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St. Louis Shoe Industry

Introduction

In the early 1900s, St. Louis was one of the nation’s largest shoe manufacturing cities. How and why this happened had much to do with the city’s location, access to transportation and inexpensive labor. American shoe manufacturing began in the northeast – centering on Lynn, Massachusetts where the nation’s first tannery was located. Lynn’s tannery attracted many craftsmen (and women) who made shoes.¹

During the 1840s-1880s, a number of machines were invented that sped up the process of making shoes – the first was the sewing machine, patented by Elias Howe in 1848. This was followed in 1858 by the introduction of a lasting machine, used to sew and shape shoe uppers. By the 1860s, heeling and welting machines – the latter of which sewed strips of leather along soles – were in use.² As shoe making became increasingly mechanized, skilled labor was no longer critical. Nearly anyone could be trained to operate shoe machinery. Transportation had also improved by the 1860s with arrival of the railroad, which provided a cost efficient way to ship goods and materials. This meant that shoe manufacturing was no longer tied to locations near raw materials.³

By the 1870s, shoe manufacturing was shifting to areas where labor was “relatively cheaper and more abundant.”⁴ At that point in time, St. Louis began to emerge as one of the nation’s largest centers of shoe production. Women comprised a large component of the labor force because sewing was traditionally associated with female labor.⁵ This practice did not change dramatically over the years. Children were also a reliable source of cheap labor for the shoe industry, as were immigrants.⁶ When factories began to unionize in St. Louis, shoe manufacturers started building factories in small towns – where labor was cheaper. Outsourcing began prior to 1910 and picked up pace after World War I. Although the city itself was no longer producing many shoes after 1945, regional production rose; and companies headquartered in St. Louis continued to dominate national sales and manufacturing statistics.⁷ After World War II, the region

---

³ Edgar M. Hoover, Jr., Location Theory and the Shoe and Leather Industries (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937), 267;
⁴ Ibid, 269.
⁵ Ibid, 266.
⁶ Rosemary Feurer, “Shoe City, Factory Towns: St. Louis Shoe Companies and the Turbulent Drive for Cheap Rural Labor, 1900 – 1940.” *Gateway Heritage* (Fall 1988, 2).
⁷ “Shift of Shoe Industry to this Area Intensified” (Unreferenced source: 1947), Copy available in flat files: Shoes – Trade and Manufacturing, St. Louis Public Library.
steadily declined in shoe production as antitrust laws and foreign competition forced conglomerates to diversify and send labor overseas. By 1980, St. Louis’ two largest shoe companies, International Shoe Company (ISC) and Brown Shoe Company, had moved their headquarters to St. Louis County. Within a decade, both ceased producing shoes altogether.8

**St. Louis’ Early Years of Shoe Manufacturing, 1870 - 1900**

Prior to the Civil War, American shoes were produced by skilled craftsmen who did most of the work by hand. It was a laborious process that found some assistance when sewing and leather rolling machines were introduced in the 1840s.9 Pre-Civil War era shoe manufacturing in Midwestern cities like St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit and Cincinnati relied heavily on German immigrants, many of whom were skilled craftsmen and artisans.10 In St. Louis, immigrant labor provided much of the labor for shoe factories, particularly women and children.11 This practice was not unique. Shoe manufacturers had long held the notion that making shoes was “better suited to female labor” and children filled that gap as well.12 When St. Louis’ shoe manufacturers began to open factories in rural areas during the early 1900s, women and children continued to provide a bulk of the labor force.13 A report published in 1907 by the National Child Labor Law Committee indicated that as larger cities like St. Louis began to enforce child labor laws, manufacturers moved factories to smaller towns and cities that had no labor restrictions. The report further cited that St. Louis’ “two . . . largest shoe manufacturing corporations” – Brown Shoe Company and Roberts, Johnson & Rand – were among the worst offenders of such practices, “employing in most cases several hundred” children at [their] rural factories in Missouri and Illinois (Figure 1).14

Industry easily exploited labor because machinery replaced craftsmen with trainable unskilled laborers who agreed to work for less money. For the shoe industry, this change manifested itself after 1860, when capitalist Gordon McKay introduced a lasting machine patented by Lyman R. Blake in 1858. McKay failed to generate much interest

---

10 Hoover, 269.
12 Hoover, 266.
13 Hoover, 4.
initially so he introduced a royalty re-payment system under which manufacturers used the machinery at no cost up front. McKay made his money by collecting payments based on the number of shoes manufactured using his patented machinery. McKay’s machinery tracked production through an automatic stamping system that marked the soles of shoes. So successful was McKay’s idea that Charles Goodyear did the same thing for his patented welting machine. By 1899, the United Shoe Machinery Corporation managed to accumulate most of the nation’s shoe machinery patents, monopolizing the lease/royalty system well into the twentieth century. Headquartered in Beverly, Massachusetts, United Shoe had a branch office in St. Louis, initially at 1423 Olive Street (not extant) and later (by the 1920s) at 2208 Washington Avenue (NRL, 2007). St. Louis was also home of the company’s only die factory outside of the northeast at 4045 Forest Park Avenue (extant).


One of St. Louis’ earliest shoe factories, established in the late 1860s, was Giesecke, Meysenburg & Co. During the 1870s, the factory was located at 210-212 Washington

---

15 Keenoy et al, 8:10.
16 Ibid.
17 Hansen, 8.
18 Ibid, 8:10-12.
Avenue (not extant), employing about 300 persons. Like most early shoe manufacturers in St. Louis, Giesecke-Meysenburg leased several buildings over time, moving to larger spaces as the company increased its output and required more workers. This was possible for shoe manufacturing because the equipment was relatively lightweight and could be easily moved. This flexibility allowed manufacturers to use existing commercial buildings and warehouses – it was far more economical to lease an existing building than to construct a new one; particularly for small manufacturing firms. A large part of making shoes in the 1860s was still done by hand, which was the case for Giesecke-Meysenburg. The company also jobbed shoes to buyers in Missouri, Illinois, Kansas, Iowa and Colorado. By 1881, Giesecke-Meysenburg had opened a factory in Jefferson City, Missouri. In 1898, the company reorganized as Giesecke, D’Oench and Hays Shoe Company and also supported a factory in Jeffersonville, Indiana. By that time, brothers Alanson D. and George W. Brown of Granville, New York had moved to St. Louis – establishing separate companies that emerged as two of the city’s largest shoe manufacturing interests.

The Brown brothers are often viewed as the forefathers of St. Louis’ modern shoe industry. In 1872, Alanson David Brown (1847 – 1913) moved to St. Louis and opened a shoe warehouse with James McGavock Hamilton (b. 1841). While Brown’s background consisted of working for a variety of commercial interests (e.g., drug and grocery stores), Hamilton had prior experience jobbing shoes. The son of a tanner, Hamilton moved to St. Louis from Tennessee following his service in the Civil War and began working for a shoe wholesaler – Appleton, Noyes and Co. Hamilton-Brown managed to make a profit in 1873, one of few businesses to do so following the financial panic. In 1876, the business reorganized as Hamilton-Brown & Co, and two investors from Mississippi came on board, W.H. Carroll and E.F. Williams. Like Giesecke-Meysenburg, Hamilton-Brown moved around quite a bit during its early years of operation. The company initially leased a storefront at 106 Locust Street (not extant) and moved to a larger building at Washington Avenue and First Street (not extant, Figure 2) before settling into a six-story building in 1876 at Washington Avenue and Broadway.

---

19 J.A. Dacus and James W. Buel, *A Tour of St. Louis; or, the Inside Life of a Great City* (St. Louis: Western Publishing Company, 1878), 309.
21 Ibid; Hansen, 7.
23 J.A. Dacus and James W. Buel, *A Tour of St. Louis; or, the Inside Life of a Great City* (St. Louis: Western Publishing Company, 1878), 209.
24 Leonard, 85.
Hamilton-Brown incorporated in 1883 at which time it also began to manufacture shoes.  

George Warren Brown (1853 – 1929) moved to St. Louis to work as a clerk for Hamilton-Brown in 1873. Five years later, he started his own shoe business with Alvin L. Bryan and Jerome Desnoyers – Bryan, Brown and Co.  

Unlike Hamilton-Brown, Bryan, Brown & Co. originated as a manufacturing venture. This was unique – most St. Louis shoe companies jobbed shoes prior to launching into manufacturing. The first factory, located at 104 S. Eighth Street (not extant) employed skilled shoemakers from Rochester, New York. As noted previously, early shoe factories were typically situated in existing commercial buildings and warehouses – it is likely that this was the case for Bryan, Brown & Co.’s first factory. Nineteenth-century shoe manufacturing required little more than space for machinery and light for workers. Until safety regulations emerged in the twentieth-century, there were few constraints or requirements for the “modern” shoe “factory” (Figure 3). When Desnoyers retired in 1893, the business reorganized as The Brown Shoe Company. By the turn of the century, Brown Shoe reported an annual growth rate of “$1 million a year [by which time] St. Louis was becoming known as a major shoe manufacturing center.”

---

28 “Brown Shoe Company, Inc. – Company Profile.”
29 “St. Louis Shoe Industry Has a ‘Horatio Alger’ History” (Unidentified source), Copy available in flat files: Shoes – Trading and Manufacturing, St. Louis Public Library.
31 Ibid.
Figure 2. Hamilton, Brown & Co., location at Washington Avenue and First Street, c. 1879. Building is not extant. (Source: Reavis, Financial and Commercial Interests Section, p. 21).
In 1880, St. Louis supported “23 shoe manufacturing firms . . . most of them small and using foot-powered machinery.”32 By that time, manufacturing had begun to move west of the riverfront as rail made transportation easier in and around the city. Shoe businesses – both wholesale and factories – moved increasingly to the city’s center of garment production along Washington Avenue. Like the Brown shoe companies noted previously, Roberts, Johnson & Rand also operated a shoe warehouse and factory on Washington Avenue.33 The company originated in Memphis, where in 1892 brothers Oscar and Jackson Johnson opened a shoe wholesale business with their cousin, Oscar Rand. The business, Johnson & Rand, moved to St. Louis in 1898 when Memphis was hit by yellow fever. The re-location added partners, John C. Roberts and his nephew, Eugene Roberts – both previously employed as jobbers for Hamilton-Brown. Within a

---

32 “St. Louis Shoe Industry Has a ‘Horatio Alger’ History.”
33 [St. Louis Shoe and Leather Club], Official Reference Book of the St. Louis Association of Superintendents and Foremen of the Shoe Industry ([St. Louis]: Self-published, 1914), 31.
year of opening the warehouse at 818 Washington Avenue (not extant), Roberts, Johnson & Rand began to manufacture shoes.\footnote{Mary M. Stiritz, “Roberts, Johnson & Rand/International Shoe Company Complex,” National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form (1984), Section 8 [first page not numbered].}

As the twentieth-century approached, a number of things began to change in shoe manufacturing. Not only was machinery taking the place of tasks previously performed by skilled shoemakers, factories were increasingly dedicated to specialized tasks. No longer was every shoe manufactured in a single building that also served as a warehouse. New factories were beginning to crop up outside of the commercial center, frequently in residential areas populated by immigrants. Also on the forefront was the fashion footwear industry, spurred by European exhibitions and publications that created a market for advertising and merchandising shoes (Figure 4).\footnote{Hoover, 270-271.} By the turn of the twentieth century, St. Louis was recognized not only as a major shoe wholesaler but as a

---

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4}
\caption{Advertisement for Brown Shoe Company, 1909. Well-known comic strip characters Buster Brown and his dog, Tige, was used to promote the company’s sales of children’s shoes (Source: Boot and Shoe Recorder, 31 March 1909, p. 102).}
\end{figure}
shoe manufacturer. With direct access to raw materials, modern transportation and abundant inexpensive labor, St. Louis ended the nineteenth century among the nation’s top ten centers of shoe production.36

**St. Louis as a Major Shoe Manufacturing City, 1900 – 1915**

St. Louis began its new century with no lack of shoe manufacturers. By 1905, St. Louis was the nation’s third largest shoe manufacturing city, producing one-sixth of all shoes manufactured in the United States.37

In 1899 St. Louis sold 7,500,000 pairs of shoes for $18,750,000, of which they manufactured $10,500,000 worth. This was accomplished with scarcely a dozen shoe factories, most small in size, the capacity of its largest being but two thousand pairs daily. In 1913 St. Louis shoe houses sold 27,750,000 pairs for a total of $70,100,000, of which they manufactured $53,500,000, operated thirty-one plants in the city, thirty plants in towns adjacent in Missouri and Illinois – a total of sixty-one factories, the largest of which enjoys a daily capacity of 10,000 pairs.38

The companies started by the Brown, Roberts and Johnson families would eventually dominate St. Louis’ shoe businesses but at the turn of the century, there were a number of major shoe manufacturers. These included (but were not limited to) Peters, Dittman, Meier, Johansen, Wertheimer-Swarts, Friedman-Sherby and Courtney Shoe Companies. Many of these interests operated multiple factories.39 Friedman-Sherby Shoe Company, organized in 1906, had a factory in Kirksville, Missouri by 1907 and in 1909, Roberts, Johnson & Rand had six factories in small towns outside of St. Louis.40 By 1911, St. Louis’ manufacturing interests had more than 15 shoe factories in outlying cities throughout Missouri and Illinois. The numbers continued to grow steadily (Tables 1 and 2).41 Although factories were increasingly being constructed outside of the city’s limits after 1900, headquarters and warehouses remained centered on or near Washington Avenue in downtown St. Louis (Figure 5).42

---

38 Phil A. Becker, “St. Louis Shoe Trade Seventy Millions,” Forward St. Louis (St. Louis: The Business Men’s League), Volume 2, No. 8, 19 October 1914: 15.
39 “How St. Louis Has Become Greatest Shoe Center in the United States,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (9 May 1909), A16B.
40 “Shelby Joins Friedman,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (15 December 1906), 2; Erika Woehlk, Kirksville (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Press, 1915), 36; “‘Printers’ Ink’ Compliments Firm,” Boot and Shoe Recorder (14 April 1909; Volume 55, No. 3), 144.
Table 1. Shoe manufacturers headquartered in St. Louis, 1905

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Headquarters / Warehouse</th>
<th>Factory Location(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtney Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Corner of 10th and Washington Ave.</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dittman Boot &amp; Shoe Co.</td>
<td>1107 Washington Ave.*</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giesecke-D’Oench-Hays</td>
<td>1116-20 Washington Ave.</td>
<td>1308 N. 16th Street*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodbar Shoe Mfg. Co.</td>
<td>SE corner Vandeventer and Laclede*</td>
<td>One location - all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Washington Ave. at 12th (currently</td>
<td>Locust Street at 21st* 9th and Marion* Olive &amp; 21st (NRL) Jefferson &amp; Randolph (unable to identify exact location – Randolph Street no longer exists; building was likely demolished*) 9th &amp; Soulard*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucker Blvd.) SE corner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johansen Brothers</td>
<td>921-29 N. 11th Street*</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerens-Leesberg Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Warne &amp; Florissant *</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Meier Shoe Co.</td>
<td>713 N. 4th Street*</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Slipper Co.</td>
<td>1828 Mullanphy Street*</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters Shoe Co.</td>
<td>SE corner 13th &amp; Washington</td>
<td>12th (currently Hadley) &amp; N. Market* / Monroe* Jefferson &amp; St. Louis Avenue*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand</td>
<td>NE corner 10th and Washington</td>
<td>13th &amp; Mullanphy* Hickory &amp; Mississippi Aves. (NRL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Shoe Mfg.</td>
<td>909 N. 12th (currently Tucker Blvd).*</td>
<td>One location – all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wertheimer-Swarts Shoe Co.</td>
<td>SE corner 10th and Washington</td>
<td>1918 Chestnut Street* 1922 Chestnut Street* Laclede &amp; Vandeventer*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Gould’s City Directories, 1905 and 1914); * = demolished

Table 2. St. Louis shoe company factories operating outside of city limits, 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Shoe Company</td>
<td>Murphysboro, IL</td>
<td>Division &amp; 19th Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Shoe Company</td>
<td>Brookfield, MO</td>
<td>Helm &amp; Brunswick Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Shoe Company</td>
<td>Moberly, MO</td>
<td>Carpenter Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desnoyers Shoe Company</td>
<td>Belleville, IL</td>
<td>W. Third near S. Richland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desnoyers Shoe Company</td>
<td>Springfield, IL</td>
<td>N. 10th Street at Enos Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman-Shelby Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Jefferson City, MO</td>
<td>2 factories – Bolivar; Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman-Shelby Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Kirksville, MO</td>
<td>Michigan &amp; Ann Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman-Shelby Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Mexico, MO</td>
<td>W. Liberty &amp; Abat Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company</td>
<td>Columbia, MO</td>
<td>Wilks &amp; Fay Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters Shoe Company</td>
<td>DeSoto, MO</td>
<td>E. 3rd &amp; E. Clement Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters Shoe Company</td>
<td>Herman, MO</td>
<td>Guttenberg bet. 4th &amp; 5th Sts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau, MO</td>
<td>N. Main &amp; Water Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Jerseyville, IL</td>
<td>McBride &amp; Adams Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Hannibal, MO</td>
<td>7th &amp; Collier Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand Shoe Co.</td>
<td>St. Charles, MO</td>
<td>2 factories – both on S. 4th Street bet. Pike &amp; Tompkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts, Johnson &amp; Rand Shoe Co.</td>
<td>Washington, MO</td>
<td>Roberts and Rand Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 5. This image depicts some of the city’s shoe company headquarters (highlighted in yellow) on Washington Avenue at the turn of the 20th century. (Source: “New St. Louis Looking East,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 13 September 1908, B1).
After 1900, a number of large factories were erected in St. Louis’ residential neighborhoods, particularly those supporting German immigrants. One example is Brown Shoe’s 1904 Homes Take factory on Russell Avenue in the Soulard neighborhood (extant, NRL 1975). North of downtown, Peters and Dittman Shoe Companies constructed factories on St. Louis Avenue in the Yeatman neighborhood (neither is extant, Figure 6). By 1911, Peters had three large factory complexes in Yeatman: the High Grade Plant noted in Figure 5, which produced welts for men’s and women’s shoes; the Black Diamond Plant (Twelfth and N. Market Streets, not extant), which manufactured children’s and women’s shoes, and the High Value Plant (N. Market and Glasgow, not extant, Figure 7) which produced welts and shoes for men and boys. Headquartered downtown at 13th and Washington Avenue (extant), Peters also operated factories in Hermann and DeSoto, Missouri and kept a company office in Boston, Massachusetts.

Figure 6. Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1911, City of St. Louis, Volume 3, Sheet 44. Note density of neighborhood surrounding the Dittman and Peters factories.

43 “South Side has ‘Call’ on Realty,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (13 March 1904), 9; Stiritz, “Brown Shoe Company’s Homes-Take Factory,” 8:1.
45 Boot and Shoe Recorder, 1911, 75.
Factory design changed during the early twentieth century and is clearly demonstrated by St. Louis’ shoe factories. As noted previously, most early shoe companies began manufacturing in the same buildings where they conducted jobbing and retailing activities. Most companies initially leased buildings and by the 1880s, Washington Avenue was where most shoe headquarters and warehouses were located. Although smaller factories were constructed on or near Washington Avenue after 1900, as demonstrated by McElroy-Sloan’s combination factory/administration building designed by Albert B. Groves in 1919 (extant, NRL1999 - see Figure 8), large companies most often constructed factories close to labor. By the early 20th century the shoe industry also began to specialize in production activities. As noted earlier, larger shoe companies had multiple factories and each factory performed a different function. As specialization became important to manufacturing, factory design began to focus on output and workers. As a result, large open warehouses were no longer considered viable for major shoe production. Shoe factories required not only good lighting for workers but ample space for tasks to be divided by floor, room or wing, depending on the size of the factory.46

The modern shoe factory . . . has become quite typical in general form. The width of the factory is a very important consideration. Buildings are constructed with a

---

46 “Fireproof Factory Building to be Erected for Shoe Company,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (20 April 1919), A1B.
width of about fifty feet, as single long buildings, or having wings of the same width, and less often in hollow squares, maintaining the same width throughout. This construction allows plenty of daylight along the middle of each room from the two sides. A good light is necessary to accurate work, it is essential that rooms be constructed in this way . . . The plan followed by some very large manufacturing companies of extensive wings or units affords great length of rooms with floor space all well lighted from two sides . . . Such plants employ four or five or more thousands of people, and turn out from ten to twenty thousand pairs of shoes daily.47

Figure 8. Architectural rendering of McElroy-Sloan Shoe Company’s factory on Washington Avenue, 1919. The factory manufactured children’s “Billiken” shoes. An earlier factory, also used by McElroy Sloan, is behind this building. Both properties are in the Lucas Avenue Historical Industrial District, NRL 1999. (Source for image: “Fireproof Factory Building to be Erected for Shoe Company,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 20 April 1919: A1B).

St. Louis’ early twentieth century shoe factories adapted ideas promoted by the newly “specialized field of industrial engineering.”48 Factories constructed after 1900

47 Allen, 113, 116.
“addressed the comfort of workers by planning for abundant light, sufficient heat, good ventilation, adequate space . . . and convenient toilets and washrooms.”

Out of this movement emerged the city’s ubiquitous “daylight factories” – well-lighted multi-storied buildings with many windows and electric or steam powered lighting. By the early twentieth-century, shoe factories in St. Louis were typically four or more stories in height with different tasks located on separate floors. Sole and leather production were normally located on first and/or basement floors and stitchery departments were on the upper floors, where windows received the most light. Shoe finishing, packing and distribution activities were most often conducted on the second floor and the actual shoe composition or “making” department was on a central floor. Offices were situated closest to the tasks they served. Business offices were on second and third floors, while factory offices were adjacent to the departments that they managed.

Factories constructed by Brown and Peters clearly reflect the typical large shoe factory of the early twentieth century. Brown’s Homes Take factory on Russell Avenue was described by the local press as a “Sunlight Factory” without side wings, making it one of the “best lighted plants” in St. Louis. Peters’ High Grade Plant Number 5 on St. Louis Avenue was designed to capture as much natural lighting as possible, incorporating 500 windows on all elevations. Also important were fireproofing techniques – Peters’ High Grade Plant incorporated and sprinkler system and utilized “metal frames, metal sashes and [windows] glazed with wire plate glass.” The industry was well aware of the consequences of a fire after witnessing Lynn’s catastrophe of 1889, when a downtown fire destroyed nearly every shoe business in the city. The fire, which began in the engine room of a shoe factory, destroyed 384 buildings including 80 shoe factories and 74 leather brokers. Unlike Lynn, which held a large number of multi-storied frame shoe factories set very close together, St. Louis’ shoe factories (with exception of those housed in buildings constructed for other purposes) were brick. Most were sited on separate blocks, particularly if constructed in a residential area. By the 1890s, fire walls,

50 Ibid, 89, 95; “South Side has ‘Call’ on Realty,” 9.
51 Allen, 113, 116.
52 Ibid, 116.
54 “New Five Story Factory to Be Erected at Jefferson and St. Louis Avenues for Peters Shoe Co.,” “Lynn’s Disastrous Fires,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (27 November 1889), 5.
automatic sprinklers and detached power houses were all part of the standard shoe factory design, as were fireproof materials such as brick and concrete.  

Figure 9. This factory at Hickory and Mississippi Avenues (extant, NRL, Lafayette Square Historic District, 1986) was constructed c. 1903 for Roberts, Johnson & Rand. In 1908, the company opened two factories in Cape Girardeau and Washington, Missouri. After the new plants opened, half the operations at the St. Louis plant moved to these locations (Source: [St. Louis Shoe and Leather Club] St. Louis Association of Superintendents . . . 1914, p. 145; Bryan, 837; “Trade News from St. Louis, 22 Feb 2908, 62).

As noted earlier, the manufacturing process also changed after 1900. While early manufacturing consisted of many duties completed within a single building, twentieth-century factories were specialized. Most only supported one or two tasks. Welting, heel and shoe assembly plants were but a few types of factories that emerged after 1900. Factories that manufactured shoes rather than components tended to produce one or two types of footwear. Women’s shoes, for example, were typically manufactured at a factory that did not also produce men’s or children’s footwear (Figure 9). In 1910, Hamilton-Brown owned factories that separately manufactured welts for men’s, women’s and boys’ shoes. In contrast, Desnoyers Shoe Company manufactured shoes and welts at a single factory. Separate companies made essentially the same parts and assembled shoes in similar ways, which made it easy to merge operations. One of the largest mergers occurred in 1911 between Roberts, Johnson & Rand and Peters Shoe

---

58 The Shoe and Leather Reporter . . . 1911, 75.
59 Ibid.
Companies (Figure 10). The merger combined the operations of 18 St. Louis-owned factories, establishing the world’s largest shoe conglomerate, International Shoe Company (ISC).60

Figure 10. Construction of Roberts, Johnson & Rand’s new headquarters building on Washington Avenue in 1909. Soon the company would merge with other shoe manufacturers in St. Louis to create the International Shoe Company (ISC). For many years, ISC was the world’s largest shoe manufacturing conglomerate (Source: “Printer’s Ink Compliments Firm,” Boot and Shoe Recorder. 14 April 1909, p. 144).

Following the merger, ISC began to rapidly absorb smaller shoe companies. In 1912, the firm bought Friedman-Shelby and operated no less than 13 small town factories, all gained through mergers.61 That year, Alanson C. Brown of Hamilton-Brown Shoe Company noted that manufacturing had all but left the city.62 Although St. Louis supported slightly over a dozen shoe factories in 1913, smaller “towns adjacent to Missouri and Illinois” had at least 30 factories owned by the city’s manufacturers.63 Shoe companies opened factories in smaller towns for two reasons – labor was cheap and few rural areas supported labor unions. Small towns welcomed shoe factories – most

60 “Two Shoe Cos. In $20,000,000 Consolidation,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (2 August 1911), 1.
61 “Shoe Company Absorbed,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (4 October 1912), 8; The Shoe and Leather Reporter . . . 1919, 227-374.
62 “St. Louis Losing Shoe Factories, Says A.C. Brown,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch (3 October 1913), 11.
63 Becker, 15.
offered companies free land, free utilities and other subsidies. “The sense that the world would pass the town by if it did not get a factory was a powerful motivating idea” and manufacturers used this angle to control workers without union interference. Initially factories outside St. Louis simply assembled shoes – materials were sent from St. Louis to rural factories where the shoes were assembled and shipped back for storage and distribution. Although these factories were frequently smaller than those located in St. Louis because of fewer workers and/or fewer tasks, they were set up in the same way. Shoe companies retained their headquarters and warehouses in downtown St. Louis, which perpetuated the city’s status as a nationally important shoe center long after manufacturing exited the city.

Just as St. Louis seemed poised to move into the nation’s number one spot for shoe manufacturing and jobbing, the numbers began to slip, as reported by the Merchants’ Exchange in 1914. War had erupted in Europe that year and signs of commercial and industrial strains on the United States were evident. The United States exported more goods than it imported during the 1910s. These numbers more than doubled during the years 1910-1913. Shoes and leather were important markets for foreign exports, especially for cities like St. Louis. The rumblings of trouble ahead were short-lived, however, as the city moved toward playing a major role in manufacturing and jobbing shoes for military needs. It was a task that would surpass the World War I era and enable St. Louis to retain its position as an important shoe manufacturing city well into the twentieth century.
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Wartime Manufacturing and the Great Depression, 1916 - 1945

Though the United States did not engage in World War I until 1917, the probability of such an event was anticipated. As the country advanced toward that end, manufacturing shifted activities to provide readiness. Like most industries, shoe manufacturing adjusted its output to support military needs. In 1916, both ISC and Brown Shoe Company landed Army contracts to manufacture 300,000 pairs of boots/shoes (Table 3).68 The following year, Hamilton-Brown joined the effort when the company landed a contract to produce 150,000 pairs of boots/shoes for the Army. Between St. Louis’ three largest shoe manufacturers (Brown, ISC and Hamilton-Brown), 1,560,000 pairs of boots/shoes were manufactured in 1917 alone – more than half of what the Army contracted that year.69 In addition to Army footwear, St. Louis’ manufacturers also provided boots and shoes for the Navy during World War I.70

Table 3. Estimated number of boot and shoes (by pairs) manufactured in St. Louis for the United States Army industry during World War I (1914 – 1918)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Company</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown Shoe Company</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>910,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton-Brown Shoe Co.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Shoe Co. (ISC)</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contract Amounts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$665,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,385,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,579,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (see footnotes #60-66/bibliography). Prices paid by the Army are as follows: 1916 = $3.50 per pair; 1917 = $4.65 per pair; 1918 (based on shoe type) = $6.45 and $7.15 per pair.

Not all shoes produced by St. Louis companies during World War I were manufactured in the city. ISC manufactured Army boots/shoes at its factory in Cape Girardeau.71 The Cape Girardeau factory began wartime preparations as early as 1915, when the factory began operating at full capacity, producing 24,000 pairs of shoes/boots per week.72 In addition to Brown’s contract to manufacture Army shoes at its St. Louis factories, the company also contracted (in 1916) to manufacture 200,000 pairs of shoes at its factory in Brookfield, Missouri.73 Though production dipped in 1918 as the war came to an end, St. Louis’ shoe manufacturers continued to produce a large number of military shoes – contracts that frequently ended up in smaller factories outside of St. Louis.74 Moderate sized companies such as McElroy-Sloan, Pedigo-Weber, VanKleek and Peeble Shoe Companies all constructed new factories within the city’s limits after the war (Figure
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68 “St. Louis Firms Get Big Contracts for Army Shoes,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (23 June 1916), 9.
69 “City Gets $7,250,000 Army Shoe Contract,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (5 November 1917), 3.
71 “Rand Back From Europe Without A Shoe Contract,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (20 May 1915), 9; “St. Louis Firms Get Big Contracts.”
72 “Cape is Making 24,000 Pairs of Shoes Each Week,” *The Weekly Tribune* (29 October 1915), 1.
73 “St. Louis Firms Get Big Contracts for Army Shoes,” 9.
Despite such examples, shoe companies were more likely to construct factories in areas with lower labor costs, even if such areas were not physically close to “materials or market” – this became increasingly frequent after World War I. Some of the city’s postwar manufacturers did not own a single factory in St. Louis. Two examples are Lund-Maudlin Co. and Huntington Shoe & Leather Co. Headquartered in St. Louis, these companies did all of their manufacturing in Highland, Illinois and Huntington, Indiana, respectively (Figure 12).

Figure 11. Rendering for the Pedigo-Weber Shoe Company factory, constructed in 1918 at 3427-3441 Locust Street (extant, NRL 2006). The building was designed by Albert B. Groves (Source: “Spacious and Modern Factory Plant Being Erected for Shoe Company,” St. Louis Post-Dispatch 1 December 1918, p. A1B).

During the late 1910s and early 1920s, the American shoe industry boomed as mergers continued. Once again, ISC was involved in one of the largest mergers when the company absorbed Boston’s W.H. McElwain Company in 1921. Under the new structure, ISC and McElwain combined 42 factories in Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky and New Hampshire; five tanneries in Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Massachusetts and New Hampshire; and “four shoe-material factories” in New Hampshire. Outsourcing after the war included the addition of ISC’s factories in Mount Vernon, Illinois and Paducah, Kentucky. Brown Shoe built a factory in Charleston, Illinois and Hamilton-
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Brown constructed a factory in Boonville, Missouri. Of the city’s three largest shoe manufacturers, only Brown constructed a new factory in the city’s limits after 1918. By 1928, St. Louis shoe manufacturing companies had established plants in 56 small towns within a 200-mile radius of St. Louis. More than 30,000 employees worked for St. Louis’ shoe manufacturers in 1928 and not just in Missouri and Illinois. By that time, the city’s small town factory network (excluding factories owned previously by Boston’s McElwain Shoe Company, noted above) extended into Arkansas, Kentucky and Tennessee.

Figure 12. Lund-Mauldin was headquartered in St. Louis, which served as its distribution center. The company’s factory was in Highland, Illinois (Image from Boot and Shoe Recorder, 29 October 1921, p. 51).

The postwar consumer boom was largely dominated by women’s shoes – a direct result of rising hemlines. Brown Shoe Company was caught off guard by the trend and experienced a financial setback in 1920 when the company ended up with a surplus of
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“sturdy high-topped [women’s] shoes.” Fashionable footwear assisted in maintaining competition between large conglomerates and “specialized, moderate-sized” manufacturers. Competition was further enhanced by United Shoe Machinery’s monopoly. Because United Shoe profited strictly from royalties, start-up costs were low. The percentage of small company success stories was lower in St. Louis than in the northeast where specialty shoe manufacturing found a niche prior to 1900. St. Louis had always thrived on its capacity to produce cheaper shoes at lower costs. As mergers continued, it became increasingly difficult for smaller manufacturers to remain competitive – most ended up selling their businesses to larger companies or shutting down altogether. By 1929, St. Louis’ top three shoe companies were manufacturing “five percent of the nation’s output in St. Louis and . . . small-town factories scattered through Missouri and southern Illinois.”

Business remained good for St. Louis shoe manufacturers through the 1920s. Production fell after the stock market crash in 1929 but the shoe industry fared better than most. Factories, particularly those in rural areas, operated at or above production levels experienced prior to the Great Depression. One reason is that military contracts for the shoe industry continued after the war ended. One example is Brown Shoe Company’s factory in Moberly, Missouri. The plant operated at full capacity in 1931 to fulfill an order for 92,038 pairs of military shoes. ISC also won military bids in 1931; including two Army contracts to manufacture nearly 41,000 shoes. Peacetime contracts were not as large as wartime orders but they were a steady influx during an era when consumer sales were at an all-time low. During the Depression, cuts made in shoe manufacturing fell primarily on the shoulders of factory workers as companies reduced wages and hours to stay afloat. A sunnier view of the “agreement” between manufacturers and laborers during the Great Depression was reported by the *Christian Science Monitor* in 1934 as an effort by “employers” to keep [shoe] factories open and “workers together.” In exchange, employees willingly showed “their appreciation” by accepting lower wages
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and fewer hours without complaint.\textsuperscript{91} Workers had little choice but to take what they were offered. When they refused, shoe companies pulled work from the factory and went elsewhere. Such practices continued post the passage of workers’ rights legislation in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{92}

The 1930s ended with the failure of Hamilton-Brown, which filed for bankruptcy in 1939. The company had not been as successful as Brown and ISC, which were able to land military shoe contracts after the war.\textsuperscript{93} St. Louis again boomed when World War II prompted military contracts for more than 50 million pairs of boots and shoes, of which the city’s manufacturers supplied 20%.\textsuperscript{94} ISC alone produced an estimated 50 million pairs of boots and shoes for United States forces (Army, Navy, Marines) during World War II. Additionally, the company developed a program for the government that allowed military footwear to be recycled when leather shortages became an issue. An estimated 12 million pairs of shoes/boots were repurposed by ISC during the war and most of the labor came from the company’s regional factories. Because women had traditionally comprised a large proportion of shoe industry workers, mobilization was quicker for shoe manufacturing than other industries. In addition to shoes, St. Louis’ manufacturers produced jackets, gloves, pants, “leggings and delousing bags” during the war.\textsuperscript{95}

Leather and rubber shortages were problematic for the shoe industry during World War II. It was an anticipated issue, as shortages had also been experienced during World War I. Du Pont – one of the government’s largest World War II contractors – attempted to remedy the shortages by turning its attention in the 1910s toward the development of synthetic leather known as “Fabrikoid.”\textsuperscript{96} In 1916, the company tested Fabrikoid in shoes produced for postal workers in Wilmington, Delaware. Though Fabrikoid proved to be waterproof and mimicked leather’s appearance, it was inflexible and non-porous.\textsuperscript{97} Du Pont scrapped its plan to use Fabrikoid for shoes but successfully adapted the material for other consumer goods, particularly automobile interiors.\textsuperscript{98} Du Pont also
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\textsuperscript{95} “St. Louis Shoe Industry Prepared to Go All-Out in Defense Program,” St. Louis Star-Times (29 December 1950), Copy available in flat files: Shoes – Trade and Manufacturing, St. Louis Public Library.
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provided the shoe industry with two usable synthetics during the war – cellulose (used to cover heels) and neoprene, which replaced rubber.\footnote{99}{“Scientist Tells How Chemistry is Providing Uses for Farm Products,” *The Sikeston (Mo.) Herald* (2 October 1941), 4.} After World War II, St. Louis’ shoe industry returned to its traditional patterns of outsourcing labor and fine tuning production to meet consumer trends. The industry also incorporated new missions, including diversification. After the war, St. Louis also began to take the lead in national retail shoe sales and specialty manufacturing – two areas of the industry that had been previously dominated by northeastern shoe companies. Until the late 1960s, St. Louis remained an uncontested giant in many aspects of the shoe industry although the city manufactured few shoes after 1945.\footnote{100}{Edward H. Thornton, “Comparatively Few Are Made Here, However,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (16 February 1964). Copy available in flat files: Shoes – Trade and Manufacturing, St. Louis Public Library.}

**Postwar Shoe Manufacturing and the Changing City, 1946 – 1969**

Initially, the outlook was good for St. Louis’ shoe industry after World War II. Although the city itself did not support major manufacturing, regional output rose after 1945. In contrast, east coast manufacturing declined by 20% in the two years following World War II.\footnote{101}{“Shift of Shoe Industry to this Area Intensified.”} Foreign exports also rose after the war but this was a tiny percentage of regional output, averaging 2-5% of total postwar production.\footnote{102}{Though output remained high and showed signs of growth in terms of regional manufacturing, employment began to decline in 1947 and steadily continued. After the war, manufacturers replaced outdated machinery and modernized factories. The focus was efficiency and profit. People were rapidly being replaced by machines and factories that no longer produced up to postwar expectations were closed.} Until the late 1960s, St. Louis remained the world’s largest shoe manufacturer with 58 shoe factories, nine sole factories, nine tanneries, a rubber plant, cotton mill, welt factory

In May of 1948, the shoe industry experienced steep declines in production. Three months later, the industry rebounded to the point that both Brown and ISC made record profits. The Federal Reserve attributed fluctuations to the change in quality of output – St. Louis shoe companies were producing a “better made” shoe than they had prior to the war.\footnote{104}{“Shoe Decentralization,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (25 December 1949), 23G.} Additionally, production prices in Missouri were higher than elsewhere in the country.\footnote{105}{Ibid.} In 1949, ISC remained the world’s largest shoe manufacturer with 58 shoe factories, nine sole factories, nine tanneries, a rubber plant, cotton mill, welt factory
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“and numerous other supply plants” – few factories remained in St. Louis. In the same year, Brown had “33 factories, tanneries, warehouses and other offices in six states” – only three factories remained in St. Louis. After World War II, ISC manufactured shoes in rural Missouri and Illinois, as well as Arkansas, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas, Pennsylvania and West Virginia. In 1952, St. Louis had fewer shoe factories than prior to World War I. Even so, 23 shoe companies claimed St. Louis as their headquarters. In 1964, only five manufacturers owned shoe factories in the city – Florsheim, Hamilton, Samuels, Wolff and Kalmon. Of these, only Kalmon manufactured all of its shoes in St. Louis. Neither Brown nor ISC were manufacturing any shoes in St. Louis by the mid-1960s.

Factory employment declined through the early 1960s. Between the years 1947 and 1962, jobs in the leather trades dropped by 25% and Missouri’s shoe factories eliminated approximately 11,000 positions. ISC remained the nation’s largest shoe company in 1963, followed by Endicott Johnson (New York), Brown (St. Louis) and Genesco (Nashville, Tennessee). As domestic production declined, St. Louis’ shoe companies turned toward retailing to maintain their dominance in the industry. Brown began the process in 1950 by purchasing Wohl Shoes, a major St. Louis retailer that had jobbed shoes since the mid-1920s. Wohl sold an average of $33 million shoes annually in the early 1950s. The company owned more than 2,500 stores throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico and Cuba. As Brown’s “first major [retail] acquisition,” it was a great leap “toward integrating [the company’s] operations into both manufacturing and retailing.” ISC pursued a similar course when in 1952 it purchased Florsheim and Savage Shoes. By 1955, ISC owned 155 major retail shoe companies. ISC also began manufacturing overseas when it purchased Caribe Shoe Corporation of Puerto Rico in 1958.

In 1968, a “flood” of imported plastic shoes from Asia rocked the profits of St. Louis’ shoe industry. For ISC, the impact was minimal. The company had been investing in factories overseas since the 1950s and by 1960 owned approximately 800 retail establishments. ISC began to diversify, anticipating the effect that foreign imports would have on the industry. Brown was caught off guard and earnings fell by 25% in 1969.
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At this point, Brown also began to diversify.\textsuperscript{115} Between the years 1964 and 1978, ISC purchased 21 companies that manufactured and/or sold items such as shoes and clothing with one exception, Central Hardware, purchased in 1966. Following this acquisition, ISC changed its corporate name to INTERCO, reflecting its future as a major manufacturing/retailer.\textsuperscript{116} Brown followed a similar path but strayed further by purchasing a luggage company, retail fabric stores, a rubber company and department stores.\textsuperscript{117}

_**St. Louis in the Late Twentieth Century, 1970 - 1980**_

Both Brown and ISC (INTERCO) continued to diversify through the 1970s – INTERCO focused its business concerns on shoes and apparel. By 1979 the company had “three major operating divisions” – clothing (11 companies), manufacturing (62 plants) and distribution (13 centers). Retailing consisted of 856 general establishments (29 states) and 874 shoe stores (43 states, Mexico, Canada, and Australia). In 1979, the company began to purchase furniture stores. Although INTERCO survived a hostile takeover in 1988, the company was forced to file for bankruptcy in 1991. When INTERCO restructured in 1996 as Furniture Brands, International, it did not return to shoe manufacturing or retailing. In 2008, Furniture Brands moved its headquarters from St. Louis to Clayton, Missouri – something that Brown had done much earlier in 1952.\textsuperscript{118} Brown closed its final business in St. Louis in 1980 – a downtown shoe warehouse, though its headquarters remained in St. Louis County until 2015.\textsuperscript{119}

In 2015, Brown was absorbed by a Wisconsin shoe company, Caleres, which utilizes the Brown name for men’s and children’s shoes. The latter is most significant in that the company also uses the legendary Buster Brown image adopted by Brown Shoe Company in 1904 for its children’s shoes, originally manufactured in St. Louis (Figure 13).\textsuperscript{120} Shoe manufacturing may be long gone but it is not forgotten. In addition to enduring images such as young master Brown and his canine companion, St. Louis has successfully converted many of its former shoe buildings – warehouses, headquarters and factories – for contemporary use. The best recognized example is ISC’s former downtown headquarters and shoe warehouse complex at Washington Avenue and 15th

\textsuperscript{115} “Brown Shoe Company, Inc. – Company Profile . . .”
\textsuperscript{116} “Furniture Brands International, Inc. History.”
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Street (NRL, Washington Avenue Historic District, 1986), which today houses an urban museum, residential lofts and an entertainment venue.

Figure 13. Brown Shoe promotion using its Buster Brown and Tige campaign in Grove City, Pennsylvania, c. 1915 (Sources: Birnkrant Collection, Available at: http://melbirnkrant.com/collection/page8.html and Arcadia’s Postcard History Series, Grove City, p. 98).
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