1880.
2. Dr. Rhode notes that, at one point, Dr. Bixler says that four bevel gear engines were built in 1906, but, in another place, Dr. Bixler says that five bevel gear engines were constructed in that final year of production of bevel gear engines.

3. The term “gasoline engine” as used in this connection and in the board’s deliberations [refers] to a tractor . . . and . . . probably [is] used in contrast with the [term] “steam engine.”
4. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
5. *The Rooster*, September 1920. 2.
6. Aultman & Taylor catalogs, 1910-1923.
7. *The Rooster*, August 1920. 12.
8. Interview with Herbert Rupp.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

The eleventh installment of Dr. Bixler’s history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, as edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode, appears in this issue of the *Album*, which is serializing Dr. Bixler’s book. Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, passed away before he could publish the manuscript to which he had devoted considerable energy. Several manuscripts belonging to Dr. Bixler are in the Sherman Room of the Mansfield/Richland County Public Library in Mansfield, Ohio. This installment presents detailed factual data, supplying a vital resource for resarchers.

Chapter 11

Output of Machinery

The figures presented in . . . this chapter are estimates of the number of separators, engines, hullers, water tanks, [and] attachments, . . . needed . . . to satisfy the demands for [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. Following the presentation of [such] estimates [to the board] they were sometimes modified but were always approved by the board of directors. [The] estimates were made at the close of the previous year or at the beginning of the next year prior to building the output for the ensuing season. Usually [the] estimates became the actual number of machines manufactured. However, [the firm] occasionally overestimated the number of separators, hullers, or engines, and in those instances the surplus was carried over to the next season. Then, too, there were years when [the company] underestimated the number of separators or engines needed to meet the demand. That was true in 1892.

. . . [E]stimated production for 1892 . . . consisted of 339 separators, 200 horse powers, 315 engines, and 50 swinging stackers. By July of that year it became evident that there was an unusual demand for certain [machines]. . . [T]o meet the shortages that had developed, [the] estimates were revised upwards. Straw-burning engines were increased to 90 and separators to 451. That was an increase of 15 . . . engines and 52 . . . separators. In other words, [the company] built a total of . . . 330 engines during . . . 1892.¹

[Estimated output of machines for 1892 was as follows:] 399 separators, 200 horse powers, 315 engines, and 50 swinging stackers. [Estimated output for 1894 was:] 313 separators, 130 engines, 85 horse powers, 100 automatic stackers, 50 hullers, 25 water tanks, and

25 picket mills. [Estimated output for 1895 was:] 175 Dixie separators, 135 Columbia separators, 100 hullers, 25 Galland stackers, 25 Dinger horse powers [on the] heavy pattern, 25 Woodbury horse powers (8 x 10), 80 simple traction engines, 40 compound traction engines, and 17 standard . . . engines [a type of portable engine produced by Aultman & Taylor].

No accurate information is available with respect to [the firm's] output for 1893. . . . In addition to the output for 1894 . . . provision was made to increase slightly the number of separators to be built, in the event that it was warranted by the demand.

. . . [In 1895, the company] built a few more engines and separators than is indicated by the [figures above]. . . . The exact amount of the increase is unknown.

[Estimated output of machines for 1897 was as follows:] 10 17 x 28 Dixies, 20 20 x 32 Dixies, 28 23 x 36 Dixies, 24 27 x 40 Dixies, 25 30 x 44 Dixies, 25 32 x 48 Dixies, 66 30 x 46 Columbias, 65 33 x 50 Columbias, 65 33 x 56 Columbias, 25 42 x 64 Columbias, 10 #2 hullers, 75 #3 hullers, 25 #4 hullers, 35 Galland stackers, 65 Netherly stackers, and 50 Harvey feeders.

. . . The Harvey feeder was built solely for [the firm's] clover hullers. They had left over from 1896 35 #3 and #4 clover hullers, which gave [the company] a total of 145 hullers to sell that year. [Aultman & Taylor planned to produce] that year a total of 353 separators, 100 stackers, and 50 Harvey feeders. Provision was made to increase the production of Harvey feeders if necessary.

In June of 1897 it became . . . evident that [the firm's] output was not sufficient to meet the demand. So [the company] increased [the production] of Dixie separators as follows: 6 of the 17 x 28 model, 10 of the 20 x 32 model, 2 of the 23 x 36 model, and 4 of the 27 x 40 model. That was a total increase of 22 Dixie threshers. At the same time the superintendent was instructed to order all of the material necessary for the construction of 25 Columbia separators. When all of the figures are combined, [the company] built a total of no [fewer] than 400 separators during 1897.

[In 1897, Aultman & Taylor planned to produce] 22 Columbia Jr. [16 HP straw-burning traction engines], 10 Eureka Jr. [8 HP simple traction engines], 35 Eureka [12 HP simple traction engines], and 20 Hercules [16 HP simple traction engines]. In addition [to the 87 simple engines planned for 1897, the company planned to build] 42 compound engines, making a total of 129 engines [for] that year. The officials of the company were also instructed to provide material and have ready the wheels, cylinders, and such other items as required . . . to prepare for an increase of 15 Columbia Jr. compound [20 HP straw-burning traction] engines. [Also in 1897, the company planned to produce 75 horse powers.]

[In 1898, the company planned to build] 12 Baby Elephant [6 HP portable farm engines], 20 Standard Jr. [8 HP portable engines], 5 Standard [10 HP portable engines], 8 Samson Jr. [12 HP portable engines], 0 Samson [16 HP portable engines], 20 Ajax [20 HP portable engines], 30 Hercules [16 HP simple traction engines], 76 Eureka [12 HP simple traction engines], 28 Eureka Jr. [8 HP simple traction engines], 5 Cyclone [14 HP simple straw-burning traction engines], 5 Hercules compound [traction engines], and 15 Columbia Jr. [16 HP simple or 20 HP compound straw-burning traction engines]. [The company had on hand from the previous year] 1 Standard, 2 Samson Jr., 6 Samson, 2 Ajax, 1 Eureka, 1 Eureka Jr., 1 Hercules compound, and 4 Columbia Jr. engines. [In summary, Aultman & Taylor had 18 engines on hand from 1897 and planned to produce 224 engines, for a total of 242 engines to sell in 1898.]

[In 1898, Aultman & Taylor projected the building of] 10 17 x 28 Dixies, 40 20 x 32 Dixies, 40 23 x 36 Dixies, 40 27 x 40 Dixies, 50 30 x 40 Dixies, 35 32 x 48 Dixies, 85 30 x 46 Columbias, 70 33 x 50 Columbias, 100 36 x 56 Columbias, 10 42 x 64 Columbias, 10 19-inch

Special Mexicans, and 10 of an unspecified size of Mexicans. [To this output of threshers were added 17 separators carried over from 1897. In summary, the firm planned to build 215 Dixie,] 265 Columbia, and 20 Mexican separators. . . . [The company] also built during that year the following clover hullers: 20 #2, 150 #3, and 100 #4, making a total of 270 hullers . . .

There is no record of the automatic stackers that [the firm] built during 1899, but [there was] a good demand for them. They were expensive to build, and the officials of the company did not consider it wise to push the sales of those stackers. Due to the cost of manufacturing them it was felt that they would be unable to realize satisfactory returns. Those stackers were built by the thresher companies for only a few years, when they were replaced by the windstackers.

During 1899 [the firm] built no clover hullers since . . . 93 [were] on hand from the previous year, nearly all of which were #3 size. [The company] had sufficient stock to build 110 to 115 hullers in the event that the trade warranted their construction. It was stated that [the] #4 huller could be set up at once, [if] there arose a sudden demand for them. In any case the record shows that, during 1899, [the firm] sold 64 hullers, which left 29 on hand to be carried over to the next year.

[In 1899, Aultman & Taylor planned to build 75 plain engines, 140 simple cylinder traction engines, and 49 compound engines, with 24 engines carried over from 1898's production plans and with 65 engines on hand. The company projected the building of 264 Dixies, 309 Columbias, 18 Mexicans, and 18 experimental "New Centuries," with 18 threshers carried over from 1898's production plans. The firm also planned to build 37 windstackers for hullers and 116 windstackers for separators, with 34 of both types carried over.]

[In 1900, Aultman & Taylor planned to build 10 10 HP portables, 8 12 HP portables, 10 15 HP portables, and 5 20 HP portables, for a total of 33 portables. The company projected the building of 50 12 HP Eureka's, 50 16 HP Hercules, and 25 20 HP Columbia Jr. engines for a total of 125 simple traction engines. The firm planned to build 25 compound 14 HP Eureka's and 5 compound 20 HP Columbia Jr. engines for a total of 30 compound traction engines. As of December 31, 1899, the company had 65 engines on hand at the factory.]

[In 1900, the company planned to build 50 25" Dixies, 50 27" Dixies, 20 30" Dixies, and 40 32" Dixies, for a total of 160 Dixies. The firm expected to build 50 30" Columbias, 100 33" Columbias, 10 36" Columbias, and 10 42" Columbias, for a total of 170 Columbias. On hand were 141 threshers.] The Mexican machines were already provided for either on hand or being built. With respect to the New Century machines and the changes to the Dixies with which [the company] was experimenting during 1899, neither . . . was in shape to be recommended for manufacture in anything but an experimental few.

[In 1901, Aultman & Taylor planned to build 9 20 x 32 Dixies, 44 27 x 40 Dixies, 9 30 x 44 Dixies, and 8 32 x 48 Dixies, for a total of 70 Dixies. The company projected 12 30 x 46 Columbias, 22 33 x 50 Columbias, 4 36 x 56 Columbias, and 10 42 x 64 Columbias, for a total of 48 Columbias. The firm planned to produce 15 20 x 32 New Centuries, 25 23 x 36 New Centuries, 35 27 x 40 New Centuries, 50 30 x 44 New Centuries, 35 32 x 48 new Centuries, 20 36 x 56 New Centuries, and 5 42 x 64 New Centuries, for a total of 185 New Centuries.]

With reference to the engines for 1901 the president recommended that [the company] start with 75 Hercules and 50 Eureka's. That along with other sizes . . . and those carried over gave [the firm] a total of 300 engines to sell in 1901. The records give no breakdown with respect to the types of engines that [the company] built, but the catalog for that year carried advertisements of all of their engines, including the simple and compound engines. . . . [I]t is

fair to assume that the output of engines for that year included all of the types built during previous years.

. . . The estimated output for the season of 1902 presented to the board of directors by the president was approved. With the exception of the 32 x 56 [model], the output of New Century separators was increased fifty percent. This is not too meaningful, since no figures are available for their output of threshers and engines for 1902. . . .

[In 1903, Aultman & Taylor planned to build 30 23 x 36 New Centuries, 66 27 x 42 New Centuries, 30 30 x 46 New Centuries, 200 32 x 56 New Centuries, 185 36 x 56 New Centuries, and 40 42 x 64 New Centuries, for a total of 551 New Century separators.] Material was to be provided for a possible increase of 25% on all but the 42 x 64 separators. The actual output for 1903 amounted to about 500 separators and 150 clover hullers. The last Dixie separators were built in 1901, and beginning with 1902 the company [produced] only New Century separators.

[In 1903 Aultman & Taylor planned to build 6 6 HP plain engines, 10 8 HP plain engines, 6 10 HP plain engines, 5 12 HP plain engines, 5 16 HP plain engines, and 4 20 HP plain engines, for a total of 36 plain engines. The company projected 10 Eureka Jr. engines, 10 Eureka Jr. compound engines, 10 Eureka engines, 9 Eureka compound engines, 75 Hercules engines, and 10 Hercules compound engines, for a total of 124 bevel gear engines. The firm planned to construct 35 25 HP spur gear engines, 20 20 HP spur gear engines, and an unspecified number of 14 HP spur gear engines.] . . . [Also,] 32 tractions of all sizes and 16 plain engines . . . were carried over from the previous seasons. . . .

[In 1904, the firm planned to build 20 25 HP spur gear engines, 50 20 HP spur gear engines, 10 16 HP spur gear engines, and 10 14 HP spur gear engines, for a total of 90. The company projected 10 8 HP Eureka Jr. engines, 20 12 HP Eureka Jr. engines, and 40 16 HP Hercules engines, for a total of 70.] As soon as was expedient, the officials were instructed to order boiler plate to build such further numbers of 14, 16, 20, and 25 HP engines . . . as might be needed to satisfy the demand.

No figures are available on the output of separators and hullers for 1904, but [the company's] projected goal was to build 600 separators and 150 to 200 clover hullers per year.

[In 1905, Aultman & Taylor planned to produce 2 6 HP, 4 8 HP, 7 10 HP, 10 12 HP, 25 16 HP, 9 20 HP, and 5 25 HP plain engines, for a total of 62 plain engines. The firm projected the building of 6 8 HP and 5 12 HP bevel gear engines, for a total of 11. The company also planned 50 14 HP, 50 16 HP, 5 16 HP straw-burning, 75 20 HP, and 50 25 HP spur gear engines, for a total of 230.] That there was a [market] for increased power is shown by the fact that the 16, 20, and 25 HP engines were in the strongest demand. It is also true that there was a dramatic decrease in the number of bevel gear engines that [the firm planned to construct]. . . . The committee on output for 1905 submitted its report, which was discussed and accepted with the exception of the 32 x 50 New Century separators. It was deemed advisable to increase the [production] of that size from 100 to 120 machines. During 1905, the firm [planned to build] a total of 490 separators, 10 hullers, 25 Sattley stackers, and 121 baggers. [The company] also made provision for material from which to increase the output of . . . separators by 25%, if the trade warranted it. . . . [E]ven as late as 1905 there was still some demand for horse powers. The company estimated that [it] needed to build that year 40 horse powers in sizes 10, 12, and 14 HP.

The firm also built during that same year the following water tanks: 50 #1 (10 barrel), 20 #2 (12 barrel), and 30 #3 (15 barrel), making a total of 100 water tanks

At the directors meeting in June of 1905, Kalmerten brought to [the board's] attention a separating beater for the New Century [thresher]. It was recommended simultaneously by three

of the company's customers, one of whom had [put it to practical tests]. The company experimented with . . . the new device in home territory during the season of 1905.

Still another device . . . of a secret nature was mentioned. It was stated that it would tend toward radical improvement of [the firm's] separator. Its construction was advocated by Louis Snyder of Hastings, Ohio. The president and secretary were authorized to enter into an agreement with Snyder for the [use] of his device.

No information is at hand to indicate whether those devices were incorporated [in] the building of the New Century separator. However, the above information is significant, in that it suggests that the company was constantly alert to any improvement that could be made on [its] separators.

[In 1906, Aultman & Taylor planned to construct 50 20 x 36 threshers, 40 23 x 36 threshers, 60 27 x 42 threshers, 75 30 x 46 threshers, 120 32 x 50 threshers, 150 36 x 56 threshers, and 55 42 x 64 threshers, for a total of 540 threshers. The company also planned to build 10 #2, 30 #3, and 160 #4 clover hullers, for a total of 200. The firm projected the need for 2 8 HP and 2 12 HP, making a total of 4 bevel gear engines, 8 8 HP, 18 12 HP, 50 14 HP, 85 16 HP, 75 20 HP, and 65 25 HP, making a total of 301 spur gear engines, and 6 6 HP, 5 8 HP, 10 10 HP, 6 12 HP, 25 16 HP, 10 20 HP, and 10 25 HP, making a total of 72 plain engines.]

. . . On November 6, 1906, the superintendent was instructed to build and complete the following engines in the order mentioned for the trade of 1907: 10 14 HP tractions, 10 16 HP plain engines, 15 16 HP traction engines, 10 20 HP traction engines, making a total of 45 steam engines for 1907.

. . . On January 20, 1910, the officials were authorized to purchase the White separator patents at a price of \$10,000.00, which included royalties for 1909. No explanation was given for the purchase of the White patents. . . .

On November 1, 1910, the directors approved the action of the executive committee requisitioning 385 separators. They were authorized to [call for] 500 additional separators in such quantities as . . . necessary to keep the shops running economically until the time of the annual meeting of the stockholders. Clover hullers and steam engines were requisitioned in the same manner. . . .

On January 19, 1911, the executive committee was authorized to [call for] gas engines in lots of 25 from time to time as conditions required; to build [no more than] 200 steam traction engines in sizes such as the trade required; and to requisition such numbers of . . . hullers, sawmills, separators, and attachments as the conditions of the trade demanded. During 1912 the company built 250 separators and presumably about the same number of steam engines and tractors as in 1911.

No figures are available for 1913 and 1914. . . .

The company's output for 1915 was as follows: 750 separators, 110 hullers, 25 to 50 bean threshers, 290 steam engines, and 160 gas tractors. Sawmills were to be built as the need developed, and attachments were manufactured as the trade required.

The output in number for the . . . year . . . 1916 was similar to that of 1915, with the exception of [the company's] tractors. [Aultman & Taylor] built 64 more [than] in 1915, or a total of 224 for 1916. That same year, [the firm produced] 98 fewer steam engines, or a total of 112. As might be expected, these figures reflect the decline in demand for steam engines. However, during the same period of time the figures show a marked increase in the demand for tractors.

[The company's] output for 1917 was as follows: 800 separators, 125 hullers, 25 bean

machines, 50 sawmills, 175 steam engines, and 300 tractors. The executive committee was authorized to increase or decrease the output according to requirements as the season advanced. It was their intention to increase their sales of separators. They felt that the output and sales [were] not sufficient, and they intended to take steps to offer inducements that would produce increased sales.

Much of the preceding data has been presented in lieu of more . . . reliable figures. It must be emphasized that the figures that have been [given are] for the most part . . . estimates of [the company's] annual production. Obviously those estimates were altered from time to time in concurrence with . . . changing demands. . . . As will be indicated later, [Aultman & Taylor] built 9,393 steam engines. It is also fair to state that [the firm produced no fewer] than 44,000 separators.¹

An amazing fact emerges as one contemplates the large number of separators built by this company: . . . only a relatively small number of them are in existence. The ravages of time have taken their toll, and most of the Aultman & Taylor separators are gone. It is to be regretted that they were not accorded better care. . . .

Note

1. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the twelfth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's book. During his lifetime, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, published a few of his chapters as separate articles in this magazine and others, but the majority of his book remained unpublished until now. The chapter below includes certain details that only a few steam aficionados are likely to know.

Chapter 12

The [45-120 HP] Engine and Unique Machines

At a meeting of the board of directors [of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery] Company held on November 8, 1904, G. W. Gans presented a report on a double cylinder engine patented and built by the Improved Engine Company, which was located at Myersdale, Pennsylvania. It was his recommendation that Aultman & Taylor acquire the exclusive right to manufacture that engine or in some way secure control of it. At that meeting the president was empowered to appoint a committee to visit the plant of the Improved Engine Company . . . for the purpose of investigating [the] double cylinder engine and to ascertain the conditions by which the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company might acquire control of the patents on that engine.

. . . [T]he president appointed a committee consisting of the following members: E. W. Gans [sic], A. Kalmerten, and G. W. Seaman. As instructed, the committee visited the company in Myersdale . . . , carefully examined the engine, and at the December meeting of the board of directors reported favorably on the . . . merits of the engine. However, their mission to Myersdale failed because of the unreasonable royalty demands made by the parties that controlled the patents. . . . Their report was followed by a lengthy discussion, after which it was decided to design and build [Aultman & Taylor's] own double cylinder engine.

Accordingly Mr. Seaman, who was a draftsman and for a few years the superintendent of the plant, at once began work on designing the bid engine. That engine was built at the Diamond Street plant in Mansfield, and, while the exact date of its completion is unknown, it probably was [constructed] near the end of 1906 or the beginning of 1907.¹

In any case the first publicity about the engine in a newspaper, including a picture of the engine, occurred on March 14, 1907. [The engine was rated at 45 HP, with the maximum indicated horsepower 171 and a maximum economic horsepower of 120.] The Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company was one of the first to [design and assemble] a large traction engine

The building of that engine came as a result of a [market] for an engine larger and more powerful than were the traction engines in use at that time. The demand for larger engines came primarily from the Western states, Mexico, and Canada. . . .

It was a double cylinder engine mounted on top of the boiler. The dimensions of the cylinders were ten inches by nineteen inches. It was rated as a 45 HP engine, but, in the tests to which it was subjected, it developed 111 to 120 horsepower. The drive wheels were 7½ feet in diameter with a face of 42 inches. The supply tanks had a capacity of 800 gallons of water, and the coal bunkers carried 1,500 pounds of coal. It was fitted with a new, patented steering device. With a simple turn of the wheel the engineer could steer the engine in any direction The boiler was 42 inches in diameter, and the height of the engine was 15 feet. A picture was taken . . . with a man standing beside it which gives one an impression of the immensity of the engine; the man appears [to be the size] of a small boy.

[The] engine was given a series of thorough and rigid tests in the shops and on the road. The tests proved that it could be used economically, and the road tests demonstrated . . . that it was an excellent road engine. It was capable of traveling at the rate of 2 4/10ths miles per hour. One of the tests was of considerable interest and demonstrated . . . its great power. The men in charge attached to the drawbar of the engine two traction engines, a 20 and a 25 HP . . . , well loaded with coal and water. It pulled that load of two dead engines up Franklin Avenue Hill, located north of the factory, and Park Avenue East, and then [it] returned to the factory. That test, or feat, was performed with the greatest ease The assertion was made that it . . . had the power to [plow] up Main Street with gang plows almost the entire width of the street.

The engine burned coal, wood, or straw. Because of this feature it was well adapted to the needs of the Western grain-growing states. Then, too, the company believed that there would be a demand for such an engine [in] the Canadian Northwest. . . . In spite of the demand on the part of the great ranch owners it was ignored for a number of years. Finally, the evermore insistent demand convinced the officials of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company of the need . . . of building an experimental engine of the type already described.

Still another use for that engine that the builders envisioned was in connection with the Mexican mines. Since that engine was a good hill climber, it was surmised that it could haul the ore as rapidly as [a] mule team and at considerably less expense.²

[The giant engine] was used for various kinds of work around the factory and yards until 1909. It was found to be as serviceable as were the smaller engines. . . . Even though there [was] a . . . demand for this kind of engine, yet the company was unable to sell that engine as soon as it was built. However, in April of 1909 it was shipped to Faulkton, Faulk County, South Dakota, in the heart of the wheat fields. Several of the men who were spectators when it was loaded for shipment testify that, because of its weight, two flatcars were required to transport it³

So far as the author has been able to ascertain, there is no one living today in Mansfield or its environs who was privileged to see that engine. Those who witnessed its performance in the yards of the company and in the city of Mansfield . . . are all gone. . . . [O]nly a few men are living today who saw that engine or had any experience with it. They are elderly men . . . in Faulkton . . . or in that vicinity. They are in the unique position of being able to share with others their . . . impressions of the big engine

Ray Church of Faulkton . . . remembers that engine when it came . . . in April of 1909. He was fourteen years of age The engine was bought by Fred E. Udell, who lived on a farm nine miles south of Faulkton. That farm was later owned by Church and is now in the possession of Church's son, Richard. The big engine became known in that area as the "Udell Engine."

Udell owned three quarter sections of land. In addition to doing his own work he also did a large amount of work for other farmers. The engine was used for plowing and broke many acres of prairie ground. It could pull fourteen plows, and Church often operated the plows. He also hauled water for that engine and recalls one especially busy day when he hauled nine tanks (fifteen barrels to the tank) of water for it. One tank of water was usually required to make a round for breaking ground.

Electus Pritchard ran that engine for Udell for several years and was paid five dollars per day. During the threshing season those men pulled a 40-inch separator with that engine and could thresh 5,000 bushels of oats per day.

Peter Baughs states that, in the fall of the year, they added an extension of two . . . plows, making altogether sixteen plows, which that engine pulled covering almost twenty feet of ground [in one swath]. Mr. Baugh's brother, John, was the plow tender and was paid \$1.75 per day. That outfit broke 45 to 50 acres of sod per day. It should be remembered that those were 14-hour days.

During 1910 the engineer was Henry Struever [The men] threshed so late in the fall that . . . they were caught in a snowstorm and were unable to finish the threshing. The farmer, Dan Cooper, had to stack his grain, which was threshed the next spring.

Faulkton had its own light plant, and on one occasion the gas engine that powered the plant broke down. It could not be replaced immediately, so the Faulkton town officials rented the big engine and belted it to the generator. A house was built to cover the engine, and the engineer . . . , Buttler Lambert, . . . ran it each night and furnished light for the community.

After using the engine for five years, [it] was sold to William and Fred Olsen, who lived about a mile south of Faulkton. The engine was known widely for its power and operated the largest threshing machines It did not lose power until the steam pressure was down to 40 pounds. When that engine got stuck, it was really a stuck engine, and [it] was quite an operation to get it going again.

[The men who ran it] used coal for fuel when plowing, and, when the engine pulled a threshing machine, flax was often used for fuel. The engine was last [run] during the early 1920s and in 1936 was sold for scrap iron⁴

As stated earlier, that engine was built as an experiment. . . . Why didn't the company [put] that type of engine into production? No firm answer can be given to that question The cost of building that engine must have been considerable, and perhaps the company decided that there could be little or no profit in . . . that type of engine. It may well be that they had some misgivings about the engine [T]here is a clue, and it is only a clue In several of the company's catalogs statements were made that pointed out the advantages of the side-mounted [single cylinder] engine as contrasted with the double cylinder engine, [and] those statements were made on the basis of [the company's] many years of experience with both types of engines.

. . . Whatever the reasons may have been, it was the only engine of that type that the company ever built. . . . [The] history [of the giant engine] has been something of a mystery to those who have learned of its existence by way of the grapevine but never have had access to authentic information. Consequently, in the preceding pages an attempt has been made to present reliable information pertaining to the big engine, so that it may be to the reader more than a mere legend

Joe Rynda's Eureka Engines

On August 15, 1932, Joe Rynda had his 10 HP Eureka engine steamed up, when he was approached by a tall, elderly man, who remarked, "Fifty years ago today (August 15, 1882) I was married in St. Scholastica church at Heidelberg, Minnesota. When we came out of the church, this engine was coming up the hill from the north, having been unloaded at Prague It was driven by the owners, the Prochaska brothers, to their farm home in Montgomery Township, LeSueur County That engine was used for threshing in Montgomery, Lexington, and Lanesburg Townships."

It had wooden wheels and was probably built in 1877. Around 1894 that engine was sold to the Wondra brothers, who used it for threshing and sawing lumber. In 1900 it was traded for a 16 HP Gaar-Scott return-flue engine. During the next four years the Eureka stood on Main Street near the railroad tracks in Montgomery It was then sold to Albert Brabec [Rynda's uncle].

One day it was decided to take the engine home. The boiler was filled with water, and steam was raised. Rynda's father was unable to start the engine; it would not turn over. The . . . engineer who had operated the engine did not open the cylinder cocks, and the piston was rusted to the cylinder. After removing the cylinder head they used cord wood . . . and a sledge [to drive] the piston into the cylinder [Then] the engine would turn. Brabec was a competent mechanic and placed the engine in good shape. He used it until 1925 for driving a two-roll Rosenthal corn husker.

[In] 1909, Rynda was a seventeen-year-old boy six feet tall but not very wide, so he was able to get through the small firebox door [to roll] in new flues. While rolling . . . flues he told his Uncle Brabec that, if he ever wanted to sell that engine, he would like to have it. In the spring of 1925 Brabec pulled that engine to Rynda's home and said, "I pulled that engine in the hog lot, and you can have it."

During the years of 1931 and 1932 Rynda became quite ill, forcing him to live on milk and crackers. He concluded that he did not have long to live and began looking for a home for the Eureka. He wrote to the Ford Museum, but they would not take the engine until they had its complete history. They offered to buy the engine, but Joe would not sell it. Instead, he gave it to them with the stipulation that, should the museum ever move out of the United States or be

closed, then the engine was to revert to the living descendants of Rynda.

One summer day a trailer that was used to transport cars came to the Rynda farm. The engine was loaded and hauled to Duluth, where it was placed on a boat and shipped to the Ford Museum in Detroit. Today that engine with its wooden wheels stands on the floor at the Ford Museum where thousands of curious people . . . admire it. Just before that engine was moved, Leonard L. Rynda, son of Joe, used a center punch [to] cut his name on the crosshead slides, and there it is for all to see.

From 1934 until 1951 Joe Rynda did not have a Eureka engine in his yard but kept looking for one. Then in the early summer of 1951 the state inspector informed him of one that was on the Grundsteen estate near Harris, Minnesota. That was in the wild country of Minnesota. Joe found the engine among the trees that had grown around it. A five-inch elm had grown around the cylinder, so he literally had to chop the engine out. The top of the governor [and] the Stephenson link were gone, and the smokestack was lying down. The serial numbers of the governors of those two engines differed only by six digits. Upon closer examination it was discovered that the two engines were identical, which suggests that they were probably built during the same year.

There were six children in the Grundsteen family, and they decided that Rynda should have the engine, for which each of them was to receive twenty dollars. So Joe paid \$120.00 for the engine. Some of the parts, such as a bull gear and a pinion, were buried in the ground under a wood pile. That was done . . . to avoid the ravages of the World War II scrap drive. The old wood on the wheels was scarcely able to support the engine while it was loaded on a truck, so it was necessary to have all of the wooden parts of the wheels replaced. Those parts of the wheels were made in a wood shop at Prague, Minnesota, the cost of which was \$800.00. . . . [I]t was a great satisfaction for Rynda to discover that the boiler was like a new one. After a considerable amount of work the engine was completely restored, and then Rynda exhibited [the] engine at shows and ran it in parades whenever such opportunities arose. Not only did he bring pleasure to himself, but he brought enjoyment to untold numbers . . . by the restoration of [the] two old and rare Aultman & Taylor Eureka engines.⁵

Rynda was a pioneer in the [collecting] of all kinds of steam engines. At . . . his death he was credited with having . . . the largest collection of steam traction engines in the nation. He was a competent operator of steam traction engines, enjoyed working with them, and experienced many hours of pleasure . . . exhibiting them at community events and steam shows. . . . Rynda was widely and affectionately known as “Steam Engine Joe Rynda.” He died on February 17, 1972, at the age of seventy-nine. Burial was . . . at Montgomery, Minnesota, where he resided during most of his life.⁶

The Grasshopper Engine

Galland’s first delivery was one of [Aultman & Taylor’s] traction engines . . . nicknamed “The Grasshopper.” . . . [T]hose engines were built with the rear axle in front of the firebox. Occasionally, when one of them ascended a hill, the front of the engine would rear up or hop, from which it acquired its nickname. Galland delivered [the] engine at Hixton, Minnesota, in 1899. It was the first traction engine ever delivered in that town, and it turned out to be a great event for the inhabitants of that community. . . . [P]eople living there and for miles around . . . [witnessed] the unloading of [the] engine from a flatcar. A few of the more adventurous climbed on top of the separator and rode out of town.

Later that year Galland delivered the first 12 HP Eureka in that area. At that time it was considered to be quite large and almost in the same class with a locomotive.⁷

The Little Separator

William Koppes was employed by the Champion Thresher Company, . . . located at Orville, Ohio. It was there that he designed and built [the] first Champion separator, with which he threshed using horse power. After that company closed out its business, Koppes went to Mansfield, where he was employed as a designer by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. [In] 1921 he designed and built a half-scale . . . separator. Upon its completion he showed it to Walter L. Blakely.

The sole purpose of that machine was to meet the demand of farmers in the hilly country of southeastern Ohio, West Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. The Frick and [Geiser] companies had already placed small separators on the market, and so an additional purpose for building the machine was to [compete with] those companies.

The two companies mentioned . . . did not use screens or riddles. The Aultman & Taylor people took the position that it was impossible to clean . . . foreign materials from grain without the use of riddles and screens. Since Aultman & Taylor separators were fitted with screens, this became one of the strong points in their favor. . . .

. . . [T]his unusual separator is known only to a relatively small number of persons, and even a smaller number have been privileged to see the machine The author was fortunate, in that he . . . [made] a careful examination of the [separator]. It is now in the possession of Ervin Martin, a nephew of Koppes, and stands on the barn floor on Martin's farm. To Blakely, whose knowledge of this machine surpasses that of any living person, the author is deeply indebted for his comprehensive explanation of every aspect of the little separator.

Its cylinder is twelve inches in width, and the length of the separator from the end of the feed board to the back of the machine is ten feet. . . . A glance at the little separator shows that the blower drum is on the left side of the machine. The designer [placed] it there . . . to shorten the length of the machine, so as to make it more adaptable to barn threshing. An additional reason for its location was so that grain could be threshed out of the mow and the straw blown into the opposite mow or barn floor. Moreover, its location facilitated the pitching of the bundles of grain from near the center of the mow.

. . . Opposite the blower drum is located a 1½ or 2-inch air tube. The wind from the fan blows the chaff toward the blower drum. [The] practicality [of this device] would immediately impress a professional thresherman . . . , when one considers certain conditions with which threshermen were often annoyed. . . . [W]hen threshing was done in the field, there were [occasionally] soggy bundles, . . . filled with mud. When a mass of that kind of material went through a threshing machine, it would frequently lodge in the blower boot and would not slide down to the blower fan. When that occurred, and if it were not caught within a few seconds, the entire machine would be full of straw rendering it inoperative.

The manner in which Koppes designed that machine would have to a large extent alleviated the problem just described There is every reason to believe that, if the half-scale separator had been placed into production, it would have been [a] success, since it was such a practical idea that . . . would have had a great appeal to professional threshermen.

Following the liquidation of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, all of their patterns, models, etc., were destroyed by the Advance-Rumely Company, which had purchased

them. Soon after the destruction of those materials . . . Blakely . . . journeyed to Mansfield and went back to the old boiler shop, where he had gone on many previous occasions. It was dark in the old shop, but with the aid of a glimmer of light emanating from the open door he found the little separator. For some reason it had escaped destruction.

. . . Blakely hastened to the Koppes home, . . . met Koppes on the street, and informed him of his discovery. Thereupon he suggested that the two of them go down to the shop and see the machine. After looking at the separator for a moment Koppes remarked, "By God, that's mine!" He was greatly surprised that it was still there . . .

Immediately Koppes went to a phone and called one of his neighbors, an elderly man who had a Ford truck with a worm drive on the rear axle. The three men loaded that little separator onto the old truck and with all the speed of which it was capable transported their precious cargo to the Koppes home. After it was unloaded, it suddenly dawned upon Blakely that he had helped to steal a separator . . . ; then realizing the gravity of the situation [he decided] it was high time for him to make tracks. So he removed himself from that scene with due haste.

Without doubt it was a stroke of luck that Blakely discovered the little separator. Had it not been for his foresight . . . , that little separator would in all likelihood have been destroyed . . . A few years later the two men met at the Ohio State Fair, [and] Koppes stated that, five years after he built that separator, the Huber Company decided to build a [prototype of a] separator. They employed Koppes, and he took the model separator with him to the Huber plant. It was at that plant that Blakely last saw the little separator.

Following the death of Koppes all trace of the machine was lost. Blakely searched for ten years before he located it. Martin informed the author that Mr. Miller, who was associated with the Huber Company, was instrumental in placing the little separator into his possession. As already mentioned, the . . . separator now [is] on Martin's farm near Smithville, Ohio. Martin has displayed this unique and remarkable machine at the Dover and Mansfield, Ohio, shows. Through the generosity of Martin large numbers of people have had the privilege of enjoying this . . . machine. That separator was never placed into production, since it was soon after its completion that the company was liquidated.⁸ [It] is illustrative of the genius . . . of many of the designers who created improvements on . . . threshing machines, making them gradually more efficient . . .

The burial of Koppes was . . . at the Medina, Ohio, Cemetery on May 26, 1936.

Notes

1. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
2. *Mansfield Weekly News*, March 14, 1907.
3. *Mansfield Weekly News*, April 29, 1909.
4. Letters and correspondence with Robert Deinslake, president of Faulkton Community Club; Ray Church, Owen Roberts, Earnest Llob, all residents of Faulkton, South Dakota, and Peter Bauks, resident of Ethan, South Dakota.
5. Information taken from . . . letters written by Joe Rynda to the author and unpublished manuscripts written by him.
6. Hayes, John. "The Golden Roll." *The Iron-Men Album Magazine* (May/June 1971). 31.
7. *The Rooster*, 1920. 2-3.
8. Interviews with Walter Blakely and Ervin Martin.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

The thirteenth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode, appears in this issue of the *Album*, which is serializing the complete book. Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, passed away before his book could be published. Dr. Bixler's thoroughly documented manuscript offers rare insights into Aultman & Taylor. In this installment, Dr. Bixler explores the highs and lows of this once-great firm.

Chapter 13

Enlargement of the Plant and Labor Relations

It will be recalled that the [Aultman & Taylor Company] began building water-tube boilers in 1895. That part of [the firm's] business required additional facilities. At the same time there was a marked increase in [the company's] threshing machine business, including engines, separators, clover hullers, sawmills, water tanks, and all of the other appurtenances that belonged to that part of their business. In fact their business outgrew the capacity of the plant to meet the demands for their products. . . . [I]t was at once apparent that there was only one way to solve the problem, and that was to enlarge the plant by the erection of new buildings and the addition of modern equipment.

At the board of directors meeting on September 25, 1894, there was common agreement that the outlook on [the company's] boiler trade necessitated an increase in [the plant's] facilities. [The directors] decided to build a new boiler shop and to equip it with modern machinery Bids were solicited for the foundation, brick work, iron structure, and machinery. Upon its completion it was one of the most modern boiler plants in the country. In 1896 . . . the plant was enlarged by the erection of a . . . brick building west of Main Street in Mansfield that was used exclusively for the building of water-tube boilers. The expenditure for the enlargement of the boiler plant [and] installation of machinery . . . amounted to \$37,000.00.

The company's efforts to meet the increased [market for its] products is demonstrated by the following account. It will be remembered that the company lost its huge warehouse in the . . . fire of 1896. In February of 1897 the subject of replacing the old warehouse came before the board of directors. Following a discussion [of] how to acquire more storage space, the decision was reached to [build] one-story sheds. These were erected immediately, one on the west side of the creek and the other on the east side. The erection of those two sheds required an outlay of \$4,000.00.

On January 18, 1900, it was reported that during the previous year the company had contemplated the selling of their thresher department. It was even thought that, within the six weeks following the above date, their thresher department might be sold. . . . Since the sale of their thresher business did not materialize, [the company was] unable to use those buildings or even to adapt them to [the firm's] boiler business.

Disturbing Conditions

The company was confronted with still other disturbing circumstances So long as [the firm] had two departments, the officials of the company were of the opinion that they could get along by buying a considerable amount of their castings from outside foundries, but, if they had sold that part of the plant east of Main Street, they . . . would have had no foundry whatever belonging to the plant. . . . [The firm] had already contracted with outside boiler shops for the year of 1900 [to build] all [the company's] firebox boilers for their engines. That must have been an unusual situation into which [the firm was] forced, since it was not the practice of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company to contract with outside companies to build boilers for [the firm's] engines.

. . . [I]t was during those years that the company became involved in tax litigation with Richland County. President James E. Brown stated that, while conditions in Mansfield were against further investments on the part of the company, yet [it was] confronted with the actuality that, . . . in spite of unfavorable local conditions, investment in the enlargement of the plant could no longer be delayed, or [the firm] would lose an immense business and suffer a heavy loss from damages for non-fulfillment of contracts with [the company's] customers and agents. . . . [F]ollowing the settlement of the “. . . tax graft” suits, the company . . . gradually enlarged its plant, so that it was able to increase its capacity . . . for turning out its products.

Meeting the Need

. . . First of all . . . the board of directors decided that a suitable addition to the foundry should be built. That was done, and it was equipped to provide an increased output. [The] addition to the foundry was made at a cost of \$6,000.00. At the same time an addition was built to the carpenter shop for the purpose of storing materials, and [a new] storage room for machinery was erected.

With the rapid increase in . . . business, it became imperative to employ [more] personnel for the office force. The office building had remained unchanged for many years, and . . . working conditions became such that the efficiency of that area . . . was greatly reduced. . . . [T]o relieve the overcrowded conditions of the drafting and bookkeeping departments, the board of directors decided on January 1, 1901, to have a third story added to the main office building. A bay window was [included], so as to provide more light for the close work that was done . . .

Mansfield Machine Works

For many years the Mansfield Machine Works built portable engines, sawmills, and fire engines. In 1900 that company was placed in the hands of [a receiver,] A. A. Peck Soon thereafter overtures were made by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company for the purchase of that company's plant.

Since the trustees appointed by the stockholders of the Mansfield Machine Works were desirous of selling their plant . . . , President Brown was authorized to bid a sum not to exceed \$65,000.00 for the plant, real estate, machinery, patterns, and . . . stock of merchandise on hand. Immediately after the meeting of the directors on November 12, 1901, the purchase of the Mansfield Machine Works was [completed].

At the next meeting of the board of directors on December 24, 1901, Brown was

authorized to sell to the International Fire Engine Company of New York City certain items that had been purchased from Peck Those . . . items were of little use to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and included fire engines, drawings, patterns, etc. Brown executed the bill of sale . . . and also entered into an agreement that the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company would not compete with the International Fire Engine Company in the manufacture and sale of steam fire engines. . . .

[Aultman & Taylor] sold to the Century Manufacturing Company all of the [Mansfield Machine Works'] small tools, portable engines, gas engines, patterns, and all other materials except those items pertaining to sawmills for the sum of \$13,000.00. At a subsequent time [Aultman & Taylor] sold some machinery that was not needed in the manufacture of threshers and portable engines for the sum of \$10,000.00. With the completion of those sales, the net cost to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company for the Mansfield Machine Works was \$51,000.00. It was further reported that the fire engines, patterns, drawings, and good will were sold to the International Fire Engine Company for \$60,000.00 in stock . . .

Other Extensions

At their meeting on March 4, 1901, the board of directors engaged in a discussion of the inadequate facilities of their thresher plant. . . . [T]he president was authorized to prepare plans . . . for an extension of the machine shop that was to be used as an engine shop. The specifications for the buildings were for [an] engine shop 164' long by 40'8" wide, a warehouse 48' long by 64'15" wide, an extension of the foundry 200' long by 100' wide, a new test house 72½' long [by] 50' wide, [and] an extension of the Babcock & Wilcox shop 132' by 100'. All of those extensions were built on the east side of the plant.¹

On January 21, 1904, G. W. Gans was instructed to [acquire machines] that were deemed necessary . . . to increase [the company's] separator and engine output. . . .

Two additions were made during 1905. The company erected a thresher warehouse . . . [designed] by Mr. Redding, who was [the firm's] architect. The estimated cost of that building was \$11,000.00. In October of that year Gans called the attention of the board members to the unsanitary conditions of the . . . water closets that were located between the Main Street foundry and the blacksmith shop. That matter was referred to a special committee, and new water closets were erected at the east end of the carpenter shop.

On August 7, 1912, the officers of the company were authorized . . . to extend the foundry building 100' or 150' as [might] be determined, . . . to build a cleaning room and core oven in the foundry, to install a crane, an air compressor, and an air compressor motor, . . . to install an approximately 200 HP gas engine and generator, [to] erect a building for housing the same at the Diamond Street plant, . . . to build an extension to the Diamond Street machine shop, . . . to build a new motor test house, [to] extend the paint shop, and . . . to install sufficient machine tools to give full capacity per week of the four steam engines and eight gas engines.²

. . . It is evident that from 1894 to 1912 the company erected new buildings and added equipment almost every year, so that [the firm] could increase . . . output. . . .

Labor and Management Relations

. . . [Aultman & Taylor was] relatively free [of] labor problems, due in no small measure to the superb . . . leadership of Michael D. Harter. For the most part high morale prevailed

among the employees. . . . Consequently most of the employees could see no advantage to be derived from membership in a trade union, and they were unilaterally opposed to strikes. Several attempts to organize a union were met with dismal failure. Yet, . . . [a] few minor difficulties . . . beset [the firm]. . . .

During the early part of 1879 the company ordered a reduction . . . in wages for all of their employees. Two reasons were advanced for that action: first, there had been an advance in the price of materials used in the manufacture of machinery; second, the company reduced the prices of [its] machinery . . . to bring them more in line with those of other companies . . . Those and other reasons . . . for the reduction in wages of the employees seemed justified to the authorities, if the company was to survive and make a profit. This information was transmitted to the employees. Even though disappointed, most of them viewed the action as reasonable, but there was a small minority who were disgruntled That group incited by outsiders became a vocal minority, which in turn became . . . anathema to the majority of the employees.

That dispute was not confined to the officials and employees of the company. Embittered by the attacks against the company and Harter, . . . those who were friendly to him [launched a counterattack]. . . . [A]rticles were published in the *Mansfield Herald*, [and] it became a newspaper fight. Soon . . . citizens of Mansfield and surrounding communities became aware of the labor controversy. Although it grew out of labor problems, unfortunately it was not confined to those difficulties. Personalities outside of the company became involved in the wrangle [resulting in slanderous accusations of the ugliest kind].

During November of 1879 A. Wolf, the editor of the *Courier*, a Mansfield newspaper, published several articles in which the management of Aultman & Taylor was attacked. He criticized the company's labor practices and accused the management of favoritism in its employment practices. Immediately the situation developed into a [fight] involving the two local newspapers, a local German newspaper, the Aultman & Taylor Company, its employees, and a Catholic priest. Following the appearance of [Wolf's] articles the company replied with articles . . . published in the *Mansfield Herald*.

One aspect of the dispute was concerned with the authorship of the [stories] that appeared in the *Courier*. A Catholic priest, . . . Father Magehann, was accused of writing [the] articles, which fomented the labor problems. Several of the writers claimed that [only Catholics had obtained] employment in certain departments of the Aultman & Taylor works but [that] a stop [had been] put to that practice. Prior to the curtailment of that practice, it was [alleged], Father Magehann wandered through the plant as if he owned it. Although not stated directly, the implication [was] that, in return for securing employment, the members of the church would then enrich its coffers. [According to various writers,] after the curtailment of [unfair hiring practices] the priest no longer made visits to the plant. It was implied by some that Wolf was not competent to write the articles [attacking Aultman & Taylor's labor practices] and that [only] the priest could have written them. To those accusations the editor of the *Courier* replied in the following vitriolic language: "For the articles concerning the labor question no one is responsible but myself, and the man who intimates that anybody else has anything to do with it is a skunk and a man who would murder his mother."

To that outburst a group of mechanics replied in the same vernacular: "So says this cabbage head, Wolf of the *Courier*, and further on he says that since the present proprietors have bought the *Courier* there has not been a single line furnished by the Rev. Father Magehann nor had the priest ever attempted to influence them one way or another.

"What a barefaced liar! He must have bought an 'indulgence' before he commenced

penning the above knowing it to be a lie. If he at all wrote it (for we hardly give him credit of ever writing two lines in English or German without a mistake; we now offer one hundred cents if he will in the presence of the Editors and at their dictation perform this school boy feat) let us nail the lie.

“Has this stupid blockhead Wolf, whose seat of brain is evidently in that portion of his body which the rest of mankind use to sit on, forgotten the dirty class of literature that appeared in his sheet about a year ago against a certain mechanic of the Aultman & Taylor Company who had caused the wrath of this high stepping Jesuit Priest to fall upon him because he was no longer willing to dance to all the tunes this whimsical Priest whistled?”

. . . [T]he exchanges in the newspapers became acrimonious [and biased] and degenerated into personal attacks . . . termed “character assassinations.” . . . While the dispute grew out of labor problems, in the end they contributed little to their solution.

A remonstrance was prepared and signed by sixty-one workmen [T]here were others who seized the cudgel on behalf of the company and presented other aspects of the dispute. Readers of the newspapers were invited to consider the sources of those articles, as well as the motives that prompted their writing. . . . The whole affair was condemned in the most bitter terms, and indignation was expressed at so gross an outrage on the employees of the Aultman & Taylor Company.

Most of the men claimed . . . the . . . right of . . . going elsewhere, if they became dissatisfied with the wages . . . they were receiving. They assumed the attitude that there was no fence around the factory, and, if there were those who were dissatisfied with their working conditions and wages, . . . there was nothing to prevent them from seeking employment elsewhere.

As already observed, most of the men were content to leave the question of wages in the hands of Harter, since they fully believed on the basis of their experience and knowledge that his action . . . would be fair Nevertheless, a few of the men were dissatisfied and [thought] Harter had been in error in making a general cut in wages Day wages paid by the Aultman & Taylor Company at that time were not above the average range of wages paid by other companies, and for that reason, according to . . . a small minority, should not have been changed. . . . A better plan, according to one mechanic, would have been to have appointed several men . . . to judge the worth of the work, as well as the worth of the men involved. . . . Competent mechanics were called upon to work for less pay than those who called themselves mechanics but could not sustain their calling for a single day. . . . However, most of the men believed that Harter would correct that error, if the people would give him sufficient time and let him do it.

In due time the wages were restored and grievances ameliorated. In fact the episode was soon forgotten, and once again normal conditions prevailed at the Aultman & Taylor Company’s plant.³

On October 13, 1900, an awkward incident occurred that involved the company and its employees in a difficult situation. During the afternoon of that day a parade was staged in Mansfield in honor of William Jennings Bryan, who was a visitor [to] the city. Bryan was the Democrat candidate for President of the United States [in what] became known as the Bryan-McKinley campaign. That day was designated by the city leaders as “Bryan Day,” and in the afternoon [the] parade [was held].

When the men who were employed in the boiler shop arrived that morning, they found posters located at various places in the shop. They stated . . . that every man would be expected to work throughout the entire day. The men were struck with consternation and disappointment.

A newspaper account stated that “immediately 162 free American citizens who did not propose being coerced picked up their dinner pails and started home. Only three men remained and consequently the intended work was declared off and all of the patriotic workers in the department lined up to see the great parade and hear the great champion of liberty this afternoon.”

On November 1, 1900, . . . Brown . . . replied to the newspaper item. He stated that the men were asked to work, since that was what they had been doing for some time. They had been working through Saturday for a number of weeks . . . to fill large and important orders. The company had contracted to ship those orders on an agreed-upon date. If they were not filled as per contract, the company would lose that business. Brown stated that the contract would not be filled, if the output for a single day were lost.

The confusion of the situation was compounded when on Wednesday morning of November 1, 1900, the men in the boiler shop were notified that they could have a half day off if they so desired, and at three o’clock that afternoon the shop was closed down. Apparently there was a Republican demonstration in Mansfield that afternoon. One newspaper account stated that the [crowd] was to be addressed by a man who was the greatest political enemy of John Sherman. The newspaper was unable to understand why they did not close because of [a] “rush of orders” when a Presidential candidate came to town, yet, when a man addressed a Republican demonstration, . . . the shops were closed. Apparently Brown did not reply to that inquiry.⁴ . . .

On Saturday morning, March 13, 1911, there were 150 skilled workers at the North Diamond Street plant who quit work. The trouble originated when one of the men was discharged. In addition . . . there was some [dispute] over the matter of working time. Immediately after quitting work the men held a meeting at Traders’ Council Hall A committee was appointed to hold a conference with the officials of the company that afternoon . . .

On that same morning the company issued the following statement: “On account of the demand for our machinery, we have been compelled for some time past to run our shops to their full capacity, but in some departments to operate on Saturday. This extra time is not from choice upon our part, and we have been making every effort for some time past to limit the hours to ten, except . . . in emergencies. Some of our men laid down their tools and walked out without giving us notice and without definitely presenting their complaints.”⁵

It should be noted that the ten-hour day was the most common practice in industry at that time. This was . . . a decade prior to the adoption of the eight-hour day, which came into being only after a prolonged and bitter struggle. Long before the eight-hour day was adopted . . . there were complaints . . . with the ten-hour day. It appears that this was part of the trouble in [this] particular case. It is fair to assume that the trouble was adjusted, since there was no appreciable cessation of the building of machinery.

During the week of June 13, 1913, the boilermakers at the Diamond Street plant went on strike for one day. Following that . . . strike there was a temporary adjustment of the difficulty, and the men returned to work with the understanding that, unless there were a satisfactory agreement reached, a general strike would be called.

. . . [T]he employees of the various departments of the Diamond Street plant were organized, and a committee was selected which met with the officials of the company. That committee . . . made a demand for settlement of the machinists’ and boilermakers’ strike. The issue about which the contention arose was the “Premium System.” The employees demanded that it be abolished.

The Premium System was a plan that provided a wage bonus for a worker who completed a certain amount of work in less time than the standard amount of time allowed for it. In addition the system provided for premium pay for overtime work in excess of the standard number [of hours] required in a day or week. It also included premium pay for work at night or on Sundays and holidays. It was also called the "Gain Saving" plan and was designed as an incentive to increase production. The system was first adapted to specific industries by T. A. Halsey. [The] system was in vogue in many . . . industries during the early years of the twentieth century. It was not in use in most of the industries engaged in manufacturing similar to that of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, [but] the system was not unusual for that time As a matter of fact it was generally accepted by . . . industries with few or no complaints.

The committee representing the employees informed the officials of the company that, unless a satisfactory answer to their grievances was forthcoming by eleven o'clock on Friday morning, June 28, 1913, the machinists and boilermakers would go on strike [again]. After considering the proposition presented by the employees, the officials of the company requested that the time be extended. On Saturday morning, June 29, . . . the committee from the machinists and other departments that were involved in the strike were called to the company's offices. . . . [Failing] to receive a favorable answer the employees decided to call a general strike at the Diamond Street plant. A majority of the employees joined in the strike, but a small number of the men continued to work. They included a few painters and others who were not affiliated with the labor organization.

The strike continued until July 21 By the end of that time a satisfactory adjustment of the demands of the boilermakers and their helpers was achieved, and they returned to work.

The company did not reemploy the men as a body or a group. The wage question was considered with each man at the time he made his application for work. An agreement was reached with the molders, and they returned to work. The last group to hold out were the men in the machine shop That department did not operate until a few weeks later. The details and exact terms of the agreement that was reached are unknown but apparently were sufficiently satisfactory so that the men returned to work. That was one of the most serious problems . . . the company . . . confronted.

The years between 1916 and 1919 were crucial and brought another critical labor problem to the company. . . . [T]hose were the years the First World War was [fought]. The high wages paid during that war drew many of the men away to more lucrative jobs in the munitions factories. . . . [T]o keep [its] labor force intact, [the firm] was obliged to increase wages. [The company] handled that acute . . . situation as best [it] could; . . . nevertheless, [the plant] lost many . . . competent men Those circumstances made it necessary for the company to employ new men, most of whom were inexperienced. Obviously that was not a desirable practice, nor was it profitable to the company. . . . [The] labor problems became increasingly [difficult]. . . .

The stockholders were informed that their problems would be intensified with the approach of warm weather in the spring of 1917, when outdoor work would be available and plentiful. . . . [To cope with the] labor situation, the company offered . . . employees a bonus, which was to be paid at periods during the year, rather than giving the workmen a general increase in wages So during the year of 1917 [the firm] paid each of the employees . . . at the quarterly periods of April, July, October, and January a bonus beginning with the first quarter

The stockholders were hopeful that the proposed plan would tend to ameliorate their problems and enable them to hold their men. . . . Brown advised the stockholders that the proposed bonus would cost the company an annual sum of \$30,000.00, but it was his judgment that such an inducement would result in keeping their labor force together. If the expenditure of that sum of money accomplished their goal, it would be well worth all of that cost to the company.⁶

At the same time that [the company was] forced to increase wages, there was also an . . . increase in the cost of the raw materials essential to the manufacturing of [the firm's] machinery. Because of the increased cost of labor and materials, the company was compelled to increase the cost of its products. . . . [I]t marked the beginning of the end of the company. The heyday of the steam [engine] was forever gone. [The company's] tractors were too large to meet the growing demands of the small . . . farmer. Furthermore, other manufacturers were building and placing on the market smaller tractors that met the demand of the farmers [T]he company was caught in a squeeze from which it was never able to extract itself.

. . . [T]he officials of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company lacked the foresight . . . to comprehend the devastating effects of their labor problems, as well as the prevailing economic conditions of a nation at war. Moreover, they were unable to cope with the rapidly changing conditions of the time or to [extricate] themselves from the complicated situation with which they were confronted. . . .

Notes

1. *The Mansfield News*, November 22, 1901. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
2. Ibid.
3. *The Mansfield Herald*, November 20, 1897; November 27, 1879; and December 4, 1879.
4. *Mansfield Daily Shield*, November 1, 1900, and October 13, 1900.
5. *Mansfield Daily Shield*, March 13, 1911.
6. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the fourteenth installment of the late Dr. Bixler's history of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* is serializing Dr. Bixler's heretofore unpublished book. In this installment, Dr. Bixler paints a picture of the firm's advertising techniques.

Chapter 14

Advertising the Machinery

Advertising was one of the most important elements in the marketing of [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. The officials of the company were imaginative and aggressive in devising new methods by which the public and particularly farmers and threshermen were made aware of [the company's] products. . . . The United States mail was the chief avenue for the distribution of [advertising] materials [M]uch of [the firm's promotional literature was handed out] at the fairs and expositions where [Aultman & Taylor] machinery was exhibited. Along with . . . advertising, [the company] developed a program of public relations designed to build good will . . . , and nothing was left undone to achieve that end. In addition, . . . it will be of interest to describe several of [the firm's] more dramatic [means] of advertising; one of these was referred to as the "Royal Train."

The Royal Train

One of the gimmicks used by a number of . . . companies to call . . . attention . . . to their machinery was a special train loaded with [equipment]. It is not altogether clear as to which company began the use of [such] trains, but J. I. Case and Avery [were] among the foremost.¹ Nevertheless, the Aultman & Taylor people laid claim to being the originators of the special train, for it was in 1874 that they shipped seventy-six threshers to Kansas. They were also the first company to ship a train load of machinery to a foreign country. During 1891 they shipped a train [filled with equipment] to Mexico, . . . a distance of 3,200 miles. . . .

. . . [The special trains] had [many] of the earmarks of a circus . . . and were a unique and dramatic means of making . . . products known to farmers and threshermen . . .

Perhaps it is within the realm of possibility to join the crowd of people along the railroad tracks in Mansfield and to enter vicariously into the experience of [a] day [when a] train of thirty cars loaded with Aultman & Taylor machinery pulled out of the yards. Even to this day there are a few of those living who in a nostalgic mood recall the experience of seeing that train and sensing the high emotion that prevailed among the thousands of people who witnessed [it] on that . . . May morning of 1892. It was the kind of experience that was never forgotten . . .

On Sunday, May 8, several thousand people visited the Union Depot in Mansfield to inspect the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company's . . . train of machinery that was destined for the far West. For many days workmen had been busy loading the [equipment] on . . . the cars. The train extended back to the Fourth Street crossing in Mansfield, from which point the train began its long journey.

This special train . . . left the company yards . . . at 8 o'clock on Monday morning, May 9 . . . , loaded with . . . threshing machines, . . . horse powers, engines, water tanks, swinging stackers, etc., bound for Omaha, Nebraska. Shipments . . . of this kind were no longer a novelty, but there was one departure in the case of this train. An engine and separator were belted up and in full operation in charge of James Boles, a . . . machine expert. The [equipment] . . . was valued at \$90,000.00. The train was decorated with bunting and flags. . . .

A special car was attached to the end of the train that carried . . . Chester Miller, the freight agent of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, [and] D. H. Maloney, the general freight agent for the Chicago and Rock Island Railroad. In addition to these gentlemen the following

representatives of the [firm] accompanied the train as far as Crestline: J. E. Brown, president, James Reynolds, Arnold Kalmerten, W. A. Habeson, J. F. Stine, William Ackerman, and George Knofflock, all of whom were influential members of the . . . organization.

The special coach that carried the above party was also loaded down with circulars that were distributed at the various stations as the train made its way to the West. When a representative of one of the local newspapers boarded the train, he was treated to fine cigars and accorded every courtesy in keeping with the event.

. . . The cheers of the crowds of spectators along the track [were] almost continuous from Fourth Street to the waterworks reservoir.

The train was on the road five days before it reached Omaha It moved slowly for the purpose of giving the people along the route an opportunity to view the sight of this unusual train. It was taken to Chicago over the Pennsylvania Railroad, leaving each of the stations on the way . . . : Crestline, 9:15 a.m.; Bucyrus, 10:50 a.m.; Upper Sandusky, 11:50 a.m.; Forest, 12:40 p.m.; [and] Lima, 2:15 p.m. [It arrived] at Fort Wayne at 6:00 p.m. It left Fort Wayne the next morning and then left Englewood via [the] C.R.I. and P. railroads. The train made brief stops in the towns of Illinois and remained at Rock Island during the night. It reached Des Moines, Iowa, on Thursday evening and left the next morning, arriving at Council Bluffs, Iowa, on Friday evening. On Saturday morning the train was taken across the Missouri River and delivered at the company's branch house in Omaha.

The Dialogue

In 1880 the company published a unique pamphlet that contained a dialogue proclaiming the unquestionable merits of [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. On the front cover . . . was a picture of the [firm's] trademark.

The introduction in the pamphlet stated that the dialogue and the accompanying letter had been prepared for farmers and threshermen in America, as well as in foreign countries where Aultman & Taylor machinery was used, and wherever grain was grown. The pamphlet was distributed free of charge to "every intelligent man and woman who feels an interest in the proper threshing of grain." It stated that threshing machinery was "a natural ally of the fair sex" and was an active champion of "the rights of farmers' wives and daughters." The letter was a compilation of testimonial letters received from their customers.

The dialogue was used at school exhibitions [and] by literary societies The one-room rural school made many contributions to the education of past generations and was one of the most popular of all institutions of the nineteenth century. Recognizing the potential of [the schoolhouse] for advertising [the company's] products, [the firm] seized upon the opportunity to use its social [and] educational functions to promulgate information about [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. . . . [T]o encourage the use of the dialogue, the company sent a certificate to be given to each person who was a participant in the play. The certificate was engraved and signed by the trustees or directors of the school district.

. . . [The dialogue] is valuable for another reason. More than any other . . . document in existence, it gives the most complete explanation of [the Aultman & Taylor] separator and clover huller attachment built during the 1880s.

[The dialogue] was an effective vehicle for dramatizing the advantages and disseminating the merits of [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. It may have been overdone, but it was couched in the kind of language . . . that the ordinary farmer . . . could understand, and there was enough

humor to hold the attention of the audience. At the same time the points that the company wished to emphasize were a part of the content, so that the listener was caught up in the ongoing theme of the dialogue. [Listeners became] gradually convinced that no other machinery in the world could possibly do the kind of work that was claimed for the “Starved Rooster” machine. . .

. . . [T]he following excerpts are presented with the hope that they may . . . indicate . . . the nature of the subject matter, the style, and [the] method of staging the dialogue.

The characters in the dialogue were five boys and two girls . . . : Mr. Robinson, a farmer living in St. Joseph County, Indiana; Bill Simmons, the miller, proprietor of the Empire Mills; Mr. Jones, a farmer living in Elkhart County, Indiana; Mrs. Robinson, wife of Farmer Robinson; Mrs. Jones, wife of Farmer Jones; [and] boys and girls Costumes were of that period.

Jones — “See here, you, Mr. Miller, I’ve a crow to pick with you. How does it come that you pay my friend, Mr. Robinson, five cents more for the same kind of wheat than you pay me? You said my wheat was good, and I know it is the same kind of wheat that Robinson sold you. It don’t seem like a fair shake. I haul my wheat thirty miles, and Robinson hauls his five miles, and you pay him more for the same kind. Do you think that is just?”

The Miller — “No oh no, that would not be right if the grain was in every particular the same; I have put your wheat and Mr. Robinson’s in separate bins, as they do not grade alike at all, and now I will bring a sample of each, and I think I can show you to your entire satisfaction that there is fully five cents a bushel difference in the market value of the two in favor of your friend, Mr. Robinson’s wheat. (*brings samples of wheat*) This sample of wheat I bought of Mr. Robinson this morning; you cannot but notice how entirely free it is from broken and cracked grains, cheat, dirt, etc. This sample is from the wheat I bought from you, which, in the straw, was quite as good or better than Mr. Robinson’s, but you see there is a large percentage of cracked and broken grains, cheat, cockle, broken straw, and dirt in it. And now let me explain to you that the price of wheat is governed in large measure not only by the kind and quality of the grain but very much by the condition in which it comes to the market.”

Robinson — “Hold on, my friend, you are wrong about my having run my wheat through a fanning mill; you see it now just as it came from the threshing machine.”

Jones — “Now see here, Robinson, you don’t pretend to tell me that there is a thresher in all Christendom that will thresh wheat and clean it like that?”

The Miller — “Just a word, Mr. Jones, right here; there is a vast difference in threshing machines now-a-days; there has been wonderful improvements made in threshing machines in the last eight or ten years; we are always willing to pay from three to five cents per bushel more for grain threshed by what is known as the ‘standard thresher of the vibrator class,’ what is better known among farmers (on account of the peculiar trademark) where it is in use as ‘the Starved Rooster’ thresher, manufactured by ‘The Aultman & Taylor Company’ at Mansfield, Ohio, than for wheat threshed by the endless apron make of threshers, or in fact any other make that we know of.”

Robinson — “Yes sir, Jones, I know what the miller has said to be true, and I do pretend to say that there is a threshing machine called the ‘Starved Rooster’ that will not only thresh and clean your wheat just as you see mine has been threshed and cleaned, but that will do some other things no other machine will or can do. If you will sit down with me on this pile of bags, I will tell you what else it will do no other machine that I have ever seen, heard of, or expect to see or hear of, can do; that is, she will thresh all kinds of grain and seed, in any condition, in all kinds of weather, wet or dry, hot or cold, and I will prove it by my own experience before I am through

talking to you about it; and now, Jones, just as you see this load of wheat I brought up this morning, she will do her work every time; besides, in ten years [she] will save a man a little fortune.”

Jones — “Look here, Robinson, I am getting interested; I see why I have lost five cents on the bushel this morning, but what in thunder do you mean by saving a man a fortune in ten years? This———what d’ye call it?”

Robinson — “‘Starved Rooster,’ standard thresher of the vibrator class.”

Jones — “Yes! yes! Starved Rooster business, that’s it.”

Robinson — “You see there is five cents a bushel you have lost this morning, on account of imperfect separation and cleaning; now add to this fact that the ‘Aultman & Taylor’ machine will save more grain than the endless apron does, to pay your threshing bills and other expenses connected with the threshing, and the further fact that the Aultman & Taylor will do your work in half the time, and that you have a lot of hands and horses around you for a week, to eat you out of house and home, working your women to death, roasting their brains over the cook stove, and putting them in such bad humor that it takes a whole week for them to get over it. Now after taking all these things into consideration, you will begin to have some idea of what it costs you each year to have your grain threshed by the endless apron and other grain-wasting, time-losing machines.”

Jones — “You talk about getting a job done up so quick, I don’t see into it; it sorter puzzles me how that they do the work and faster than any other machine.”

Robinson — “Well, you see, Jones, it’s altogether different from your endless apron rattle traps; it has no beaters, pickers, or raddles to wrap, clog, or wind up with straw. I have seen threshermen spend hours unwrapping old beaters and pickers; besides, endless apron threshers are more subject to breakdown than a man with age. They shake all to thunder in a few years. I have no patience with a man that will buy such a machine. I hardly know which is the biggest fool, the man that buys or the man that employs them.”

Jones — “Robinson, how are you going to shake the grain out of the straw, if you dispense with beaters and pickers? How does your ‘Starved Rooster’ machine manage it?”

Robinson — “Well, as I told you, it is differently built from all other machines used for threshing; separation commences at the cylinder, and it has the whole length of the machine to separate over; it has seven sets of rakes or fingers, which bounce up and down like a ‘hen on a hot griddle,’ and knock the stuffing right out of the straw, and you get all your grain in the half bushel and bags, instead of having part of it carried into the strawstack; besides, the riddles are as big as a town lot, and they use the overblast instead of the underblast. These are a few of the reasons which explain the cleanness of my grain. This curious arrangement of shaking the straw up so lively, and the wonderful separating capacity, prevents the possibility of any grain going over with the straw into the stack. Now don’t you see the parable of the ‘Starved Rooster’ unfold to you like the dawning of a summer morning?”

The Miller — “Mr. Jones, I hope our friend Robinson has enlightened you on the subject of threshing and threshing machines, and that you are fully convinced that I did not take advantage of you in our grain deal this morning.”

Jones — “When a man sees a thing with his own eyes, he is bound to believe. I do see that Robinson’s grain is much cleaner than mine, and free from cracked grains, and . . . worth five cents a bushel more than mine.”

The Miller — “Well, Mr. Jones, I trust that you will profit by this information and either buy yourself, or persuade your threshermen to buy, an Aultman & Taylor machine next season. I

can assure you this one thing, that it will prove a source of profit to you and your neighbors, in saving your grain and in time, and in securing for you a better price for your grain, to say nothing about the great satisfaction it ought and certainly will afford every thrifty farmer, too, that the fruits of his hard labor was garnered in his granary instead of being in large measure thrown away. I am not paid for talking up any particular thresher, or prejudiced in favor of any manufacturer of threshers, but I am interested in having all the grain our farmers raise not only saved, but as well in having it come into the market in the best possible condition, and since these very desirable ends can only be accomplished in the transit of the grain from the straw to the sacks, it is the duty, I think, of every farmer to look well o the kind of machinery he employs to do this work, and it seems these Mansfield people have solved the problem of perfect grain threshing. This much I will promise, that I will cheerfully pay you from three to five cents per bushel for your wheat threshed by one of the standard threshers of the vibrator class, manufactured at Mansfield, Ohio, than I will for wheat threshed by any other make now in use; and now that this Aultman & Taylor concern has developed and perfected a machine that is as superior to the endless apron machine as the endless apron machine was superior to the flail and old ‘Ground Hog’ machine, it is a duty every farmer owes to himself, to his miller, and to the grain dealer, to patronize that machine. Every well-to-do and influential farmer should talk it up among the threshermen and insist that they operate Aultman & Taylor grain-saving, time-saving, money-making machines; and a refusal to do so should be sufficient reason for withholding their patronage from those who persist in the use of these old grain-wasting, time-losing, money-losing machines.” . . .

Simmons — “She is ‘Queen of the Tribe,’ and knocks the old endless apron and all other makes of machines I ever heard of into a ‘cocked hat.’ I can just make her do anything in the line of threshing grain or seeds, except to crack and break it, and that she won’t do; that’s settled. Next to my wife and babies I prize that thresher most. She has made me a little farm, built me a comfortable house and barn, and has won for me the warm thanks of the farmers—because with it I have threshed, cleaned, and saved all their grain and seed which they worked so hard to raise. Why Jones! just look at her, is it any wonder the women are in love with her? I tell you Jones, she is a ‘woman’s rights’ machine, and don’t keep them cooking and baking and stewing a whole week over a hot cook stove, to feed a lot of hungry men, when the same job can be done in a day. When I was running the old endless apron thresher, the women looked as sour as a ‘pickle keg’ when I came around to do their threshing for them; but since I have the ‘Starved Rooster’ they look happy, and give me a welcome when I come, that you would think it was only to be a picnic. Why, the very girls are all partial to the boys that help me run my machine. Now come here, Jones, and I will show you how she does it. You see, to commence with, she has a heavier and better cylinder than other machines; the spikes are better arranged and more of them, so that every grain is knocked out of the head to start with; the concaves are grated, so that separation begins at the cylinder, what grain passes through concaves is carried back to the sieves, and what passes through with the straw is sifted out by the agitating fingers or rakes, of which there are, as you see, seven sets worked by these adjustable cams; if you want more agitation in the straw (which you always need in damp grain) all you have to do is to tighten up these cam straps, that raises the fingers higher and gives all the motion necessary to thoroughly separate the grain from the straw before it reaches the rear of the machine. Now, look here, Jones: You see the upper conveyor is all slat-work, so the grain falls through into the lower conveyor (Which has a solid bottom.) and is carried back and delivered into the sieves, where there is over 12 feet of sieve surface to clean over. Now add to these things the advantage (gained over other makes of

threshers) of this overblast fan, and it makes the saving and cleaning of the grain or seed thorough and perfect. Here is another nice contrivance, a lever called the ‘belt tightener’ with which to tighten the belts; this saves the time and trouble of cutting and sewing belts. Here, too, is the concave adjuster with which you raise or lower the concaves; you will readily see, from the peculiar construction of this machine, that there is no possibility of litterings, which is not the case with other machines, which take from one to two hours to clean up. Say, Robinson! did you explain the clover huller attachment to Jones?”

Robinson — “Why no! I forgot about it. Strange, too, that I should not think of it when you done the finest job of hulling ever done in my barn!”

Simmons — “I tell you, Mr. Jones, the Allonas Clover Hulling Attachment is one of the greatest inventions of this age. In fifteen minutes I can change my Aultman & Taylor thresher to a perfect clover huller, and I can hull two bushels of clover seed while the best double-cylinder huller in America hulls one, and clean it so perfectly that the seed will always bring the highest price in the market. No need of running it through a fanning mill, for it will be thoroughly cleaned when it comes from my machine.”

Jones — “Now, Simmons, you don’t pretend to tell me that you can hull clover seed on a threshing machine? That’s spreading the thing on a little too thick.”

Simmons — “Yes, sir, I do pretend to say that I can do that very thing, and as ‘proof of the pudding is in eating of it’ if you will just step here to this granary, I will prove to you that I have only told you the facts. Right here in this bin is sixty bushels of clover seed hulled in one day from a twenty-acre field, and hulled, too, by that same ‘Starved Rooster’ machine that you have been looking at.”

Jones — “Simmons, you don’t mean to say that you hulled sixty bushels of that seed in one day—and on your threshing machine? Why, that is the cleanest seed I have ever seen. I would like to know how you hull clover seed on a threshing machine, and do such work at that.”

Simmons — “That’s what I mean to say, John Jones, . . . I can hull eighty bushels of clover seed on that ‘Starved Rooster’ machine with my Allonas Hulling Attachment and clean it just as well as this in my bin; and now I’ll show you how it’s done; you see this shelf is a hulling concave; I just drop this at the rear of the cylinder, and bolt it fast to the post of the cylinder frame; then this solid concave I drop in next, the same as you would any concave; with these little bars of iron I close up the cracks between the concaves, and also the grate work in the two threshing concaves, which I use in the front. I then put the grain board in the proper place, change my riddles, shutting off the draft in the wind-mill, using just enough to clean the seed thoroughly, and then I am ready for business. You see that it is only the work of a few minutes to make the change, and that here is another saving to the farmer. The same machine threshes perfectly, and without waste, your wheat, oats, barley, Hungarian timothy, flax, and clover seed, without pulling stakes, and of course without the loss of time and annoyance of having a second machine and another threshing spree.”²

Other Kinds of Advertisements

Frequent use was made of a variety of publications The one nearest at hand was the newspapers. During several months of each year the newspaper carried a half and full page advertisements of [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. The pictures in those advertisements were accompanied by statements or explanations that suggested the outstanding . . . features of [the] machinery. Advertisements also appeared in the *American Thresherman* and many of the farm

journals.

Circulars, catalogs, and similar materials in great quantities were sent out through the mails. For example, in January of 1892 [Aultman & Taylor] mailed the largest quantity of material ever sent out by one firm in Mansfield. They [sent] during that month 540,000 pieces of mail. It was decided that such a vast number of pieces of mail . . . seriously [interfered] with the usual routine in the Post Office, since the quarters . . . were cramped. So a method of handling that vast quantity of mail was adopted by the postmaster and the mail clerks: . . .

The wrappers for the circulars were brought to the Post Office and canceled, after which the circulars were enclosed in the wrappers. . . . [T]o avoid delay . . . in sending them through the Mansfield Post Office again, the postal clerks who laid over at Crestline . . . went to the Aultman & Taylor office and sorted them into states preparatory to taking them directly to the train. It was [assumed] that this way of handling such a large bulk of mail was perfectly legal.³

Another means of advertising was by the exhibition of [Aultman & Taylor] machinery. The company [showed its equipment] at the state and county fairs, as well as the great . . . world's fairs. At many of those expositions the company won gold medals for [its] machinery.

A number of the companies devised . . . stunts for the demonstration of . . . traction engines The author recalls a rather simple stunt that the Aultman & Taylor people used in demonstrating their engines at the fairs. . . . The steering chains of the engine were so adjusted that, when the engineer turned the front wheels in toward the boiler, the engine would move continuously in a circle. From time to time the engineer would check the water and throw a few shovels of coal into the firebox, and then he would leap off the platform while the engine would continue to move in [a] circle without an engineer There was usually a crowd of fair-goers standing nearby gawking at that engine without an engineer By the time the fair came to an end, the engine had dug a furrow or ditch eight or ten inches deep

Merchants have often made use of a . . . lottery to advertise . . . their business. This is illustrated by the involvement of the Aultman & Taylor Company in such a deal. [The company] sold a thresher to a local merchant and entered into an agreement to have the thresher given away to a customer. On December 1, 1883, the [firm] sold a separator to Schonfield and Frederick, who were merchants in Mansfield. That separator was built especially for the company's exhibition at the world's fair⁴ [The company officials] sold it much below cost, since it was their desire to have the separator somewhere near the factory. It was the most elegantly finished thresher they had ever built The list price was \$400.00, but they stated that they would not build another one like it for less than \$700.00.

The merchants presented to each customer a guarantee ticket that on July 1, 1884, one of their customers would get the Aultman & Taylor thresher free of charge. Each edition of the newspapers for seven months carried a full-page advertisement of Schonfield & Frederick in which the customer was urged to purchase merchandise and was informed that along with his purchase he would be given a ticket for a chance on the Aultman & Taylor thresher. A picture of the thresher appeared with each advertisement. . . . [In this way,] a product of the Aultman & Taylor Company was before the public from December 1, 1883, to July 1, 1884, or a period of seven months.⁵

Another scheme . . . had an appeal to those of musical inclinations. The company published songs [for] the organ and piano. The title of one such song was "The Jolly Thresherman." The title page was finely lithographed. At the center of the page was a portrait of the ideal young thresherman with scenes at dinner and at [a] dance. At the corners of the

picture he was shown as a husband, father, and patriot. It was claimed that the poetry was superior to that of the average sheet music of that day. The song was set to music from the famous . . . popular opera *H.M.S. Pinafore* [by Gilbert and Sullivan]. It was advertised in several of [the firm's] publications and was sent free of charge to anyone who wrote to the company and requested a copy.

. . . Through the use of newspapers, magazines, drama, trademark, and other [methods, the company] succeeded in bringing [its] machinery to the attention of the farmer, the thresherman, and the general public.

Notes

1. Holbrook, Stewart. *Machines of Plenty*. New York: Macmillan, 1955. 112-15. [This source] gives a detailed description of the trappings of the Case special trains.
2. *A Dialogue*. Cleveland: Short and Foreman.
3. *The Sunday Shield*, may 9, 1892.
4. Dr. Rhode notes that Dr. Bixler's text contains a discrepancy. Dr. Bixler gives the dates as 1883 and 1884, but he cites a publication from 1880 (below). Logic demands that the date of the publication fall during or after 1884. Also, Dr. Bixler's manuscript states that the world's fair was held in St. Louis. The Louisiana Purchase Exposition took place there in 1904. Perhaps he had in mind the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876. The only other world's fair of any size occurring within a decade of Dr. Bixler's dates was the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893.
5. *Mansfield Herald*, April 29, 1880.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the fifteenth installment of the annals of the Aultman & Taylor firm, researched and written by Dr. Bixler. The *Album* is posthumously serializing Dr. Bixler's book. During his lifetime, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, published a book and numerous articles on agricultural uses of steam power. He did not live to see his biggest project in print—the complete history of the Aultman & Taylor Company. The *Album's* staff is pleased to bring you Dr. Bixler's book, edited and prepared for publication by Dr. Robert T. Rhode.

Chapter 15

Litigation and Personnel in the Aultman & Taylor Company's Later Years

The Aultman & Taylor Company was involved in a variety of [lawsuits]. They had to do with patent rights and infringements, damage suits, collecting of money due the company, and contract violations.

. . . On February 15, 1870, Andrew W. Hummer brought suit against the company for certain damages. It was a civil action The trial began on February 28 . . . , but it did not in reality get underway until September 14 . . . [when] a jury was impaneled to hear the case. . . . After due deliberation the jury returned [its] verdict . . . in favor of the plaintiff and awarded damages in the amount of \$360.00.¹ . . .

At the conclusion of the trial the attorneys for both parties gave notice of their intention to demand a second trial. . . . The plaintiff asked for \$600.00, and the defendant set the figure at \$200.00. The court records do not show the final disposition of the case. . . .

In February of 1899 a furor arose [over] a lawsuit brought against the Aultman & Taylor Company. . . . [An] Ohio statute . . . provided that the county commissioners could employ a tax inquisitor whose responsibility was to search out those individuals or corporations in the county [that] had not paid their taxes. He was to be paid twenty percent of the amount of money collected The . . . New Testament [shows] that [tax collectors] were despised by most of the people. . . . Ohio's . . . were equally unpopular Suit was brought against the company in the amount of \$228,000.00 for delinquent . . . taxes.

George Brinkerhoff was the attorney for the company and also the administrator of the Harter estate. At a meeting of the employees of the company he stated that W. F. Charters was employed by the county commissioners to hunt [down] prospects [who may have] concealed assets . . . subject to taxation. It was charged that Charters had no interest in Richland County and . . . was [concerned only about] the amount of money that he could collect for himself.

James E. Brown, president of the company, stated that, if that amount of money [were] collected, [the firm] would be compelled to move to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, where conditions would be more favorable. This threat aroused the employees of the company, and they held a meeting at Company M's Armory . . . to take action in regard to the giant tax suit . . .

George Knoflock, who was in charge of the shipping department, was informally selected as chairman for the evening. The men [chose] Isaiah Little to be secretary of the meeting. Morgan Roop, the man who drove the first stakes for the Aultman & Taylor Company and whose sons had been employed by the company, along with several of the older employees, [sat on] the platform.

Brinkerhoff . . . demonstrated the cussedness of the tax inquisitor It was brought to the attention of the group that this suit was one way . . . to create suspicion and impair credit. When a large concern [like] the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company began manufacturing in the spring of the year, it was necessary to borrow large sums of money. Local banks were unable to furnish all of the necessary money, so some of it had to be borrowed elsewhere. The attorney . . . expressed the opinion that it was unnecessary to reveal such information to the public. It was stated that the company was in a sound financial condition and that it could weather all of the storms.

If the suit had been successful . . . the inquisitor would have received \$45,000.00 for his services. Those who were present that evening were warned that, in the event the suit was successful . . . , [the company] would close its shops and locate in an eastern city where conditions would be more favorable. . . . New York at that time did not levy a tax against manufacturers. . . . The company took the position that it could better afford to abandon the buildings and move to an eastern city rather than submit to what [it] regarded as unjust taxation. . . . [One of the employees asked,] "Do we want to put a fence around Mansfield against manufactories and drive out those we have?"

One of the newspaper artists drew a picture of a fat man and labeled him "The Grafter."

[The artist suggested] that, while the rooster almost starved on the Aultman & Taylor strawstack, the tax grafters were . . . plucking the company.

. . . Knofflock made a brief talk in which he informed the men that he had gone to work for the company on December 1, 1868, that he had always been treated [well] by the company, and that he never asked for a favor but that it was granted. He then asked, “How is it with you? . . . Now then, the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company has a payroll of \$20,000.00 per month. You can’t afford to have the company move to Pittsburgh and lose this. Can the merchants of Mansfield afford it? No sir! Last summer for four months the payroll . . . was \$26,000.00 per month.”

. . . One of the county commissioners, George Gribbling, did not vote to employ the [tax collector]. He attended the meeting of the employees and showed them something of the ignorance . . . and inability that prevailed at the courthouse.

. . . At [the meeting’s] close a committee . . . consisting of William Brent, John Cahall, James Livingston, Edward Smith, Isaiah Little, Louis Theis, Joseph Galland, John W. Glashon, and Morgan Roop [was appointed] to draft resolutions and present them to the county commissioners.

At a meeting held in the large paint shop during the noon hour the resolutions prepared by the committee were read and [given a preliminary adoption]: . . .

“The employees of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, in mass assembled, unanimously passed the following declaration and resolutions with reference to the recent suits begun by the Treasurer of Richland County against the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and against the estate of Michael D. Harter, deceased.

“We look upon said suits with horror as being an effort to extort money from said estate and from said company without regard for the interests of the employees and taxpayers resident in said county. Prior to the death of Michael D. Harter it was our privilege to work under him for many years—some of us ever since we were old enough to work, and as such employer he not only dealt honestly and fairly with us but was a personal friend of each and every man under his employ and in his conversations never knowingly defrauded the county or Richland. The Aultman & Taylor people as a corporation have always dealt with their employees not only fairly but generously, and their dealings have always been honest, and we feel that the tax returns that they have made to the county have been [as] near correct as it was possible to make them; that the interests of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company and the estate of Michael D. Harter, deceased, are so interwoven that anything that injuriously affects one must to a great extent injure the other, but if the Aultman & Taylor people are required to pay taxes on such evaluation as indicated by the suit pending that they must necessarily be driven from Richland County and the state of Ohio; that if this should happen it would not only injuriously affect the employees of said company but would be injurious to every resident in our city and county. We denounce in the strongest possible terms the action taken and demand not only as employees of said company but as taxpayers and residents of Mansfield that the country treasurer at once dismiss both of said actions; that the county auditor with such [of] the county commissioners as may be necessary, take from the tax duplicate the addition place thereon as against said company and against said estate.

“We request that the citizens of Mansfield, irrespective of their business, through the Fifty Thousand League, or such other means as may be thought best, . . . hold a meeting as soon as possible to take such action as they in their judgment may deem best. This action should be taken . . . not solely from the pecuniary standpoint but because of what we owe to the company

whose interests have been attacked and their officers.

“We request the News Publishing Company and the Shield Publishing Company publish this statement in their daily paper and also re-publish it in their semi-weekly edition.

“In behalf of said meeting signed by the following committee, one from each of the several departments: W. T. Brent, Chairman, W. M. Roop, James Livingston, Joseph E. Smith, J. Cahall, E. J. Little, Joseph Galland, Louis Theis, [and] J. R. Glashan [sic].”

. . . On the afternoon of February 4, 1899, at two o'clock, the entire force of the employees . . . assembled at the plant and after hearing the report of the committee adopted it. The workmen then formed a line and marched up to the courthouse. They marched around the south side of Central Park and entered the courthouse. They assembled in the common please court room. The meeting was called to order by Knofflock. Morgan Roop and William Brent were appointed to wait on the county commissioner and request their attendance at the meeting. . . . [A] motion was made to summon the county treasurer, Brumfield, and county auditor, Fritz, to the meeting. As soon as the commissioners and the other officials were present, Knofflock read the resolutions

Speaking for the commissioners, Gribbling agreed that they would get rid of the tax inquisitor and annul the suit of the treasurer. Brumfield also agreed to do everything he could to ease the difficulties. . . . Fritz was called upon, and he declined to take the extra tax off . . . the duplicate. He read a passage from the law to justify his action.

After lengthy hearings, including . . . the Ohio Attorney General, the case was settled by requiring the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company to pay the sum of \$35,000.00 as back taxes. Judge Shields of the common pleas court held that the tax inquisitor, Charters, was not entitled to twenty percent of the amount collected or any other sum of money. The judge also found that the auditor was entitled to four percent of the amount collected.²

As a result of this settlement tempers cooled, and the Aultman & Taylor Company continued to build machinery in the city of Mansfield. . . . [A] group of concerned . . . people [had] demonstrated that an injustice [can] be corrected by an aroused citizenry.

On May 11, 1889, a civil action was brought by Brinkerhoff for Michael Kissel and David Bushey, executors of the last will and testament of Jacob Kissel. The case was adjudicated and settled by the court, which required the company to pay the full judgment and costs [amounting] to \$219.00.³

In 1903 the records of one of the meetings of the board of directors show that the expenses incurred by a suit brought against the [firm] by the Thayer Company was charged to their sinking fund. The Thayer Company was an agent for [Aultman & Taylor's] water-tube boilers. . . . The suit was brought to satisfy an unfulfilled obligation.

On December 2, 1909, the following resolution was adopted by the board of directors:

“Resolved that the proposition of W. H. Cahall to pay him \$6,250.00 in full settlement of his pretended claim of royalties or damage under patent upon a manhole device used in horizontal boilers be, and the same is hereby, rejected, and be it further resolved that, inasmuch as he has written to Mr. Isaac Harter and others on the subject, . . . Mr. Harter be instructed to write so to him, and to further state in substance that, while the company denied all liability of every kind or anyone else upon his pretended claim, in order to avoid litigation, it would take up the matter of compromising said claim for such nominal sum as might cost it to defend against and defeat said claim.”⁴

Apparently this claim was settled outside of court

Company Personnel in Later Years

Biographical sketches of individuals . . . [important] in the life of the company were presented in earlier chapters. Yet, there were others who in later years became prominently affiliated with the [firm]

James Ephraim Brown

James Ephraim Brown was born [in] Bloomfield, Trumble County, Ohio, on March 21, 1846. . . . His [British] ancestors emigrated to this country during the early period of our nation and settled at Westmoreland, New Hampshire. His relatives became a part of the New England group that settled in what became known as the Western Reserve in Ohio.

Brown received his early education in a private school at Bloomfield. He attended high school in Massillon, Ohio, from which he graduated in 1864 One might add that this was the first high school chartered by the state of Ohio, and it was shortly thereafter that Brown attended that school. He completed a business course at Poughkeepsie (New York) College. From there he went to New York City, where he engaged in the wool business for a period of three years. Then he spent the next three years in Boston . . . engaged in the same business. . . . [H]e returned to Massillon, where he conducted a hardware business until 1878.

At that time Michael D. Harter importuned him to come to Mansfield to affiliate himself with the Aultman & Taylor Company. Accepting [the] invitation Brown entered the employ of the [firm] in October of 1878 as assistant to Harter, who was then the manager of the company. In 1881 he was elected secretary and held that position until 1891. As already noted, in October of that year the company was sold to the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company, and Brown was elected President. He held that position until 1922, when he relinquished it and was elected President of the Board of Directors. The latter position he held until the company was liquidated. Altogether he served the company in official capacities for forty-five years, a longer period of time than any other person connected with the [firm] with the exception of Elizabeth Aultman Harter, who, it will be recalled, was affiliated with the company from the founding to [its] liquidation.

He was united in marriage on April 24, 1872, to Isabella Hurxthal, a daughter of a Massillon banker. One son, James, was born to that union. Mrs. Brown died on July 7, 1891. In 1901 he was married to Katherine Holloway of Mansfield. To that union [were] born two children, Ephraim H. and Mary Katherine.

Brown was affiliated with the different Masonic bodies in Mansfield and held office in . . . those organizations. He was . . . an active member of Grace Episcopal Church in Mansfield . . .

Although he never held public office, yet he was active in . . . Mansfield political affairs as a Republican. On January 1, 1897, he was elected President of the Mansfield Savings and Trust Company and on January 22, 1922, became Chairman of the Board of that financial institution, which position he held until . . . his death. . . . [B]urial was . . . in the Mansfield Cemetery.

The presidency of the company placed [Brown] at the center of a vast manufacturing concern It was his practice at each of the annual meetings of the stockholders in January to present a report. Those reports contained a resumé of the production of machinery during the preceding year, the financial status of the company, and problems concerned with its management. . . . They . . . constitute one of the most important sources of information . . .

concerning the company.

When vitally important matters were to be considered by the board of directors, he conferred with Mrs. Harter and secured her approval of the proposed action. Occasionally Mrs. Harter was unable to attend meetings of the directors or stockholders; in those instances, Brown went to her home in Canton to . . . seek her counsel. One experience is illustrative. On February 20, 1906, Brown discussed the details of the proposed liquidation of the indebtedness due . . . the Aultman & Taylor Company . . . and secured [Mrs. Harter's] approval before the matter was presented to the directors and stockholders. This procedure . . . is understandable in view of the fact that Mrs. Harter was the largest stockholder in the company, and . . . with her years of experience he [trusted] her opinions . . .

At the stockholders meeting in January of 1916, Brown made the following statement: "As I am approaching my seventieth birthday and the thirty-eighth year with the company, it is natural to feel that, within a few years at least, I shall have to cease connection with the company, and for the remaining period of my connection with the company I feel it necessary to relinquish a great deal of the work I have been doing and be free to absent myself at times from the business. I desire to give attention to the general matters of the business, financial, etc., leaving all details which I heretofore looked after, more or less, to be attended to by somebody else. I feel under the conditions my salary should remain as it is so long as I am filling this office. Mrs. Harter is in perfect agreement."

Following the above announcement the offices of the company were placed largely in the hands of G. Paul Alexander, who became treasurer. His appointment . . . was for a period of three years.⁵

Huntington Brown

Huntington Brown was born in Trumble County, Ohio, in 1849, a son of James Monroe and Mary (Hicks) Brown. His father was the original proprietor of Bloomfield Township . . . , was the coadjudicator of the early anti-slavery men of the Western Reserve, and also served in the House of the Ohio General Assembly in 1824.

In early childhood Huntington Brown accompanied his parents when they moved to Massillon, Ohio. His early education was acquired in the public schools of that city. Later he attended Nazareth Hall, a school . . . located in Pennsylvania. In 1867 he went to Mansfield and became associated with M. D. Harter In an earlier chapter it was shown that Brown was one of the men who traveled [across] the West seeking to introduce the new company and its products to prospective customers. At the age of twenty-one he toured Europe

Upon his return from that trip he entered the employ of the Aultman & Taylor Manufacturing Company. He [was recognized] for his abilities and was rewarded by successive promotions. He became superintendent of the company in 1879, serving in that capacity for ten years. After having been affiliated with the company for twenty-one years, he then moved on to other executive positions in . . . Mansfield.

His activities included a variety of social, political, fraternal, and commercial relations. He possessed great qualities of leadership and did much to mold public thought and action. . . . He served as mayor of . . . Mansfield for a number of years. He died on February 8, 1914.⁶

James Reynolds

James Reynolds was born in New York City on July 14, 1846, a son of William and Ann (Bowden) Reynolds. In 1863 he accompanied his parents to Ohio, where they located in Crawford County, and in 1872 he went to Licking County.

He received a practical education through firsthand experience when at the age of sixteen he became an errand boy in the office of a Wall Street broker. Beginning in 1863 he taught in a rural school for eight years. Following that experience he taught in village schools and then became superintendent of schools in Crestline, Ohio, and Warrensburg, Missouri. While at Crestline, he became an inspector of high schools in Ohio. He went to Mansfield in 1877 and became the principal of the Tenth-Ward School His career as a teacher . . . closed in 1878 [when] he entered the employment of the Aultman & Taylor Company.

Reynolds was married to Charlotte A. Trimble, whose parents originally came from Harrison County, Ohio, and were pioneers in Crawford County. Four children were born to that union: Emma, Alexander Tully, Mary, and William Fielding.

For many years he was one of Mansfield's most prominent and respected citizens. He was a hard-working, progressive businessman. . . .

An active member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Mansfield, he served as the superintendent of its Sunday School for many years He was an opponent of the liquor business

He was president of the board of trustees of the Emergency Hospital in Mansfield. He also served as a trustee of the Carnegie Library during its construction. . . .

Reynolds . . . served as . . . treasurer [of the Aultman & Taylor board of directors] for thirty years. . . . He was one of the persons who envisioned the need for innovations He resigned as treasurer of the company on April 28, 1908, and retired that year. His death occurred on August 13, 1909, at his farm located about two miles south of Lexington, Ohio. He was survived by his wife, two sons, and a daughter. . . . Burial was made in the Mansfield Cemetery.⁷

Arnold Kalmerten

Arnold Kalmerten was born in Burgstein, Germany, in 1850. He was educated in the German Gymnasium located in the Westphalian city [of his birth]. . . . Kalmerten pursued . . . English, French, Latin, . . . mathematics, and commercial [studies]. Kalmerten's father was a . . . miller. . . . [His] father's mill . . . was so situated that Kalmerten could watch the two turning stones and could fish in the stream that flowed beneath the mill. . . .

Upon coming to America Kalmerten located at Fort Wayne, Indiana. He was unable to secure employment there or in Chicago. He went . . . to Iowa, where he was employed at farm work until the fall of 1866, when he returned to Chicago, where for a year he met with varying fortune. . . .

In the fall of 1867 he [found work] as a clerk in a store in St. Louis. . . . Following that experience he worked on a farm in Warren County, Missouri, and also taught in a parochial school. . . . [H]e maintained a brave, dogged perseverance

He went to Cincinnati, where in 1869 he entered the Normal School. . . . He increased his knowledge of English and . . . teaching A few months later he went to Lawrenceburg, Indiana, where he was a successful teacher in the public schools during 1869 and 1870.

Unfortunately his voice soon failed, and he was compelled to relinquish classroom work [to become] a day laborer. He lived on milk and raw eggs for three months, when his voice

returned. He then received an appointment in the Mansfield schools, beginning his work in 1871, and taught there for more than two years.

Following his teaching experience in Mansfield he entered the wholesale dry-goods business of Wood and Witter, where he remained until 1875, at which time he went to Toledo, Ohio. Then, upon the recommendation of Wood, . . . he was given employment with the Aultman & Taylor Company. He . . . and served as secretary [beginning in] 1876 [On] June 4, 1913, he was appointed Examiner of School Funds in the State of Ohio.

His work was in the State Bureau of Public Accounting and Inspection, which was under the state auditor's department. . . .

Kalmerten was married to Mary A. Krabill, a daughter of Charles Krabill, a contractor . . . who as a young man had come to this country from Germany. To that union was born three children: Ernest, Julia, and Bertha. The son . . . held the position of mortgage clerk in the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

Kalmerten and his family were members of the German Evangelical Church, [where] he was a chorister for twenty-eight years. . . . [H]e was elected twice a member of the Mansfield board of education.

. . . He was one of the incorporators of the [Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company] and served as secretary of the stockholders until January 25, 1907, when he resigned from that position. Beginning [on] January 18, 1912, he was no longer a member of the board of directors.

. . . Let it be said that only in this land so richly blessed could a young man [like] Kalmerten from a foreign land have been afforded . . . opportunity for advancement, even though it entailed hardships . . .⁸

George W. Seaman

George W. Seaman was born February 22, 1869, at Beardstown, Illinois. His early and high school education were acquired in the public schools . . . He was graduated from the University of Illinois in 1893 with the degree of Bachelor of Science. After receiving his baccalaureate [degree] he pursued a graduate program and was awarded the degree of Mechanical Engineer.

Following his graduate work he located [in] Port Huron, Michigan, and remained there for eight years. He then went to Mansfield in 1904, where he was employed at the . . . Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company until June 14, 1914. He was the company's draftsman, superintendent, and chief engineer. It will be recalled that it was he who designed the big engine that was shipped to Faulkton, South Dakota, in 1909.

Seaman and [his wife] went to Cleveland on July 23, 1914, to attend [a Bible conference] for two weeks. . . . [T]hey had planned to take a trip through the West, but that trip was never made. Seaman was struck by an attack of appendicitis [and] died on Saturday, August 1, 1914, at Glenville Hospital in Cleveland

He was survived by his wife, two sons, and one daughter, together with one brother and two sisters. Funeral services were held at his home in Mansfield, and burial was . . . in the Mansfield Cemetery.⁹

John Cahall

John Cahall was born in Reading, Pennsylvania, on June 4, 1842. Leaving his native city

at . . . age . . . ten . . . he lived and worked on a farm near Wilmington, Delaware, for seven years. He then returned to Reading, where he learned the trade of boilermaking in the Reading railroad shops. Upon . . . completion of his apprenticeship he went to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where for another seven years he had charge of Tippet's boiler shop. At the end of that time he went to Lewistown, where for four years he engaged in business for himself.

In May of 1877 he went to Mansfield and for two years was affiliated with the firm of Flanningham & Sullivan. In January of 1879 he entered the employ of the Aultman & Taylor Company, becoming the first foreman of the boiler shop, which position he held until his retirement. He and his son William were the inventors of horizontal and vertical water-tube boilers, to which reference has already been made. Those boilers were one of the most . . . significant products manufactured by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. Cahall was . . . [an] expert machinist.

Cahall was married twice. In 1867 he was married to Sarah Ritner of Reading, Pennsylvania, who was niece of Governor Ritner of that state. To that union were born three children: Mary A., John D., and William H. [In] June [of] 1882 he was married to Helen Eliza Holeywell, a teacher in the Mansfield schools. To that union were born three children: Fred H., Raymond D., and Leslie

. . . [His second wedding] was followed by a mock serenade, which was in vogue in some communities many years ago. It was known as a "belling." Those who participated used a variety of noise-making instruments. After a period of noise . . . the bridegroom made his appearance and, . . . to satisfy the crowd, offered to treat them. Failure to meet the demands of the serenaders made him subject to the disfavor of his friends Sometimes he gave the bellers money with which to purchase ice cream for the crowd. At other times, . . . he would provide them with beer, which was known as "settin' of 'em up." [Cahall's belling was] managed by the employees of the boiler department. They appeared . . . with a traction engine, to which was attached a wagon loaded with a section of a boiler, followed by another wagon that carried a horse-fiddle, a large triangle, dinner bells, and other [noisemakers]. There were eight or nine whistles on the engine that opened the performance emitting discordant shrieks that could be heard for many miles around Mansfield. One group of men with sledges . . . belabored the section of the boiler, [while others] added to the noise with other "musical" instruments. . . . Cahall had only one plan that would be acceptable to the crowd: "settin' of 'em up." . . .

Cahall was active in the community. He was a prominent member of the Episcopal Church, in which he served as vestryman. He was a Mason and a Knight Templar He served as a member of the County Council for two terms. Later he was appointed by Mayor Huntington Brown as one of four members of the Sanitary and Garbage Commission . . .

Cahall died on February 11, 1919 Burial was . . . in the Mansfield Cemetery.¹⁰

Marvin W. Lutz

Marvin W. Lutz was born in Stark County near Canton, Ohio, and was reared in that city. Prior to his going to Mansfield, he was connected with the Canton Post Office and later was associated with the Isaac Harter Bank . . .

During 1906 Mrs. Harter [invited] him to become associated with the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. At that time the company was plagued with . . . serious financial difficulties, and Lutz was brought in for the . . . purpose of establishing sound . . . financial practices. At the meeting of the board of directors on January 25, 1907, . . . he was elected

secretary of the company. The statement was made that, during his [years of service], it was impossible for any employee to purchase a box of matches without his sanction. . . .

[T]he records of the company show that he served on a number of committees and was influential in the life of the company. He had a host of friends among the old threshermen who were customers of the company. . . .

There are those who aver that Lutz became a victim of certain [professional] jealousies that had developed among the officials. . . . [H]is affiliation with the company was terminated in 1919. . . . [A]t the time of the liquidation of the company [he remarked], "Aultman & Taylor has been rotten on the inside for some time due to the incompetence of its leadership, and now it is dead."

. . . [H]e opened an insurance agency in Mansfield. He was the . . . representative of a number of concerns, the chief of which was the Union Central Insurance Company of Cincinnati. In 1931 he retired . . . but remained in daily contact with his office.

Lutz was a member of [the] Knights of Pythias, the United Commercial Travelers, and . . . Masonic bodies, including the Scottish Rite He was also a member of St. Luke's Lutheran Church in Mansfield.

He died on June 7, 1932, at the age of sixty-one. Lutz was survived by his wife, Magdaline King Lutz; a sister, Nillie E. Lutz of Canton; and three brothers, Rev. John Lutz of Amanda, Ohio, Cyrillus M. and Warren W. Lutz both of Canton.¹¹

George Paul Alexander

George Paul Alexander was born in Wheeling, West Virginia, in 1874, a son of Mr. and Mrs. David E. Alexander, who were early residents of . . . Canton, Ohio. His elementary and secondary education [were] acquired in the Canton public schools.

. . . [H]e enrolled in the College of Wooster in the fall of 1890. He left the [college] at the close of his sophomore year . . . to go to work The 1968 edition of the Alumni Directory of the college indicates that he was a member of the class of 1894. . . .

[H]e became associated with the Bonnot Manufacturing Company in Canton, which was an old firm in that city. After some years . . . with that [firm] he became affiliated with the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

The first mention of Alexander in the Record Book of the company was at the meeting of the directors held on January 25, 1907.¹² A motion was made by Henry W. Alexander . . . that G. Paul Alexander be elected Vice-President of the company with an annual salary of \$4,000.00. . . .

On April 28, 1908, Alexander submitted his resignation Immediately following . . . , his name was presented for Treasurer His salary was to be the same as when he served as Vice-President.

. . . [When in January of 1916 President Brown announced his desire to relinquish many of his responsibilities, he said,] "The above change will put the management largely in the hands of Mr. G. Paul Alexander, Treasurer, and . . . I have recommended . . . that for a period of . . . three years . . . his salary be fixed at . . . \$8,000.00 per year [and] 2½ percent on the net profits of this company . . . in excess of \$100,000.00 and [3½ percent on profits in excess of \$200,000.00]." . . .

From 1916 to 1921 he assumed managerial responsibilities in addition to holding the office of Treasurer of the company. . . . His withdrawal from the Aultman & Taylor Machinery

Company . . . occurred when he was forty-seven years of age and eighteen years prior to his death.

[An] item appearing in the Alumni Association records of the College of Wooster [states,] “From Coconut Grove, Florida, G. P. Alexander writes that he is a ‘retired manufacturer.’ To those of us who are still working sixteen hours a day the ease of a retired manufacturer basking in the tropical vegetation is almost beyond comprehension.”¹³

In 1907 Alexander was married to Alice Lynch, a daughter of . . . William A. Lynch, . . . a highly respected attorney

Following a long illness, Alexander’s death occurred in Coconut Grove, Florida, on Wednesday . . . , October 25, 1939 He was survived by his wife and two daughters, Mrs. Price Day of Ft. Lauderdale . . . and Mrs. William J. Matheson of Philadelphia One brother, James C. Alexander of Fort Wayne, and two sisters, Mrs. Lester Deweese of Canton and Mrs. Francis A. Buxton of Coconut Grove, survived him. . . . Interment was . . . in Canton . . .¹⁴

Notes

1. Records of the Richland County, Ohio, Clerk of Courts.
2. *The Mansfield News*, February 4, 1899.
3. Records of the Clerk of Courts.
4. Record Book, Minutes of the Meetings of the Stockholders and Directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.
5. Baughman, A. J. *Centennial History of Richland County, Ohio*. Vol. 1. Chicago: Lewis Publishing, 1902. 584. *Mansfield News Journal*, June 26, 1925.
6. Ibid. 618. *Mansfield Shield*, February 9, 1914.
7. Ibid. 244. *Richland Shield and Banner*, August 19, 1909.
8. Ibid. 393-94. *Mansfield News*, June 4, 1913.
9. *The Mansfield News*, August 3, 1914.
10. The horse-fiddle was comprised of a huge wooden box, the top or one side of which was open. A plank or a similar piece of timber was placed on top of the open box. the plank was then propelled back and forth by men standing on each side of the box. . . . [T]o increase the volume of the noise, resin was placed on the underside of the plank and also on the edges of the two sides of the box. The noise produced by that contraption was deafening
11. Baughman. 383. *Mansfield Herald*, June 15, 1882. *Mansfield News Journal*, February 12, 1919.
12. Record Book.
13. Personal letter from Edward Arn, Director of Alumni Relations, the college of Wooster, December 15, 1971.
14. *The Canton Repository*, October 26, 1939. Records of Westlawn Cemetery Assn., Canton, Ohio. Facts in this biographical sketch have been authenticated in personal communications from Quintin Alexander, Mrs. Price Day, and Miss Elizabeth Fogle, all of whom are relatives of Alexander.

The Aultman & Taylor Company

by Dr. Lorin E. Bixler

This issue of the *Album* contains the sixteenth, and final, installment of the late Dr. Bixler's chronicle of the Aultman & Taylor Company, edited by Dr. Robert T. Rhode. The *Album* has been serializing Dr. Bixler's book. During his lifetime, Dr. Bixler, a professor at Muskingum College in New Concord, Ohio, published a few of his chapters as separate articles in this magazine and others, but the bulk of his book remained unpublished until now. Dr. Bixler's manuscript offers rare insights into a significant manufacturing firm and the people who made it famous.

Chapter 16

Aultman & Taylor Financial Status and Liquidation of the Company

One of the problems that plagued the thresher companies was the collection of money that their customers owed on machinery, much of which was bought and sold on time. It was common practice to execute promissory notes covering the cost of machinery that were made payable to the company. Frequently those notes extended over a period of years. Following the close of the threshing season representatives of the [firm] made their rounds to collect money On those trips it was not uncommon for them to encounter difficulties, even to the extent of being threatened with bodily harm. Sometimes, especially during a poor season, threshermen had [trouble] collecting money from the farmers. Then there were always a few customers who were negligent . . . and did not meet their financial obligations. . . . [O]n many occasions the company was compelled to institute foreclosure proceedings that always entailed additional expenses. The collection of money due . . . involved such [costs] as salaries and travel expenses for the collectors.¹

. . . [T]he number of foreclosures for . . . six years [follows]: 148 in 1897, 132 in 1898, 98 in 1899, 82 in 1900, 56 in 1901, and 84 in 1902, for a total of 600 foreclosures.

[During the same six years, the amount of money paid out for collections was as follows]: \$19,690.83 for 1897, \$20,463.93 for 1898, \$22,183.44 for 1899, \$23,012.53 for 1900, \$11,208.90 for 1901, and \$8,836.35 for 1902, for a total of \$105,395.98. . . . [D]iscrepancies with respect to the number of foreclosures . . . compared [to] the expenses involved . . . may be attributable to . . . the number of collectors employed each year, as well as the fluctuation in the costs of . . . travel, meals, lodging, etc. . . . [G]reater effort to collect outstanding debts may have been exerted during some years than was true of others . . . to avoid as many foreclosures as possible.

. . . [T]he annual collections made for . . . eight years [for the Aultman & Taylor Company follows]: \$81,832.00 in 1895, \$116,263.00 in 1896, \$51,011.15 in 1897, \$42,583.94 in 1898, \$42,843.34 in 1899, \$27,872.96 in 1900, \$22,453.69 in 1901, and \$15,649.32 in 1902, for a total of \$400,509.40. The money for the liquidation of those debts continued to dribble in for more than eight or ten years. . . .

. . . [T]he amount of collections made . . . for the eight years [for the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company follows]: \$300,621.12 for 1895, \$349,020.73 for 1896, \$522,196.27 for

1897, \$558,953.58 for 1898, \$533,899.98 for 1899, \$537,759.07 for 1900, \$488,759.07 for 1901, and \$511,311.94 for 1902, for a total of \$3,802,521.76. The total collections for the two companies during the eight years . . . amounted to \$4,203,031.16.

. . . [The profit] made by the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company for each of the years for which figures are available [was]: \$245,000.00 in 1892, \$71,894.00 in 1894, \$353,379.00 in 1896, \$33,998.44 in 1897, \$122,574.50 in 1899, \$167,805.56 in 1900, \$68,603.62 in 1901, \$300,000.00 in 1903, \$250,000.00 in 1913, \$308,356.00 in 1915, and \$214,000.00 in 1916. [In the years for which figures are available, sales were highest in 1903 and 1915, amounting to \$2,300,000.00 and \$2,139,060.00 respectively.]

. . . [F]igures suggest that 1896 was a reasonably successful year. . . . In 1909 the capital stock was reduced from \$2,000,000.00 to \$1,000,000.00, and it should also be pointed out that the net income for 1906 was \$72,000.00; then in 1908 it was \$37,100.00 Doubtless this was a reflection of the business recession of 1907

[Net sales in years for which figures are available follow: \$674,400.00 in 1890, \$1,017,800.00 in 1892, \$924,800.00 in 1893, \$654,400.00 in 1894, \$875,700.00 in 1896, \$1,256,100.00 in 1908, \$1,307,200.00 in 1909, \$3,312,700.00 in 1912, \$3,032,800.00 in 1913, \$1,964,300.00 in 1922, and \$1,889,400.00 in 1923.]

. . . [T]he net sales for . . . 1916 amounted to \$1,970,591.00 as compared [to] \$2,139,060.00 in 1915, . . . a difference of about \$170,000.00.² . . . Due to unfavorable crop conditions during 1915 the company was compelled to carry over an [unusually high] number of completed separators. In addition . . . they had on hand sufficient materials [from] which to build . . . considerably more, which they were obliged to eliminate from their building schedule.

Moreover, [the] inventory in 1917 was \$300,000.00 higher than it was at the same time during the previous year. The contingency of World War I was upon the company, and . . . it was confronted with a critical financial situation. Yet, . . . [the firm] paid a dividend on the preferred stock. . . .

From 1912 through 1919 an earnest effort was made to increase the cash receipts from [the company's] sales. . . . In 1919 [the company made a gain of] 15% over the previous year. . . .

Yet, even with [the improved collections], there still remained on [the firm's] books in 1916 33% of . . . sales . . . due to the company. The payment of those obligations extended over several years. In view of the stringent financial situation that the company encountered, it was most unfortunate to have been forced to carry such a sizable amount of unpaid obligations. [Had] those funds . . . been collected, they might have enabled the company to have tided over the crisis with which it was confronted, and perhaps [the firm] could have survived.

. . . The company made no profits [in 1921 and 1922] but instead suffered a loss of \$180,000.00 in 1922 and \$215,000.00 for 1923, making the total loss for those two years . . . \$395,000.00. . . . [U]nder those conditions no dividends were declared.

Some additional light may be shed upon the financial condition of the company by [an] examination of [its] output. [The production] for 1916 was approximately the same as it was for the previous year, except that [the company] built 64 more gas engines in 1916 than . . . in 1915 and 99 fewer steam engines. Again, the estimated output for 1917 was about the same as it was for 1916. . . . [A]t their meeting in January of 1917 the directors authorized [the] manufacture and selling [of] the following quantities of machinery: 800 separators, 300 gas engines, 175 steam engines, 125 hullers, 25 bean machines, and 50 sawmills.

. . . The Record Book of the company constitutes an invaluable source of information, yet the record keeping of those who were charged with that responsibility leaves much to be desired. . . . If it be true that the kind of records that a business . . . keeps is in some measure indicative of the . . . acuity of that company, then, aside from faulty judgment that . . . entered into decision making, there was a tragic lack of valid bookkeeping . . . upon which firm decisions could have been made.

Notwithstanding the lack of certain information, yet perhaps enough has been presented to portray the increasingly untenable position in which the company found itself. . . . [Many] of the [facts] were ominous, [presaging] the . . . disaster that was soon to befall the company. . . . [T]he next, and final, section [will be] devoted to a detailed recital of the . . . unfortunate events . . . that culminated in the demise of the old company.

Liquidation

. . . [A] final event in which [the company] was involved is worthy of mention, especially since no one outside of the management was aware of . . . the impending events that brought the old company to its tragic end. What turned out to be the last advertisement of [the firm's] machinery at a fair appeared in the *Mansfield News* on September 26, 1923, . . . barely a month prior to the beginning of the liquidation of the company. It [invited] the public to attend the Richland County Fair and stated that Aultman & Taylor [built] "America's foremost tractors and threshers," and, as usual, the advertisement carried a picture of the starved rooster. Those attending the fair were urged to visit the company's exhibit and make it their headquarters. They were invited to meet Mr. Hawkins, the company's representative, who . . . might have something interesting to tell the visitor.³ . . .

It was during the latter part of 1920 that the signs of a business recession became apparent. Restriction of credit, deflation of values, and a readjustment of commodity prices to a lower level characterized the financial conditions of the country at that time. The trend which began in 1920 continued and resulted in a severe business recession in 1921. Prices dropped sharply, and there was a general deflation.

During the First World War and for about a year thereafter there [had been] a shortage . . . of raw materials essential to the building of machinery. That shortage was created largely by [the diverting of] raw materials . . . into the manufacture of munitions for the war. . . . [T]o protect themselves, companies in almost every industry bought all of the raw materials that were obtainable. As a result of the . . . hoarding of materials prices skyrocketed. The Aultman & Taylor Company [had been] involved in that rush for raw materials. In the midst of the 1921 recession the company had on hand an over-priced inventory [A forced adjustment to a lower market value for the firm's inventory led to a loss in excess of a million dollars.] The acuteness of the situation that confronted the company was compounded by the fact that at no time did it . . . have substantial cash resources. [The firm's] inventory expansions [had been] financed almost entirely by bank loans and sale receivables, which made [the company's] financial situation untenable.

Matters were brought to a head in the fall of 1923, when the bankers realized that the company had no future and decided to call their loans immediately while the security was still unimpaired. . . . It is the judgment of Quintin Alexander that, if the liquidation had been conducted over a longer period of time, the deficit probably would have been much smaller, but . . . the banks were unwilling to wait any longer for their money. . . . Mrs. Harter was unwilling to

assume the loans herself, and so without further consideration the company was forced into . . . liquidation proceedings.

[At the time of liquidation, the amount to be realized on the company's assets was \$2,805,000.00. The debts and expenses, including a liquidation cost of \$100,000.00, amounted to \$2,390,000.00. The balance was \$415,000.00. While the liquidation proceeding got underway, some of the figures were calculated differently, with the amount to be realized on the company's assets scaled down to \$1,766,000.00. The debts and expenses, including the same liquidation cost, were reevaluated upward to \$2,648,000.00, thereby leaving a deficit of \$982,000.00.]

In the final transactions of the liquidation inventories, receivables and other assets with a book value of \$2,700,000.00 were disposed of for only \$1,000,000.00. . . . [T]his was due partially "to an incorrect valuation of machines and supplies, as well as poor quality of assets and notes receivable. However, the chief reason for the discrepancy between book and sale values was the haste with which the liquidation was accomplished."⁴

The net loss to Mrs. Harter in the liquidation due to note endorsements amounted to about \$1,000,000.00. This did not include the former value of her holdings of stock in the company. That constituted a substantial increase in her loss [This] . . . must have been a staggering blow not only to Mrs. Harter but to her family, as well as to others who were closely associated with her

[Ultimately, the] "inventory, accounts and notes payable and good will were sold to the Advance-Rumely Company at La Porte, Indiana, for about \$1,000,000.00 cash. The machinery was sold to various purchasers for about \$1,000,000.00, and a part of the land was sold to the Ohio Brass Company for \$150,000.00."⁵

The Advance-Rumely Company moved the machinery and other items that [it] had purchased. That sale included the . . . raw materials, finished products on hand, accounts receivable, all of the patterns—which were destroyed—patent rights, and a portion of the plant equipment.

The remainder of the assets, which included a part of the plant in Mansfield and a warehouse in Kansas City, were incorporated in the Harter Real Estate Company, which then became a part of the Harter Estate. Those assets including the remainder of the plant were sold to various purchasers. The building in which the separators were built is now in the possession of the Ohio Highway Department.

One can easily understand that the conditions described in the preceding pages gave little encouragement for the continuation of the company. . . . [T]here were unmistakable forebodings of the calamity . . . that were tantamount to a danger signal . . . , but . . . the leadership, as well as a number of the employees, had become blasé

. . . [M]orale among the employees [had] reached a low ebb. There was . . . widespread lack of concern and urgency. . . . [A] complacent attitude . . . was rampant throughout the plant. [When] an effort was made to . . . modernize and bring . . . order as well as efficiency into the parts department, . . . a number of the employees refused to cooperate. A system of standardization was inaugurated, so that each part would carry a fixed price, rather than determining the price . . . upon the whim of a given employee. . . . [Once,] when a customer requested . . . a pinion for his traction engine, [a]n employee led him into the yards and, after kicking around in the grass, found the desired pinion, whereupon inquiry was made as to its price. [After lifting up the pinion] the employee stated that it weighed about three pounds and was worth around three dollars. Interviews with a number of the old employees yielded

testimony that leaves little doubt that this was not an isolated incident

Testimony of several of the men who were prominent in the management of the company also provides considerable evidence that presaged the end of the [firm]. Marvin Lutz was for a number of years a director and occupied official positions in the company. . . . [H]e was on the inside and in a position to have . . . firsthand knowledge of the affairs of the company. He was aware of the decisions that had been made and the mismanagement that had occurred, all of which he deplored. When the company was liquidated in 1923, he [observed to] his friends, “. . . . This was to be expected, since it was rotten on the inside” [H]e must have considered the management of the company to have been woefully derelict in the discharge of its responsibilities.⁶

Still another example . . . was shared with the author by Herbert Rupp, . . . the chief testing engineer His description of some of the deplorable conditions . . . contained an almost endless list of malpractices. . . . It was the opinion of Rupp that the man who was [the company’s] sales manager was a “flop” and a totally irresponsible individual. On one occasion the company shipped several carloads of separators to Amarillo, Texas. [The firm] did not even have a downpayment on those separators, and . . . in the end that shipment was . . . a total loss to the company.⁷

[O]ne would be hard pressed to envisage any situation that would be more the antithesis of good business practice than that which characterized the final years of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company.

. . . [A] company that ceases to experiment or explore new frontiers sounds its own death knell One of the most unusual opportunities that the officials of the company bungled . . . was a proposal presented . . . by Curtis C. Baldwin of Nickerson, Kansas, during the years between 1919 and 1922. For a few years prior to 1911 Baldwin labored on . . . a machine that would harvest and thresh the grain in one operation. . . . After working for a period of years he invented the “Standing Harvester.” An application for a patent . . . was filed on August 23, 1910, and the patent was granted on September 26, 1911. A second application was filed on February 17, 1917, and [the] patent was granted on January 7, 1919. The second patent contained improvements made over the previous one.

[Baldwin’s machine] was . . . to be a combined harvester, thresher, and separator . . . mounted on an ordinary carriage The grain was cut in the same manner as was done with the . . . binder or header and thrown rearward onto a canvas provided with slats. The canvas ran over drums or rollers.

Baldwin stated [in the description of his patented machine] . . . , “The object of this invention is to combine the operations of harvesting and threshing small grain . . . from the standing stalks, thus avoiding the useless labor of handling the straw a number of times and diminishing the losses incident to the present methods of treatment, such as the fermentation in the shock or stack”

The name which Baldwin gave to his machine was the “Gleaner.” It was . . . a forerunner of the present-day combine. . . . Baldwin attempted to persuade the officials of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company to manufacture his [machine], but he was unsuccessful Rupp asserted that the officials . . . were unable to comprehend [the invention’s] significance or to foresee that, within a few years, the combine would take over the harvesting [and] threshing of . . . grain and . . . relegate the . . . threshing machine to obsolescence.

Undaunted by the temporary setback, Baldwin . . . built his first Gleaner while . . . living in Wichita, Kansas. . . . It was demonstrated during . . . 1923 in Oklahoma and Kansas and

proved to be an outstanding success. A . . . number of retail orders were taken The first Gleaner patent was filed on February 19, 1919, and granted to Baldwin on December 3, 1924.

During 1924 Baldwin's company moved its manufacturing facilities to Independence, Missouri, and [in] that year approximately 500 [Gleaners] were built. . . . [T]he company was incorporated under the name of "The Gleaner Harvesting Corporation" in 1925, at which location Allis-Chalmers continues to manufacture the famous Gleaner combine.

. . . [The Aultman and Taylor officials] failed to recognize the golden opportunity that had been placed in their hands [when Baldwin first approached the firm with his invention]. . . . [O]thers whose minds were more . . . attuned to the changing conditions of the time were able to seize that opportunity One may well agree with the biblical injunction that "where there is no vision the people perish."⁸

. . . Competition with other companies became a . . . problem for the [firm]. While most of the Aultman & Taylor tractors were well built and performed well in doing the work for which they were designed, such as operating threshing machines [and] sawmills [and for doing] road work, yet they were cumbersome and ill adapted for much of the work required on the farms.

Companies sensitive to the needs . . . of the . . . farmer began building tractors more adaptable to the work on the average farm. . . . Within a few years . . . [small] tractors flooded the market. They were less expensive than . . . the Aultman & Taylor tractors and . . . could be afforded by a large number of users. At last becoming aware of the demand for a more versatile tractor, Aultman & Taylor began building [the] 15-30 tractor [in 1917], but, as was shown in a previous chapter, a year [and] more was lost in experimentation and testing. According to Rupp, it did not meet with immediate success, since other tractors on the market were in many respects superior to it. At length the market for [Aultman & Taylor] tractors disappeared

Aultman & Taylor reached a pinnacle of success under inspired leadership and then gradually came to [an] end due . . . to human frailties and errors. The officials . . . were unable to cope with the problems that confronted them with sufficient alacrity, so [the company] succumbed to the rapidly changing agricultural . . . and industrial conditions of the times. No longer was it able to build machinery that met the needs of its customers, so it gave way to other more dynamic companies that were in harmony with the times.

It may be recalled that, upon the death of Aultman, Michael D. Harter became the . . . leader of the [firm]. Under his inspired leadership the company prospered When Harter relinquished his responsibilities in 1890, James E. Brown . . . became President. . . . [T]his has been considered by some to have been the turning point in the affairs of the company. . . . The [firm] did not go into immediate decline—in fact, it lasted for twenty-seven more years. But the spark of genius that had placed and held it in its favored position was lost forever. . . .

A recapitulation of the events . . . of paramount importance in the decline and termination of the company is now in place. . . . [T]he disposal of [the] water-tube boiler business was a colossal blunder. . . . The minutes of the directors and stockholders show that there was a rather unusual amount of haggling over the contracts and salaries of salesmen and agents for [the] water-tube boilers. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that unnecessarily high salaries and commissions were paid to their agents and salesmen. Moreover, the final transaction that led to the disposal of the business was little less than a travesty. A high commission was paid to an agent to sell the business, yet the Stirling Company was anxious to acquire the business, so that the services of an agent were not needed. . . . At the time of the sale of [the] water-tube boiler business, it was claimed . . . that additional space was needed for the manufacture of threshing

machinery. In retrospect this does not appear to have been a valid reason for [eliminating] that part of [the] business, since it certainly would have been possible to have secured additional land for the expansion of the plant, [had] there . . . been a justifiable need for it. In any case alert management in other companies was already sensing the far-reaching changes that were imminent in the processes of harvesting and threshing of . . . grain. . . . [H]ad the company retained its water-tube boiler business, accompanied with the decline in the demand for . . . threshing machinery, there is the real possibility that [the] water-tube boiler business would have increased. Thus, its retention . . . could well have constituted a bulwark against the unfortunate circumstances that came to a head in the fall of 1923.

[A second factor forcing the company into liquidation] was the building of a huge inventory at high prices largely on borrowed money.

The historical record . . . leaves little doubt that [Aultman & Taylor] machinery was [often] of the highest quality. . . . It is generally agreed among experienced threshermen that the New Century was one of the best and most efficient separators ever built. . . . Even though [Aultman & Taylor] machinery met the needs of the threshermen during a given period of time, yet, because of the rapid changes and improvements that came about in the manufacture of agricultural machinery, [the firm's] products became outmoded. During the company's latter years it is clear that its management was content to rest on past achievements

. . . [T]he leadership of the company was impotent and unable to extricate itself from the tangled web in which it was caught Soon after the middle of December of 1923 it was known by those in positions of leadership that the end of the company was near at hand, but it was not until December 30, 1923, that the general public was made aware of the passing of the old factory. On that day an announcement revealing its passing appeared in the *Mansfield News*. It contained a brief history of the company and also stated that [the firm] was sold to the Advance-Rumely Company⁹

The general public was informed that, within a short time, an announcement would be made with respect to the holdings of the company. One of [them] was made on February 5, 1924, which stated that the Ohio Brass Company had come into possession of five acres of ground with a number of buildings located north of the Erie tracks. At that time the company still owned the Diamond Street side of the factory, as well as the land west of Main Street on which was located the old Cahall, Babcock and Wilcox boiler shops.¹⁰

Even though the citizens of Mansfield were informed concerning the sale of the old factory, yet there was, whether intentional or not, one glaring omission in the announcements. That was the fact that the transaction was indeed a liquidation of the company, so that the public was unaware of the real reason for the sale of the company until . . . later. Only those who were officers and . . . connected with the management had firsthand knowledge of the momentous events that consummated in the demise of the old company.

At the time of its liquidation the following persons were its officers: J. E. Brown, chairman of the board of directors; J. U. Fogle, president; E. A. Harter, first vice-president, G. C. Heck, second vice-president, B. Hurxthal, secretary and cashier; C. E. Shiplet, works manager, and W. W. Worthington, chief engineer.¹¹

News concerning the sale of the company and that the old plant would be closed did not come as a surprise to the citizens of Mansfield. In fact it was something of an anti-climax. Layoffs by the company were, by early 1923, becoming rather frequent. . . . Mansfield had by that time new industries that were able to absorb most of the workers.¹²

. . . Alexander . . . puts the situation succinctly with refreshing candor . . . when he states,

. . . “In short the later history of the Aultman & Taylor Company is a chronicle of mediocre management. Never brilliant, it managed to sail along satisfactorily, with the exception of two gigantic blunders. The first, the Cahall boiler affair, dealt the company a blow from which it was unable to recover. The second, unwise investment in inventory with borrowed funds, finished it before its time.”¹³

The time is now at hand when we approach the end of this [book]. There is little more that can be told. [We can only reflect on how the Aultman & Taylor Company] fell upon evil days and was unable to cope with internal problems and the changing conditions of the times. . . . [I]t had outlived its usefulness It gave way to other companies more youthful in spirit [and] imagination . . .

So there comes . . . a sense of poignancy as [we] contemplate the unfortunate events that culminated in the demise of the old [firm]. . . . As [this] history of the Aultman & Taylor Company is brought to an end, whatever profit may result from a study of this narrative or whatever conclusions may emerge, they are now within the province of those who may read this [chronicle]. Finally, as the author sends forth this book, it is accompanied with his best wishes . . . that . . . it may contribute to the enlightenment, as well as the pleasure, of all who may ponder its significance.

Notes

1. Wik, Reynold M. *Steam Power on the American Farm*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1953. 135-77.
2. A basic source of information for this . . . chapter has been a thesis written by Quintin Alexander while he was a student at the University of Pennsylvania. Alexander is a grandson of Elizabeth Aultman Harter and a great grandson of Cornelius Aultman. His thesis covered the Harter Estate, which included the assets in the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company. The authenticity of his thesis is enhanced by the fact that he had access to the private papers, letters, old documents, etc., of Mrs. Harter that she had collected during her lifetime. The writer is profoundly grateful to Alexander for permission to use this valuable information. A second source of information from which the writer has drawn heavily for . . . data . . . is the Record Book, containing the minutes of the meetings of the stockholders and directors of the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company from 1890 to 1917 inclusive. This book also includes the annual reports made by the president of the company. The Record Book is the most valuable single source concerning the Aultman & Taylor Machinery Company extant today.
3. *Mansfield News*, September 26, 1923.
4. Alexander, Quintin. Unpublished thesis. U of Pennsylvania.
5. Ibid.
6. From conversations with Walter L. Blakely, who was a close . . . personal friend of Marvin Lutz.
7. Interview with Herbert C. Rupp during October of 1968.
8. Proverbs 29:18.
9. *Mansfield News*, December 30, 1923.
10. *Mansfield News*, February 5, 1924
11. Ibid.
12. Standfield, Virgil. *News Journal*. Mansfield, Ohio. October 25, 1970.
13. Alexander.